

## Prospectus: A History of Writing at Arizona State University

### I. Introduction

According to the first wave of composition historians, the birth of writing instruction in American postsecondary institutions began at Harvard in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and quickly spread across the country, extending out from the elite colleges to become a ubiquitous requirement in almost all institutions of higher education by the end of the century (Kitzhaber; Berlin, *Writing Instruction*; Crowley, *Methodical and Composition*; Connors, *Composition-Rhetoric*). Many of these historians have argued that there was a flurry of intellectual endeavor in the last half of the 1800s as practitioners such as Adams Sherman Hill (Harvard), Barrett Wendell (Harvard), John Genung (Amherst), and Fred Newton Scott (Michigan) theorized ways to transform the qualities of oral rhetoric that had been the focus of classical educations for over 2000 years into the demands of writing instruction for the throngs of “under-prepared” students invading the academy after the Morrill Act of 1862. But according to Robert Connors, “the great generation of experts from the 1890s [...] either did not or could not train replacements for themselves,” (“Composition” 9) and by the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, resulting from the intense workload required to teach writing and the distinct lack of graduate programs in rhetoric (Scott’s being the lonely exception), most of the courses were being taught by graduate students and non-disciplinary faculty (Connors, “Rhetoric”).

In histories of college writing instruction that trace this stagnation in composition’s development as a field, it has become axiomatic to see the period from approximately 1910-1950 as theoretically dead (the period has been variously described as beginning as early as 1880 and ending as late as 1970 [see especially Connors, “Rise and Fall” and Crowley, *Methodical*]).

Historians have argued that writing instruction existed for the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century under the banner of “current-traditional” rhetoric, (see Young; Connors, “Rise and Fall” and *Composition-Rhetoric*; Berlin, *Rhetoric*; Crowley, *Methodical* and *Composition*) and that instruction was based around what Connors, following Albert Kitzhaber, calls “static abstractions”: terms whose purpose is to describe good structure in writing (*Composition-Rhetoric* 270). These include the triad of “Unity-Mass-Coherence” and the modes: exposition, definition, narration, and argumentation (see especially Connors, “Rise and Fall” and Crowley, *Methodical*).

Formative histories for Rhetoric and Composition, including Kitzhaber’s germinal dissertation *Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900*, suggest that the dearth of theoretically inclined practitioners after 1900 doomed composition to a pedagogy of apprenticeship driven by untrained writing teachers inheriting textbooks and handbooks from which to draw their daily lessons as well as their pedagogical educations. These apprentice teachers taught writing only as long as was necessary and then abandoned composition for more prestigious and less demanding careers teaching literature (Kitzhaber; Connors “Rhetoric”). In these histories, only eccentric individualists like Porter Perrin, Kitzhaber’s dissertation advisor, cared about or pursued the intellectual nature of teaching writing in the years between the institution of first-year composition as a universal requirement at Harvard and the birth of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1949.

## **II. Review of Literature**

Not all composition historians, however, have agreed with such a monolithic history. Some historians believe that the “current-traditional” era is more complex than the

acknowledged histories suggest (see Varnum, “History” and *Fencing*; Carr, et al; Gold, *Rhetoric*; Tirabassi). In 1988, John Brereton argued that the assumption that “major thinkers in English Studies simply abandoned composition” after 1900 is “quite wrong” (“Composition” 41). He argues that some of the century’s most prominent scholars, among them John Matthews Manly and Norman Foerster, dedicated much of their time to developing rhetorical theory, writing composition textbooks, and teaching composition based on contemporaneous developments in education theory and cultural theories. Brereton concludes that the theoretical contributions of Manly and Foerster in particular, and of practitioners of the Old Criticism in general, from which Manly and Foerster emerged, were widely repudiated by the subsequent generation of rhetoricians such as Kenneth Burke and I.A. Richards, which “would slowly transform thinking about composition and relegate Manly and Foerster to the past” (53).

