Florida State University Libraries

2010

(Re)Imagined Textual Geographies

Katherine Bridgman

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

(RE)IMAGINED TEXTUAL GEOGRAPHIES

By

KATHERINE BRIDGMAN

A Thesis submitted to the
Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2010

The members of the committee approve the thesis of Katherine Bridgman defended on June 18, 2010.

_____
Kristie Fleckenstein
Professor Directing Thesis

_____
Kathleen Yancey
Committee Member

_____
Michael Neal
Committee Member

_____
Deborah Coxwell-Teague
Committee Member

Approved:

_____
Ralph Berry, Chair, English Department

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members.

I dedicate this to my companion species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the following questions: how can we account for the emergence and change of a discipline *and* what is the role of the individual in this change? I answer these questions through a case study of the discipline of Basic Writing in which I explicate the textual identities of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. The data set of disciplinary texts that used in this study center on two "moments" in the discipline's history. The first "moment" is that of the discipline's inception in the 1970s. The second "moment" is that of a disciplinary change that occurred in the early 1990s. I answer the two research questions posed by this study by drawing from two theoretical frameworks. The first is that of Said in his seminal work of cultural criticism, *Orientalism*. Said enables this study to account for the initial emergence of a discipline. This methodological approach, however, frames disciplines as closed systems and obscures the agency of individuals who join the discipline after its initial emergence and the discipline's change. Here, mobility theory complements this first theoretical frame through which we see Basic Writing behaving as a discipline. Mobility theory frames disciplinary formations as open systems and enables this study to see authors as active agents in the change of a discipline.

The composite methodological framework of this thesis is applied to the two collections of texts that I examine through asking three key questions: who is the Basic Writer? who is the instructor of Basic Writing? what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? On the basis of this analysis, this study accounts for the emergence of disciplinary formations, the fluidity of these formations as well, and the agency of individual authors in this change. It reveals that, while Said focuses on *one* moment of emergence, disciplines unfold in terms of multiple moments of (re)emergence. In these moments of (re)emergence, authors actively align their texts with surrounding power structures. Within these texts, disciplinary authors craft multiple fluid and overlapping identities that authorize their voice within these texts, within the narratives that they construct of the Basic Writing classroom, and within the lived experience of their readers.

The primary implication of this study is in regard to the discipline of Basic Writing. Although this disciplinary formation may appear to be in a moment of crisis, this study suggests that perhaps this discipline is moving into a moment of (re)emergence in which the Basic Writer will again become textually visible in *this* moment. This study also suggests that agency is

always mediated as it is through the texts that they create that the authors in the study are active agents. Their agency is expressed *through* the fluid and overlapping textual identities that they enact within the texts of this study. Finally, this study illuminates a reciprocal relationship between scholars and the disciplines that write them into the world of academia. Individuals are not passively written into their roles within the University. Instead, they at once write and are written by the collective textual identities that emerge from the disciplinary texts that articulate a shared understanding of and knowledge about the Basic Writer.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In *The Formation of College English*, Thomas Miller capitalizes on his marginal position as a scholar of rhetoric within the discipline of Composition to argue that English departments are a product of a "transculturation" in which "dialectical processes make what gets taught and learned in marginal courses and institutions central to the ongoing development of the discipline" (29). Here he is framing the tensions between the margins and centers of a discipline as themselves productive of the discipline. Embedded within this argument is a call for readers to rethink the meaning and location of rhetoric within the disciplinary formation of Composition. However, as he refocuses our attention on rhetoric, Miller also brings into focus the importance of both revisiting disciplinary histories and critically reviewing the locations from which these histories have been told as a way to better understand the position of individuals within these structures.

Even as he performs this important function, he obscures the framing mechanism of his text. In an effort to coax this frame from the shadows of his pages, I suggest that what remains beyond his focus is the traditional frame of disciplines as fixed and stable entities that he relies on to argue for the productivity of a "dialectical process" between the margins and centers of English departments. Locating his work in this way allows Miller to claim space for both a critique of and contribution to the discipline of Composition. This space, however, remains limited by the frame through which he conceives it. As he transforms the marginalized instructor of rhetoric into an active agent, he operates *within* the ostensible stability of the discipline and relies on a conception of disciplines as fixed formations. Thus, while Miller capitalizes on his marginal position as a scholar of rhetoric, he assumes the fixity of the very structure that marginalizes his scholarly work. Within this fixity the individual becomes subject to the structure of a discipline and her agency is left unaccounted for.