More recently, composition historians have begun to develop research that supports Brereton’s implicit argument—composition history is much more complex than canonical histories suggest, and much work needs to be done to uncover important nuances about the development of writing instruction and Rhetoric and Composition across the country over the past 120 years. For example, David Gold argues, drawing on Brereton’s *The Origins of Composition Studies*, “we still know too little about the classroom experiences of students and educators at Southern, religious, women’s, working-class, and historically black colleges” (*Rhetoric* ix). He continues, “The stories of such schools need to be told and not simply to represent the experiences of once-neglected communities or to satisfy a sense of historical injustice but to offer a more nuanced and representative picture of the past” (ix). Gold goes on to profile three institutions--one a historically black college, one a women’s college, and one a rural Normal school--to demonstrate the need for updating the historical record, and in the process he

demonstrates the ways in which local histories have the potential to seriously contradict received wisdom about the development of composition, in particular the notion that less-prestigious institutions replicated rhetorical pedagogy from elite colleges when making important decisions about the needs of a rhetorical education for their students (see also Donahue and Moon; Gold, “Where Brains”).

Similarly, in her recent dissertation, *Revisiting the ‘Current-Traditional Era: Innovations in Writing Instruction at the University of New Hampshire, 1940-1949*, Katherine Tirabassi looks closely at archival materials about the University of New Hampshire in the 1940s to suggest that writing pedagogies in upper-division writing courses at UNH were in fact quite progressive, as opposed to the prevalent notion that writing pedagogies during this time were uniformly static and conservative. In Tirabassi’s argument, writing instructors in advanced composition courses at UNH were using of some of the groundbreaking pedagogies developed by their creative writing colleagues, such as writer’s workshops and roundtables, to teach their students about other kinds of writing than the static abstractions of first-year composition. Tirabassi acknowledges, but largely avoids discussing, the first-year composition courses at UNH. She opts not to argue about whether the first-year courses were or were not “current-traditional” because, she argues, first-year composition courses, the traditional domain of composition historians, are important but far from comprehensive as sites for historical study. Furthermore, she issues a call, following Connors (“Dreams”), that histories of composition need to be undertaken at multiple, local sites and arise from multiple methodologies, including archival and oral ones. Like Gold, she sees the possibility for more complexity in the historical record resulting from local histories.

Local histories, like the ones Gold and Tirabassi call for, are gaining traction in composition publications. While few published local histories are as extensive as Gold's and Tirabassi's, two edited collections published since 2004, Patricia Donahue and Gretchen Flesher Moon's *Local Histories* and Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo's *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration*, have sought to expand the scope of composition history, arguing in particular for local histories. Each of these collections takes as part of its aims to contest previous composition histories, acknowledging the partial and contestable nature of all historical narratives, including their own. In *Local Histories*, the contributors explicitly contest the idea that composition in America trickled down from elite colleges to other postsecondary institutions by drawing on local archives that show composition instruction in full use in "non-elite" schools prior to the establishment of the required course at Harvard. Though mostly concerned with 19<sup>th</sup> Century sites of composition history, the authors and editors see the kind research undertaken by the authors in this collection as invaluable for researchers and historians looking at other local sites.

In *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration*, the authors develop the argument that writing program administrators, often working without the authority of the duly-named position, have been around as long as writing courses have been in institutions of higher learning and have been intensely affected by their local conditions. One goal of this collection is to present evidence to counter the idea that writing program administration is a relatively new concept, an idea the authors attribute at least in part to an article by Edward P.J. Corbett in which he claims not to be able to find any evidence of WPAs before the 1950s or so. The authors argue that individual institutions developed more or less comprehensive positions for responding to local conditions associated with administering writing programs, whatever the name given to the

person or position. At some institutions, professors took turns administering the programs without any real material or intellectual support. At other places, non-professorial faculty ran writing programs as their full-time employment. And at still other locales, the writing program was run by committee. For each program described, the local conditions determined the response of the writing program administration, which ends up being a major argument of the collection.

A major concern of historians looking at local histories has been the need for local materials. As such, historians calling for local histories have foregrounded the need for research methods that value non-traditional materials. So, for example, another goal of *Local Histories* and *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration* is to argue for archival research as valuable and important. L'Eplattenier and Mastrangelo take archival research as a granted for historical work (xv). Like Breerton (*Origins*) and Connors ("Writing"), the contributors to this book see history as existing in the voices of times past which exist in historical documents, and they draw on these sources to establish the individuals and programs they study as guideposts in the development of Rhetoric and Composition. As well, Donahue and Moon argue that the documents in "dusty archives" are vital to "illuminate and inflect current historical narratives in new and intriguing ways" (xiii). In addition to being important arguments for local histories that challenge traditional means of understanding the national development of writing instruction, both of these collections are important arguments for archival research.