This project responds to these assumptions of disciplinarity. While the framework employed by Miller produces valuable insights, it also prevents a more complete understanding of individuals operating within formations that emerge from disciplinary texts. Here, I seek to

expand our traditional understanding of disciplines and the textual expressions of identity that shape them. I argue that, when equipped to see disciplines and the individuals who comprise them as fluid and reciprocal forms, we can more completely understand the agency of individuals acting within them. As I ask how we can account for the emergence and change of a discipline, I endeavor to reframe both disciplines and the identities of individuals at work within them. I suggest that when we see the former as fluid and mobile, the later emerges as active agent.

I do this through a case study in which I read across two key "moments" in the history of Basic Writing, a subdiscipline that has been marginalized much like the dynamic student that it examines. Basic Writing is positioned within this study as a discipline. With this, my focus is not on the relationship between Basic Writing and the larger disciplines of Composition and English within which it is embedded. Instead, my focus on Basic Writing is primarily concerned with its emergence and fluidity as a disciplinary formation.

This project examines the emergence and fluidity of Basic Writing through a case study that looks at disciplinary identities that characterize the inception of Basic Writing in the 1970s and its first key transformation in the 1990s. This study focuses exclusively on a selected body of texts that are contemporary to these two "moments." Reading across these texts, I examine the textual identities constructed by these authors for themselves and for their students. Thus, we only hear the student's voice through the author's voice.

I argue that Basic Writing emerged as a discipline during the late 1970s. After explicating the emergence of this discipline through a reading of Mina Shaughnessy and the work of her peers in the *Journal of Basic Writing*, I look at a second "moment" through the work of Min-Zhan Lu, Bruce Horner, and their peers published in the *Journal of Basic Writing* during the early 1990s. Here, I highlight the fluidity of this disciplinary formation as it actively responds to the constellation of forces that surrounds it. I argue that we can account for the inception of a discipline as a fluid structure through an examination of the ways in which identity and location are constructed within disciplinary texts. Contextualized in such a way, individuals located within a discipline become active agents responding to and operating within locations that are not clearly delineated by the disciplinary boundaries that are often perceived to define them.

At the inception of the discipline of Basic Writing, Mina Shaughnessy and her peers actively positioned themselves in relation to various forces that coalesced around the Open

Admissions movement of the 1960s and 1970s. While basic writers have always existed within the university, Shaughnessy helped to make Basic Writing visible at a specific historical moment. She and her colleagues carefully choreographed a response to the political, economic, and administrative structures within which they worked. This response was Basic Writing. As they positioned themselves and the discipline they were conceiving, critical alignments with broader power structures were set in place. Once the discipline was established in this way, the impetus for its future responses to various social, historical, political, and economic forces was established.

As the plurality of experience within Basic Writing is increasingly broad and precarious, it is all too easy to view individuals within this field as passive subjects within the constellation of forces converging around this marginalized discipline. By attaching themselves to a disciplinary structure, individuals working with Basic Writers gain visibility through their alignment with a collective structure of knowledge about and understanding of these writers. The subject position of these individuals, however, takes on new meaning when seen through a framework that illuminates scholars and teachers as active agents within this disciplinary formation that rallies members together with what Rebecca Mlynarczyk and George Otte describe as a "strong political as well as pedagogical mission" (xv). It is with this in mind that this project asks the following: How can we account for the emergence and change of a discipline? And, when we look at the change of the discipline, how do individuals emerge as active agents within this fluid structure?

Writing from within the discipline of Basic Writing, Mlynarczyk and Otte provide readers with an historical account of the tensions between fixity and change in their text, *Basic Writing*. In their introduction, Mlynarczyk and Otte draw the reader's attention to the "strong political as well as pedagogical mission" of their field (xv). This mission is emphasized through the multiple stories that are woven together in what they describe more broadly as an account that traces "the arc" of social and cultural forces that have "shifted and gained momentum" since the Open Admissions movement of the 1960s and 1970s. What is perhaps less transparent in the text of *Basic Writing*, however, are the efforts of these authors to preserve individual stories while pulling together the identity of a field that continually rallies this collective identity to face what often appear to be insurmountable challenges.

Looking at the emergence and change of a discipline, my reading of *Errors and Expectations* as well as the first two years of the *Journal of Basic Writing* illuminates how the discipline was conceived as an active response to the social, political, and economic forces that informed the context of these authors. In the second "moment" of this project I argue that we are seeing the change *of* the discipline rather than a change *in* the discipline. I argue this through a reading of *Representing the 'Other'* by Bruce Horner and Min-Zhan Lu as well as the work of their peers published in the *Journal of Basic Writing* during 1990 and 1991. This later iteration of the discipline marks a distinct "moment" in its movement away from its incarnation in the 1970s.

When disciplines are no longer rendered as fixed and stable entities, the agency of individuals acting from within these disciplines becomes visible. Writing from within the changing constellation of forces that surrounded Basic Writing, scholars in the 1990s were not passive subjects. They were active agents responding from within a productive and fluid disciplinary structure. Thus, as we begin to conceive of these individuals as active agents within a discipline, we see their responses to the constellation of forces influencing Basic Writing as relational, active, and productive within a fluid disciplinary structure.

This study requires a composite theoretical framework through which we can begin to account for the multiple forces to which individuals within a discipline must respond. This composite framework animates disciplinarity as itself a form of mobility. My approach to the texts marking the first "moment" that I explore is framed by the work of Edward Said in his seminal work of cultural criticism, *Orientalism*. His framework is capitalized on within this study as a way to illuminate the textual emergence of the Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor, and the Basic Writing classroom within a disciplinary formation that is manifest within the body of texts that I examine here. As I argue that we are witnessing the emergence of a discipline within these readings, I ask the following questions: Who is the Basic Writer? What is the role of the Basic Writing instructor? And, what is the context that constitutes the textual location of writing classrooms within which the Basic Writer is textually situated? These questions allow us to read across this collection of texts and see the emergence of a coherent textual disciplinary identity that centers on the Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor, and the location of the Basic Writing classroom. The cohesive visibility of disciplinary knowledge about and understanding of the subject is referred to by Said as an imaginative geography.

I expand on Said's development of imaginative geographies as I examine a later body of texts that emerged within the discipline during the 1990s. Looking at this "moment," I analyze a key text by Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner, *Representing the 'Other,'* as well as articles published in the *Journal of Basic Writing* during 1990 and 1991. I argue that in this "moment" we see a reflection of changes to and shifts within the imaginative geography established earlier. This shift in the imaginative geography of the discipline amounts to the change of the discipline itself. We can see this shift occurring as we answer the same questions that were applied to the first body of texts examined by this study. However, this time, these questions are answered through the theoretical frame of mobility theory. Here, mobility theory responds to the limitations of Said's framework as it enables this study to expand the productive groundwork that he laid in defining imaginative geographies.

1.1 Context of Study

Traditionally regarded as stable and reproductive structures within the academy, disciplines have increasingly become the focus of scholars critiquing this reproductive function. Thomas Miller begins to challenge this narrative of the socially reproductive and silencing discipline in *The Formation of College English.* In his text Miller looks at the role of margins in the establishment of disciplinary boundaries. Drawing parallels between the provincialism of the 18th Century British educational system and the rise of community colleges in the 20th Century, Miller looks beyond what are considered the traditional boundaries of disciplinary knowledge within college English to investigate how these boundaries have been created and maintained over the past three centuries (278).

A central focus of Miller's critique is the approach taken by traditional historical accounts of disciplines. Miller looks from within the discipline of college English to the boundaries that encase his scholarship. He looks at the ideas that are excluded from the discipline in which he is located. For example, he observes that composition and rhetoric are presently excluded from many English departments. Relegated to their own programs, these marginalized areas of study have traditionally also been excluded from histories that discuss only the ideas that are included as central to the discipline of college English. Miller's history, however, accounts for what is excluded. He writes:

The most respected English departments in America have not deigned to recognize composition and rhetoric as a discipline, and other English departments have recently allowed the teaching of composition to be moved into separate programs or departments. What a discipline excludes from study defines it in ways that are ignored by histories of the ideas contained within it. (486)

Just as he looks beyond the ideas that are included within the discipline of college English, his historical approach traces the history of the discipline back to the 18th Century, further back than most traditional accounts. These more traditional accounts of the history of college English, in particular those done by literary critics, only trace the history of the discipline back to the 19th Century "when historical philology helped professionalize the study of English literature" (2).