However, archival research has also been used recently by other historians to challenge traditional composition histories. Only instead of taking as their subjects local histories, they have attempted to look at more comprehensive sites of development. Like *Local Histories*, *Archives of Instruction* contests the traditional narratives of composition histories through

archival research. Drawing solely on archival sources that the authors collected, Carr, Carr, and Schultz argue that textbooks and other schoolbooks (rhetorics, handbooks, etc.) reflect and refract prevailing cultural and educational theories, but that they are not the stalwarts of conservative thought as is often argued by other historians. In a similar methodological argument to that of Donahue and Moon, Carr, Carr, and Schultz contend that archival work is important for understanding the landscape of composition history. Unlike Donahue and Moon, however, *Archives of Instruction* is not focused simply on the local histories of institutions or writing programs. Rather, they survey several decades' worth of composition texts from the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, across several editions in some cases, to show the ways in which textbook authors attempted to balance the demands of conservative teachers who adopted textbooks, progressive educational theory, and the authors' understandings of student needs. This book, like *Local Histories*, does much to complicate the origins of Rhetoric and Composition in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

In addition to archival research, composition historians are looking for other methods to locate and value materials that can help to complicate received wisdom about the history of writing instruction. *Local Histories*, *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration*, and *Archives of Instruction* each adds important documentary and methodological arguments to composition history, but they each address time periods that can only be accessed through archival research. Conversely, Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan's *Beyond the Archives*, while also arguing for the importance of turning to archival research to better understand history for rhetoricians and compositionists (among others), also establishes the importance of oral history for amending the historical record. In *Beyond the Archives*, the collected authors ruminate on the personal and serendipitous nature of research in the archives and reflect on the ways that archival research in particular is inflected by the researcher. Like *Local Histories*, *Beyond the Archives*

comprises arguments about the need to focus on individual demands and local conditions, but the argument is less one about the subjects being studied and more about the people doing the research. *Beyond the Archives* affirms the value of archival research, but also powerfully asserts the value of oral histories to composition and other research, including archival research.

In fact, oral histories have been employed in composition history for some time. For example, Duane H. Roen, Stuart C. Brown, and Theresa Enos, in *Living Rhetoric and Composition*, collected stories of some of Rhetoric and Composition's most recognizable "scholar/teacher/storytellers" about how they came to be involved in the teaching of writing and the field of Rhetoric and Composition to prevent the rich experiential memories of Rhetoric and Composition's pioneers from being lost to future scholars. Roen, Brown, and Enos believe, "These stories also help to situate scholars, their work, and importantly, the development of the profession" (xv), an argument for oral histories (even written ones) as vital to understanding a field of study. Roen also edited *Views from the Center*, a collection of CCCC chairs addresses amended with reflective responses from nearly all the speech-makers or their close colleagues or friends "to shed light on their thinking at the time of the address—or on how their thinking has changed over the years" (vi). Both of these collections support the unstated supposition that oral histories, though perhaps flawed by time and subsequent encounters, have resonances that enrich other sources.

The same thesis, that oral histories provide rich context for the work of composition historians, guides Mary Rosner, Beth Boehm, and Debra Journet's *History, Reflection and Narrative*, in which Rhetoric and Composition luminaries are set in discussions with each other about their understandings of the developments of the field over a twenty year period. A series of group interviews punctuates more traditional, scholarly essays from participants at the 1996



Watson Conference at the University of Louisville. But, as Stephen North has argued implicitly in *The Making of Knowledge in Composition*, oral history can often be dismissed in intellectual circles as mere “lore,” a label which often undercuts the important and serious nature of oral history for academic endeavors (see Nelms for a critique of North’s historiographical methods). Lester Faigley’s response, in “Veterans’ Stories on the Porch,” collected in Rosner, et al., is that “How we understand history depends on the method of writing history” (26). He argues that oral histories need to be buffeted with the more “official” historiographical methods employed in documentary histories (27), but he does conclude that “we need both the big and little narratives to understand our history” (36). For Faigley, then, oral histories are useful in conjunction with other types of history making—a view which seems particularly useful in light of the long presence of oral history in Rhetoric and Composition, the hard work done by traditional historians of composition, and the more recent turn toward archival research by newer composition historians.

Gerald Nelms also makes the compelling argument for oral histories in “The Case for Oral Evidence in Composition Historiography.” According to Nelms, historians have been reconsidering the value of oral histories after they were dismissed as insufficient in the 1800s with the rise of scientific positivism. Nelms argues, to the same end as Faigley, that oral histories are as valuable and reliable as documentary histories because of the inherent unreliability of all history. That is, “all research exists in conversation with other research and is therefore socially constituted” (379), which Nelms sees as a benefit for oral historiography because it protects historians from drawing narrow conclusions based on incomplete documentary records. Nelms, too, sees the value for historians of setting oral and documentary

evidence in conversation, added as well to the biases and perspectives of the historians who view the evidence and write the narratives.