I respond to Miller's critique, however, suggesting that he relies on the stable borders of his field in order to access the productive potential of challenging them. Within his text he looks beyond the accepted borders of English "to examine the purposes that defined them and the dialectical potential contained within them" (486). Implicit to this suggestion remains the assumption that disciplines are stable formations and closed systems that resist change.

This assumption is echoed in Heather Murray's text *'Working' in English*. Challenging what it means to do work in English, Murray argues "in order to understand and reform the discipline of English, it is first necessary to shift the focus of examination *down* and *back*" (3). Her focus shifts "down" towards day-to-day practices within English and "back" into the history of the discipline's formation. Her re-conception of "work" within English is one that operates from what she refers to as a "disciplinary understanding of English" instead of the "critical understanding" that she sees reflected in many of her colleagues. Aligning with Miller's earlier work, her disciplinary understanding of English examines:

[s]uggestions that the "work" of English studies is really socially reproductive, and in a specific way: whereas it may appear that the job of the professoriate is to reproduce itself (to train many students, of whom the most qualified will go on to graduate study), this socially reproductive role should be defined more broadly, with English located in an educational system which at all levels functions to produce continuing class and gender stratification. (11)

Here Murray envisions an understanding and reform of English that will emerge from her disciplinary understanding of the field. Adopting this perspective would allow scholars to work

for change from within the disciplinary structures in which they are located. Thus, like Miller, Murray continues to conceptualize the discipline as a stable entity with boundaries that will resist the change she hopes to create.

Much like Heather Murray, Mary Soliday looks at the socially reproductive function of a discipline to argue that "remediation exists also to fulfill institutional needs and to resolve social conflicts as they are played out through the educational tier most identified with access to the professional middle class" (1). Unlike Miller, in *The Politics of Remediation* Soliday does not see a productive dialectic operating between the marginalized presence of remedial writing and the more central concerns of English departments. Soliday's account of the relationship between college English departments and remedial writing is one in which the former remains stable while the later is a mechanism of stabilization.

This relationship between remedial writing and English departments underwent a dramatic change during the 1960s. Amid an unprecedented increase in student populations during the Open Admissions era in the 1960s and 1970s, remediation was used as a "crisis management tool" (Soliday 64). As we consider this use of remediation, it is helpful to reflect on the rhetoric of composition's ethic of service that Sharon Crowley describes in her text, *Composition in the University*. She writes: "It goes like this: 'Our students need what we teach.' Sometimes this claim is buttressed by a second one: 'at-risk students particularly need what we teach'" (356). While Crowley criticizes the adherence of compositionists to this rhetoric of self-definition and links it to the perennially low academic status of composition, this rhetoric was engaged by Shaughnessy and her peers during the Open Admissions era, and it allowed for these writers to align themselves with locations of power that might otherwise have been beyond their reach. It is in this way that remedial writing begins to emerge in the guise of Basic Writing during this period.

The emergence of Basic Writing as a discipline is the first of two "moments" examined in this project. As I read across the writings of Mina Shaughnessy and her peers, it becomes apparent that in the shift from "remedial" to "Basic Writing," these scholars were able to position themselves in unique ways that had been unavailable to their predecessors. This positioning was an active response to and conscious alignment with various forces that coalesced around the university during the period of Open Admissions. Soliday writes:

As an administrator at City in the late 1960s and early 1970s, first of the Pre-Baccalaureate Program, and then of the remedial sequence she called Basic Writing, Mina Shaughnessy actively contested the split between remedial English and the academic disciplines. In so doing, she awarded herself and others a "pioneer" status. (63)

Emerging as a discipline under the title Basic Writing, remediation gained a new visibility within universities and colleges across the nation.

This first moment that I look at is a critical one for the discipline of Basic Writing. In their history of the discipline, Otte and Mlynarczyk describe Shaughnessy as "one especially forceful seminal figure" (xv). In *Basic Writing in America* Nicole Pepinster Greene and Patricia J. McAlexander write in their introduction: "Years after the Civil Rights protests and Shaughnessy's ground-breaking work, and even after her iconic status had been strongly challenged, her view of higher education as a means of social reform remains surprisingly intact within the basic writing field" (6). Later in this same text, Otte reflects: "Like the social circumstances surrounding her program, Shaughnessy's personal circumstances seem especially significant – almost paradigmatic – in retrospect" (23).

This student facing the "eleventh hour" of her academic career who must work through motor-mental barriers that prevent easy access to her thoughts takes on a new dimension in the writing of Min-Zhan Lu, Bruce Horner, and their peers in the 1990s. This second "moment," this more recent collection of articulations, falls within what Soliday refers to as a "politics of agency" (105). While she considers Mina Shaughnessy and her peers as engaging in a "politics of access," Soliday suggests that these more recent texts focus on the identity of the writer rather than the degree of access that she has to the university. Lu and Horner wrote the essays in *Representing the 'Other'* during a period marked by the revival of efforts to re-stratify higher education. Resulting in a backlash towards remediation, this re-stratification was enacted through several common strategies that included "restricting transfers between two and four year schools," "tightening admissions standards at public comprehensives," "privatizing the costs of attending college," and "abolishing remediation at the four year level" (107). This climate within higher education resulted in what was often articulated as "the figure of the culturally shocked student who is trapped in a chaotic urban world" (109).

Within this atmosphere, re-articulations of remediation served as a means through which to identify the responsibility of the middle-class "toward the 'other' classes through the

institution that now most defines middle-class identity" (Soliday 15). As this middle-class sense of responsibility is imagined within these texts, the objective is no longer to understand the writer and resolve her conflict within the university. Instead, conflict becomes something that all writers must deal with. Here, our attention is shifted toward the broader economic, historical, and social contexts from which this individual writer emerges. It is from this position that students are in constant negotiations with opposing forces (Horner, "Mapping" 135). In "Rethinking the Sociality of Error," Bruce Horner writes:

> We can thus understand errors as representing flawed social transaction, instances of a failure on the part of *both* the writer and reader to negotiate an agreement (the process of offering, testing, and amending) as to the kind of relationship that should exist between them and as to the kind of significance to be attributed to the written notations offered, a failure which makes impossible the realization of a certain kind of "work." (141)

The meaning emerging from these negotiations between readers and writers is one that emerges through struggle.

1.2 Methodology

This project asks: How can we account for the inception and change of a discipline? And, when we look at the change of a discipline, how do individuals emerge as active agents within this fluid disciplinary structure? To answer this, I pose three key methodological questions as I read across the texts of Mina Shaughnessy, Min-Zhan Lu, Bruce Horner, and their peers that were published in the first four issues as well as volumes ten and eleven (1990 and 1991) of the *Journal of Basic Writing*: Who is the Basic Writer? Who is the Basic Writing instructor? And, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? These questions enable this study to do two things.

First, they illuminate the emergence and (re)emergence of two sets of textual identities that are indeed different. Writers within the discipline of Basic Writing must, by the nature of their position within a discipline reconstruct the Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor, and the Basic Writing classroom within their texts. It is through these textual identities that a collective knowledge about and understanding of the discipline emerges. Reading across the two selections of core texts in the data set of this project, the answers to these three methodological

questions shift. In other words, we see the discipline change through the textual identities that create a coherent understanding of its subject.

Beyond the textual identities constructed in these two "moments" of Basic Writing, these questions enable us to see the agency of authors within their texts. Both frames illuminate the savoir of authors as they align themselves with outside forces through the construction of what Said refers to as a "radical realism:" a version of reality that is *not* reality, but a textual recreation of it, a textual recreation that renders this reality known, understood to others. It is vis-à-vis these textual identities that authors write their lived experiences into a textual narrative. The "radical realism" referred to by Said is one that reflects the lived experience of authors through a textual lens that gives this experience visibility and resonance within the broader context of their readers.