One book that works to balance the three aforementioned methods is *1977: A Cultural Moment in Composition*, by Brent Henze, Jack Selzer, and Wendy Sharer. Henze, et al. conduct extensive archival research and oral histories to sketch a history of Penn State's writing program. They argue that 1977 represented an important moment in the local history of Penn State, which itself made an important impact on national conversations about composition. According to the authors, Penn State's impact was not a result of its "elite" status, but rather because so many students passed through the Penn State composition program in the late 1970s and early 1980s (vi). The authors set out to learn about "the historical conditions that influenced the composition program" through the "multivalent strands—scholarship, culture, politics, economics, personalities, and institutional dynamics to name but a few—that entwined to form the complex and conflicted foundation" of the Penn State writing program (vii). Further, the authors resisted a unified history, choosing instead to "retain the messy traces" (viii), but at the same time they situate their narrative within other historical narratives about the development of composition. In fact, the authors situate Penn State in national and local conversations about writing, students, learning, budgets, and more, by starting with broad context (national development) and gradually moving into tighter focus on their local site. One of the important conclusions of *1977: A Cultural Moment in Composition* is that the history of Penn State in 1977 is partial and contingent (on memories, published accounts, and available ephemera), and its influences are largely indeterminable for more expansive histories of composition, though they can be read in context with other things that have been said about composition history. *1977* does a good job of balancing multiple methods for making history, as well as balancing the local history of Penn

State in 1977 with more expansive geographical and chronological narratives of composition history.

The history of Penn State written by Henze, Selzer, and Sharer opens space for other local histories of programs that have been important and influential sites of instruction over the last several decades. One such site is Arizona State University (ASU). ASU is currently the nation's largest writing program, serving approximately 18,000 students in the 2007/2008 school year. And ASU, like Penn State, has seen thousands of students come through the writing program. In 1978, Frank D'Angelo published a profile of the writing program using numbers from the 1976 fall semester in which 3450 students enrolled in writing courses ("Freshman" 46). Because students were required to enroll in two first-year courses, English 101 and 102, it is reasonable to assume that a comparable number enrolled in the spring semester as well. D'Angelo notes that 90% of FYC classes were taught by graduate students, and based on the numbers he provides, there were approximately 124 courses taught by graduate assistants, and 138 FYC courses each semester (46). Wilfred A. Ferrell, in a 1963 survey of the teaching assistant program at ASU, writes that 60 percent of FYC sections were taught by graduate assistants, who at the time numbered 27 and taught two sections each semester, (78) for a total of 54 sections taught by graduate students and 90 sections in total. If the enrollment at ASU had stayed constant with 1963's numbers, 101,250 students would have passed through ASU's FYC courses in 45 years, making it a significant site of instruction. But enrollment at ASU did not stay constant—it exploded. In the eleven year period from 1993-2004 alone, 110,340 students enrolled in Writing Programs courses, and enrollment numbers have grown even higher in the past five years. If numbers of students served is justification for a sustained study, ASU certainly deserves attention.

Numbers alone don't begin to accurately represent the profile of any writing program. Besides the students who have come through ASU's writing program, ASU has also had a number of people who were formative in the development of the field of Rhetoric and Composition as members of the teaching staff. For instance, in 1963, Jerome W. Archer was hired as chairman of the department after having served as chairman of the English Department at Marquette for 15 years. Archer, in addition to being deeply involved in the National Council of the Teachers of English (NCTE), also served at the chair of the 1955 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). Additionally, he directed a joint NCTE/CCCC conference in 1965 on the teaching of English in two-year colleges at ASU, and in 1968 contributed to a joint statement by the Conference on College Composition and Communications Executive Committee entitled "The Status of Freshman Composition" in *College Composition and Communication (CCC)* in February 1968. Archer undoubtedly contributed in important ways to both ASU's writing programs, as well as to the field of Rhetoric and Composition.