These questions have emerged from my reading and application of Said's methodology in *Orientalism*. They are shaped by the groundwork that he lays for an understanding of disciplinarity and the textual identities through which scholars write and are themselves written into the university. This understanding is rooted in an elaboration of the critical distance between an *us* and a *them*. As these respective identities are constructed and maintained within a disciplinary formation, they are also located within an imaginative geography that becomes the textual terrain of a discipline across which the subject is presented as though on a stage for the university to know, a terrain within which a discipline's authors must situate their texts. Building on Said's emphasis on textual identities through which authors create this knowledge of the *other*, these questions set a platform from which mobility theory frames a reconsideration of his static imaginative geographies.

The first question this study poses is, what is the identity of *the* Basic Writing student that emerges collectively from these texts? As these texts discuss the pedagogy, theory, and history of Basic Writing, they construct within their pages *the* identity of a Basic Writer. This singular identity enables an understanding of and knowledge about this population of students. From new arrivals to higher education in the 1960s to borderland inhabitants in the 1990s, these changes in the textual identity of Basic Writers are a critical marker of this discipline's change.

Answering this question allows us to respond to the next question that I pose in my analysis of these texts. Who is the Basic Writing instructor that emerges from these texts? Illustrating what the Basic Writing instructor *is not* is a critical means of constructing what the

Basic Writing instructor *is*. Thus, within this Saidian approach it is the distance from the Basic Writer that itself produces the Basic Writing instructor. This frame through which I look at the inception of a discipline illustrates the importance of establishing this distance between what is configured as an *us* and a *them*.

While the critical distance between an *us* and a *them* is a central component of Orientalism, posing these questions within the theoretical framework of mobility theory illustrates the ontological fluidity of these textual identities that I argue is at the root of the discipline's change across these two moments. The primary distance between Shaughnessy and her students within *Errors and Expectations* is experience and inexperience. This distance is integral for the establishment of the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor. This distance is also a central component of the ontological stability of the textual identities within the imagined geography of Basic Writing. Through the frame of Orientalism, disciplines grow and change over time, but this change occurs only on the manifest level. On the level latent Orientlaism, however, the identity of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor is regarded as fixed, or ontologically stable. As these identities shift within the discipline, the distance separating an *us* and a *them* is maintained. This fixed distance further reflects what Said suggests is regarded within disciplinary structures as ontologically stable.

When posed to the second "moment" of this study that is discussed through the frame of mobility theory, these questions allow this study to question the ontological stability of the textual identities that emerge from the disciplinary frame of Basic Writing. This fluidity is most immediately seen in the disappearance of the critical distance between an *us* and a *them*. Textual identities within this frame are no longer rooted in a stable distance that renders the Basic Writer as known to the Basic Writing instructor. They are instead ontologically fluid as it is *through* the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor that these authors move within their texts. This movement of embodied writers within their texts through the constructed textual identities of the author is relational to the moored textual identity of the Basic Writing student.

Finally, I ask, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? The textual identities of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor do not emerge within a void. Instead, they are textually located within *the* Basic Writing classroom, a location that is implicit to a discussion of the identities that emerge within these texts. As these identities change, so do the locations that simultaneously form around them within these texts. Our understanding of this

location and the way in which it implicitly forms alongside the textual identities that I examine can help us to gain insight into the ways in which individuals are not only active agents in the construction of textual identities, but also active agents in the construction of disciplinary spaces.

Using these methodological questions to shape a systematic framework through which I will engage the data for this study, I answer them through the application of two complementary frameworks. First, I apply a rearticulation of the framework employed by Said in *Orientalism*. This initial framework enables this study to account for the inception of Basic Writing as a discipline and establishes my focus on textual identities and locations as a means through which to more critically interrogate disciplinary formations. As I turn to the second "moment" of this study, I employ a rearticulation of mobility theory to once again find answers to these questions. Mobility theory complements Said by opening the closed system of disciplinarity that he explicates. Doing this enables us to more thoroughly understand the functioning of both disciplinary formations as well as the individuals working within them as we account for a) the inception and change of these disciplines and b) the individual's agency within what I re-vision as the fluid formation of a discipline.