For all of Archer's contributions, others who served the department were equally as influential in the field. For example, in 1968, Wilfred A. Ferrell, who served as the assistant chair under Archer and replaced him as chair in 1971, and Nicholas A. Salerno, who became chair of the department following Ferrell, published *Strategies in Prose*, a collection of readings for use in FYC which saw at least five editions. In 1971, Frank D'Angelo was asked to take over the program, having been hired the year before (D'Angelo, "In Search," 61-62). D'Angelo would go on to be influential in the development of composition, including chairing CCCC in 1979, and was particularly prominent in establishing classical rhetoric as a theoretical foundation for composition (see, for example, *Process and Composition*). Since D'Angelo's tenure as director of composition, Dorothy Guinn (a former student of Ross Winterrowd's and participant

at the first Wyoming Conference in 1976 [D'Angelo, "Professing," 272]), David Schwalm, Duane Roen, John Ramage, Maureen Daly Goggin, Keith Miller, Greg Glau, Paul Matsuda, and Shirley Rose have served as directors of composition or WPAs, respectively, and nearly all of them are still active at ASU and in the field of Rhetoric and Composition. ASU writing program directors have helped to pioneer programs like Stretch, which stretches English 101 over two semesters for developmental students (Stretch was first conceived of by David Schwalm, John Ramage, and others, but was not fully implemented until Keith Miller's term as WPA). In addition, the PhD program in rhetoric and composition continues to produce new scholars and teachers every year and has drawn other notable rhetoricians and compositionists, such as John Gage and Sharon Crowley, to teach at ASU. The PhD was first developed in 1978 by D'Angelo and Gage as a specialization to the Literature based PhD (D'Angelo, "In Search," 62), and it was further developed into its own full program in 1997 by Duane Roen and linguist Karen Adams. For the past 45 years, ASU's writing program has no doubt reflected and impacted national trends, local situations, and individual contributions.

But ASU's history is still more complicated than even the last 45 years suggest. For example, though ASU is currently jockeying for the distinction of the largest university in the nation, it was founded in 1885 as Arizona's first normal school, in part as a response to Tucson being granted lands designated for the state by the Morrill Act of 1862 for a state university. ASU remained a teachers' college until 1945, when according to University Archives, the school was authorized by the State Board of Regents to begin granting BA and BS degrees in response to the needs of returning GIs ("The New ASU Story"). By the mid-1950s, the Hollis Commission, formed as part of the U.S. Department of Education at the behest of Arizonans, determined that ASU served all the functions of a university and should become one. ASU was

divided into four colleges for the 1955-1956 school year, and by 1959 the name was changed from Arizona State College to Arizona State University.

Since the founding of ASU in 1885, when it was called the Territorial Normal School, writing was a major part of the curriculum. In the 1886-1887 school year, there were two tracks. The elementary course of study, a two-year degree, reflected a minimum requirement of three writing courses in the two-year curriculum (“Course of Study” 2). By 1900, the advanced course, a four-year curriculum, included the following requirements:

1<sup>st</sup> yr.—Grammar and Composition daily, both semesters

Word Analysis twice a week the first semester

Elocution once a week the first semester, twice the second

2<sup>nd</sup> yr.—Rhetoric and Grammar or Composition daily, both semesters

3<sup>rd</sup> yr.—Grammatical Analysis daily, the first semester

English Literature and Masterpieces daily, second semester

4<sup>th</sup> yr.—American Literature and Masterpieces daily, first semester

English Criticism daily, second semester (qtd. in Turner 9)

It is clear that writing was a respected part of the curriculum from the founding of the school in the late 1800s. And, while this course of study allows for the possibility that literature was valued over composition, as has been argued by many composition historians about early postsecondary educations (see for example Crowley, *Composition*, Chapter 5), the curriculum might be read differently in light of Gold’s argument that normal schools had different goals and missions than did universities. Katherine Turner, in her unpublished history of ASU’s English department offers further evidence that ASU developed along the lines of those theorized by Crowley, Connors, and Kitzhaber when she notes that James Lee Felton “consolidated English

courses under the headings of Rhetoric and Composition, Spelling and Word Analysis, English Literature, American Literature, and Grammar” and that “Rhetoric and Composition was described to seem like a forerunner of Freshman Composition” (15). Still, there was much variation in the writing courses and requirements Turner delineates that suggest writing was taught across many years, unlike the common conception, and writing was taught in ways that made use of, but weren’t delimited by, the modes of discourse. For example, in the 1913 curriculum, the first-year course was based on the traditional modes (exposition, definition, narration, and argumentation), but fourth-year students were required to take “English 4—Grammar and Methods” separate from the first year course (Turner 16), indicating that “grammar” was seen on some level as existing apart from the modes, in contrast to what many historians have seen as the formal focus of modes instruction. Certainly the writing curriculum was more developed than a single, first-year “remedial” course meant to bring students up to college standards. For example, by the 1920s, there was a two-semester writing requirement, English 101 and 102. There was also a “remedial” track, 103 and 104, and advanced composition was offered as an elective in 1931 (Turner 19-30). And writing was a major component of many other English courses as well.

### **III. Tentative Research Questions**

1. How does ASU’s writing program support or contradict accepted narratives about the national development of composition instruction?
2. How does the development of ASU’s writing program contribute to, contradict, or reinforce disciplinary histories of Rhetoric and Composition?

3. In what ways did local, regional, and national contexts impact ASU's writing program?
4. In what ways did the development of ASU from normal school to regional college to nationally ranked research university impact writing instruction?
5. How does the presence of prominent researchers and scholars in the field of Rhetoric and Composition reflect on the writing program in a way that might differ from schools with less of a focus on research?

#### **IV. Chapters**

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Chapter 3: Writing in the curriculum, 1885-1945. During these years, ASU was a normal school under 6 different names, each with different curricula, goals, and populations served. Using archives housed in ASU's University Archives, this chapter will be a broad account of writing as described in the courses of study, departmental reports, and other sources as it developed in relation to the "Grand Narrative" of rhetoric and composition.

Chapter 4: Writing at ASU, 1945-1971. During this period, ASU's English department had faculty active in rhetoric and composition, publishing in journals and writing textbooks related to writing. Using archives and faculty publications, this chapter will look at ASU's writing program in relation to disciplinary conversations taking place in journals at the time.



Chapter 5: Writing Programs and Rhetoric and Composition, 1971-1985. In 1971, Frank D'Angelo became director of composition, a position he held until 1978.

D'Angelo was the first trained rhetoric and composition professional to direct the writing program. This chapter will assess the development of writing at ASU in relation to disciplinary narratives about the "Process Movement" and the rise of rhetoric and composition as a discipline.

Chapter 6: The Modern Era, 1985-present. In 1985, David Schwalm became the first rhetoric and composition faculty member hired at ASU specifically to direct the writing program. This chapter will use archival research and interviews to situate ASU's writing program in local and disciplinary contexts that affected how the program developed into one of the largest in the country.

Chapter 7: Conclusion and Implications

## **V. Methods/Design of Study**

### **Chapter 3**

For the first part of my study, I will conduct archival research in ASU's University Archives to determine the development of writing curricula from 1885-1945, the period during which ASU was a normal school in its various permutations. I expect to find papers and documents that will enable me to offer tentative speculations about how writing instruction reflected or contradicted broader trends in relation to rhetoric and composition histories, and I will be particularly interested in the relationship of the curriculum as suggested by archival materials and the common narrative that writing theory was stagnant and "current-traditional" during much of this period. However, the comparison will need to reflect the differences

between the types of institutions generally associated with disciplinary histories of writing instruction (post-secondary) and the type of institution ASU was (even as a normal school, it changed significantly over the course of the sixty years before it became a state college).

#### **Chapter 4**

For the second part of my study, I will use archival research and published sources to determine how, or if, writing instruction changed with the switch from a normal school to a college and then a university. Starting in 1945, ASU was designated as a state college (Arizona State College), and in 1959, it became Arizona State University. I will again use archives from the University Archives to determine what courses were offered or required and how they were described. During this period, however, there were several faculty members in the English department, including some who were chairs or associate chairs, who wrote textbooks for use in first-year writing classrooms (c.f. Archer and Schwartz; Ferrell and Salerno; Myers, *Guide*; Myers, *An American*). In addition, several texts were published that either describe the writing program at ASU directly (cf. Myers, “The English Language Program”) or describe writing related activities that might be helpful for assessing curriculum, instruction, theoretical models, and/or contexts (cf. Archer and Ferrell). At least three faculty members at ASU, L.M. Myers, Jerome Archer, and Wilfred Ferrell, published about teaching writing in sources other than textbooks, and Archer was a former CCCC chair prior to coming to ASU. Therefore, in this chapter, I will especially interested in assessing how writing at ASU emerged in relation to the developing disciplinary discussions about writing taking place in journals such as *CCC* and *College English*.