1.3 Orientalism

The initial frame through which I look at the inception of a discipline illustrates the importance of establishing a distance between what is configured as an *us* and a *them*. In order to explore this distance that is maintained by the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing, I turn first to Edward Said's postcolonial critique, *Orientalism*. Said's study of Orientalism is, among other things, a study of the configuration of power and force in the establishment of a disciplinary discourse that flourished through the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. It is in this way that Said explores the emergence of Orientalism as a formal field of study. He suggests that this emergence set a trajectory that determined the direction of future developments within the discipline. This trajectory is a critical component of disciplinary formations as it is within these trajectories that the work of individuals must fall if they are to align themselves with the visibility attained by the coherence of authors in these disciplinary formations.

Authors writing within the trajectory of a discipline must locate themselves within what Said refers to as an imaginative geography (49). Imaginative geographies are the discursive

terrains within which authors writing in a discipline must locate their texts. Locating a text within such a geography is a process of (re)alignment, of bringing one's individual experience within the broader articulations of a discipline. Said discusses Orientalism as:

> [a] created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been considerable material investment. Continued investment made Orientalism, as a system of knowledge about the Orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness, just as that same investment multiplied – indeed, made truly productive – the statements proliferating out from Orientalism into the general culture. (6)

Here, the Orientalization of the East reflects material and ideological investments of authors within the discipline of Orientalism. Individual texts are products of specific configurations of power that bring them into alignment with the broader, unified articulation of Orientalism. It is in this way that a plurality of experience is unified into the singular articulation of a field. Authors entering this configuration gain both visibility and currency through their (re)aligned articulations.

Implicit to Said's suggestion is that such an imaginative geography is not unique to Orientalism, but rather that Orientalism is only one example of many. He writes: "In other words, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is 'ours' and an unfamiliar space beyond 'ours' which is 'theirs' is a way of making a geographical distinction that can be entirely arbitrary" (54). The defining feature of a disciplinary imagined geography is the delineation between an *us* and a *them*. It is through these geographies that the individual is able to locate herself within the broader, otherwise impersonal system of a discipline. These geographies enable the individual to "intensify" her own sense of self by "dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away" (55). This intensification of self that occurs at the inception of a discipline is critical in determining the trajectory of future work within it. In this case study of Basic Writing, I use the following methodological components of Orientalism to account for the emergence of this imagined geography and the "beginning principles" that determine its trajectory: strategic location and strategic formation.

The authors of these texts strategically locate themselves in relation to their subject. This "strategic location" is a means by which a distance between the Oriental and the Orientalist is

established. As authors locate themselves within their texts through the same identities, their texts gain referential power through what Said refers to as "strategic formation" (20). This formation is an expression of power that aligns with "supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, [and] doctrines" (20). When a discipline emerges, a set of relationships is put into motion that is maintained throughout the course of the discipline's development. The relationships within which a discipline is initially located are the same relationships within which individual authors must situate themselves if they are to enter the field. As they do this, authors are able to access the authority of the discipline through their texts.

If we think of "strategic formation" and "strategic location" as terms illuminating the complex dialectic between an individual's location within her text and her text's location within the coherence of a discipline, there is a second dialectic that illuminates the ways in which individual experiences are brought into alignment with these broader power structures that give shape to a discipline (22). This second dialectic is one between the plurality of individual experience with the subject and the singular description articulated by the discipline.

These two dialectics are resolved in the imaginative geography of a discipline. This geography forms in the interstices of strategic formation, strategic location, articulations of the discipline, and individual experiences of authors accessing authority within this disciplinary formation. Disciplinary texts are written within broader intellectual and imaginative territories, territories that each author recreates, *re-presents* within her work. In this study I will look at the way in which texts within the discipline of Basic Writing re-create the imagined geography of the field as they engage and re-create many of the power relations that were established at the field's inception.

I will analyze this first body of texts through the three methodological questions discussed earlier. As I answer these questions, I look at the ways in which these authors are conceiving of a discipline and locating themselves within a trajectory that is realized in the imaginative geography that unifies these texts. Despite the plurality of experience that each author has, these experiences fall into a singular articulation that we will be able to see as I answer the following questions: Who is the Basic Writer within these texts? Who is the Basic Writing instructor within these texts? And, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom?