## **Chapter 5**

In chapter 5, I will maintain my focus on the relationship of ASU's writing program and national disciplinary discussion in rhetoric and composition, but with special attention to the ways that the writing program developed as a program under the direction of trained rhetoric and composition scholars. For this chapter and the next chapter, I will conduct similar research to that described above, but I will add oral interviews of people involved with directing the writing program (see questions below). I have decided to contain my interviews primarily to the writing program directors for two reasons: 1) my IRB approval was limited to writing program directors, and 2) to keep my research manageable. In addition, especially during the years of 1971-1985, the directors were most likely the only faculty members actively engaged in the disciplinary discussions taking place in rhetoric and composition and the administrative structure was such that the directors were solely responsible for decision making in the writing program. In this section, I intend to compare ASU's writing program to disciplinary narratives of rhetoric and composition about the "Process Movement."

### **Interview Questions**

1. When you were directing the Writing Program, what staff position was responsible for developing, staffing, scheduling, and assessing the writing classes?
2. What kind of support were you given by the department, college, or university as Writing Programs Administrator (i.e. release time, tenure, budget, support staff, etc.)?
3. How were instructors recruited? What were their credentials? How were they assessed?
4. What were the local/regional/national conditions that most affected the development, teaching, administering of writing courses during your tenure as Writing Programs Administrator? Was there any specific concern(s) that arose during your tenure as WPA that drastically redirected your administrative decisions?
5. Based on your personal assessment, what was the status of the program in the department/college/university? What was the status of the WPA, instructors, and writing instruction, in your opinion?
6. Can you suggest any aspects of the program I should research or other important considerations you think I need to take into account in completing a history of ASU's Writing Program?

## **Chapter 6**

I begin this section with the hiring of David Schwalm to direct the writing program. Schwalm was the first WPA to be hired specifically to run the writing program (D'Angelo was hired at an Assistant Professor and was asked to become director when the previous director stepped down in 1970). Using materials collected from David Schwalm (now housed in the National Archives of Composition and Rhetoric), as well as the materials above including interviews, I will attempt to situate ASU in the disciplinary conversations of rhetoric and composition with particular emphasis on local and national contexts rather than in relation to a standard historical narrative (which doesn't yet exist for the majority of this period). I will look, for example, at the rise in enrollment at ASU, the "basic writing wars" that took place at ASU in the 1980s and 1990s, changes in student demographics, and developments in rhetoric and composition as a discipline.

Once I have collected my data, I anticipate situating it in relation to the existing historical narratives of composition. I plan to assess how ASU has contributed to or contradicted what historians know about composition history. Because ASU's relationship to writing instruction spans the length of composition as a discipline as historicized by traditional composition historians, and because so many students have passed through the ASU writing program, and because scholars who have worked, taught, and studied at ASU have been influential in the field of Rhetoric and Composition for over 40 years, a study of ASU's local history would be informative and useful for composition historians. The history of ASU's writing program will fill a significant gap in the historical record for composition historians.

## **VI. Timeline**

January/February 2010:	Chapter 1 & 2
February/March 2010:	Chapter 1 & 2 Revisions
March/April 2010:	Chapter 3
April/May 2010:	Chapter 3 Revisions
May/June 2010:	Chapter 4
June/July 2010:	Chapter 4 Revisions
July/August 2010:	Chapter 5 & 6
August/September 2010:	Chapter 5 & 6 Revisions
September/October 2010:	Chapter 7
October/November 2010:	Chapter 7 Revisions and preparation of final draft
February 2011:	Complete project/defend dissertation

## **VII. Works Cited**

Archer, Jerome W. and Wilfred A. Ferrell. *Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College; Proceedings of the Tempe Conference, 1965*. Champaign, IL: NCTE, 1965. Print.

Archer, Jerome W. and Joseph Schwartz. *Exposition*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. Print.

Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.

---. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. Print.

- Brereton, John. "Composition and English Departments: 1900-1925." *Audits of Meaning: A Festschrift in Honor of Ann E. Berthoff*. Ed. Louise Z. Smith. Portsmouth: Heinemann (1988): 41-54. Print.
- , ed. *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925: A Documentary History*. Pittsburgh : U Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print.
- Carr, Jean Ferguson, Stephen L. Carr, and Lucille M. Schultz. *Archives of Instruction: Nineteenth-Century Rhetorics, Readers, and Composition Books in the United States*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print.
- Conference on College Composition and Communications Executive Committee. "The Status of Freshman Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 19.1 (1968): 81-4. Print.
- Connors, Robert J. "Composition History and Disciplinarity." Rosner, et al. 3-21. ---. *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh P, 1997. Print.
- . "Dreams and Play: Historical Method and Methodology." *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP (1992): 15-36. Print.
- . "Rhetoric in the Modern University: The Creation of an Underclass." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Ed. Richard Bullock and John Trimbur. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook (1991): 55-84. Print.
- . "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 32.4 (1981): 444-455.

- . "Writing the History of Our Discipline." *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. Ed. Gary Tate and Erika C. Lindemann. New York: Oxford UP (1991): 49-71. Print.
- Crowley, Sharon. *The Methodical Memory: Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990. Print.
- . *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. U Pittsburgh P, 1998. Print.
- "Course of Study" ASU Libraries, University Archives. Arizona State University. 15 Oct. 2008. Web. 16 Nov. 2009. <<http://www.asu.edu/lib/archives/asustory/pages/02acpro1.htm>>.
- D'Angelo, Frank J. *Composition in the Classical Tradition*. New York: Longman, 1999. Print.
- . "The Freshman Composition Program at Arizona State University." *Options for the Teaching of English*. Ed. Jasper P. Neel. New York: MLA (1978): 46-51. Print.
- . "In Search of the American Dream." Roen, et al. 55-64.
- . *Process and Thought in Composition*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge, MA: Little Brown, 1980. Print.
- . "Professing Rhetoric and Composition: A Personal Odyssey." Rosner, et al., 269-81.
- Donahue, Patricia and Gretchen Flesher Moon, eds. *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of Composition*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh Press, 2007. Print.
- Faigley, Lester. "Veterans' Stories on the Porch." Rosner, et al., 23-38.
- Ferrell, Wilfred A. "At Arizona State University." *College Composition and Communication* 14.2 (1963): 78-80. Print.
- Ferrell, Wilfred A. and Nicholas A. Salerno. *Strategies in Prose*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968. Print.
- Gold, David. *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revisiting the History of Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1873-1947*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.

- . "'Where Brains Had a Chance': William Mayo and Rhetorical Instruction at East Texas Normal College, 1889-1917." *College English* 67.3 (2005): 311-30. Print.
- Henze, Brent, Jack Selzer, and Wendy Sharer. *1977: A Cultural Moment in Composition*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 2007. Print.
- Kirsch, Gesa and Liz Rohan, eds. *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.
- Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Rhetoric in American Colleges*. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1990. Print.
- L'Eplattenier, Barbara, and Lisa Mastrangelo, eds. *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration: Individuals, Communities, and the Formation of a Discipline*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 2004. Print.
- Myers, L.M. *An American English Grammar*. Tempe: Arizona State College, 1948. Print.
- . "The English Language Program at Arizona State University." *College Composition and Communication* 12.2 (1961): 66-9. Print.
- . *Guide to American English*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1959. Print.
- Nelms, Gerald. "The Case for Oral Evidence in Composition Historiography." *Written Communication* 9.3 (1992): 356-84. Print.
- "The New ASU Story." ASU Libraries, University Archives Arizona State University. 15 Oct. 2008. Web. 16 Nov. 2009. <<http://www.asu.edu/lib/archives/asustory/intro.htm>>.
- North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1987. Print.
- Roen, Duane, ed. *Views from the Center: The CCCC Chairs' Addresses, 1977-2005*. Urbana, Illinois and Boston: NCTE and Bedford/St. Martin, 2006. Print.



Roen, Duane H., Stuart C. Brown, and Theresa Enos, eds. *Living Rhetoric and Composition: Stories of the Discipline*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999. Print.

Rosner, Mary, Beth Boehm, and Debra Journet, eds. *History, Reflection, and Narrative: The Professionalization of Composition 1963-1983*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex, 1998. Print.

Tirabassi, Katherine E. *Revisiting the 'Current-Traditional Era: Innovations in Writing Instruction at the University of New Hampshire, 1940-1949*. Diss. University of New Hampshire, 2007. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2006. AAT 3260608.

Turner, Katharine C. "History of the English Department: Arizona State University." Unpublished book, 1979. Print.

Varnum, Robin. *Fencing with Words: A History of Writing Instruction at Amherst College During the Era of Theodore Baird, 1938-1966*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1996. Print.

---. "The History of Composition: Reclaiming Our Lost Generations." *JAC* 12.1 (1992): 39-55. Print.

Young, Richard E. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*. Ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: NCTE (1978): 29-48. Print.