This reading is elemental if we are to illuminate the transition of remediation into the discipline of Basic Writing that occurred during the 1960s and 1970s. As these authors describe

the students in their classrooms and the needs of these students, they are defining their position within these classrooms as they capitalize on a textually constructed distance between an *us* and a *them*. This distance is textually located by these authors within *the* Basic Writing classroom. As we see what emerges as a unified articulation of Basic Writers, Basic Writing teachers, and Basic Writing classrooms, we witness the emergence of a critical mass unified within a disciplinary structure to gain visibility. It is in this way that answering these three methodological questions through the framework of *Orientalism* allows this study to account for the emergence of the discipline and identify the imagined geography that is established during this "moment" of disciplinary inception. Answering these three questions, we can begin to see how the discipline of Basic Writing was brought into alignment and dialogue with critical cultural, economic, political, and historic forces that coalesced around it during the era of Open Admissions in the 1960s and 1970s.

Despite its value in shedding light on the inception of a discipline, Said's frame, as it centers on the development of imaginative geographies, allows us to see little more than what he regards as superficial shifts within a discipline. The limited change that this frame does allow for is accounted for in Said's explanation of what he describes as Latent and Manifest Orientalism (201). The imagined geography of Orientalism gains stability through expressions on both latent and manifest levels. Latent Orientalism, however, does not shift within the closed disciplinary system laid out by Said. It is on this level that the ontological stability of the textual identities established within disciplinary texts is maintained by the critical distance between an *us* and a *them*. The change that Said allows for within this frame is described as Manifest Orientalism. This change occurs in the surface descriptions of the ontologically stable subject. Here we can see the ways in which the descriptive imagery of an *us* and a *them* may shift while the underlying disciplinary structure remains untouched within Said's framework.

If we were to apply Said's frame to both moments that I identify in this study, we would conclude that there was only superficial change between the writings of Mina Shaughnessy and Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner. Said's framework is limited in that it gestures to the importance of exploring disciplinary trajectories and the restricted shifts of textual identities that form within these trajectories across time. His framework, however, does not allow for holistic changes within a discipline. The rearticulation of mobility theory that I employ for the later half of this study provides insight into the change that is obscured within this Saidian framework. I read

15

across Lu and Horner's *Representing the 'Other'* as well as the *Journal of Basic Writing* between 1990 and 1991 through a lens that treats disciplines as open systems, nodes of organization within which ontologically fluid identities are textually constructed as means by which authors are active agents moving within their texts.

1.4 Mobility Theory

In his 2007 text, *Mobilities*, sociologist John Urry describes what he refers to as a *mobility turn* that is "a different way of thinking through the character of economic, social and political relationships. Such a turn is spreading through the social sciences, mobilizing analyses that have been historically static, fixed and concerned with predominantly a-spatial 'social structures'" (6). This *turn* looks at "how all social entities, from a single household to large scale corporations, presuppose many different forms of actual and potential movement" (6). In the opening editorial of the journal *Mobilities*, editors Kevin Hannam, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry describe the term mobility as "an evocative keyword for the twenty-first century and a powerful discourse that creates its own effects and contexts" (1). They go on to describe the mobility turn as "spreading into and transforming the social sciences, not only placing new issues on the table, but also transcending disciplinary boundaries and putting into question the fundamental 'territorial' and 'sedentary' precepts of twentieth-century social science" (2).

A central claim of the mobilities paradigm is that there are multiple *kinds* of mobility. This paradigm relies on conceptions of space that Peter Adey describes as a "practice, a doing, an event, a becoming – a material and social reality forever (re)created in the moment" (80). John Urry describes the individual within these systems as "being reconfigured as bits of scattered information distributed across various 'systems' of which most are unaware. Individuals exist beyond their private bodies, leaving traces of themselves in space" (15). Although Urry's single-authored text, *Mobilities*, looks at systems of mobility largely in terms of their potential for "massive regulation and monitoring," elsewhere individual and collective mobilities are regarded as sources of agency and as a means through which we can re-examine social life (15). Hannam, Sheller, and Urry write: "Social life thus seems full of multiple and extended connections often across long distances, but these are organized through certain nodes. Mobilities entail distinct social spaces that orchestrate new forms of social life around such

nodes" (12). This study suggests that disciplines are one such node. With this in mind I re-consider imaginative geographies as themselves textual products of social life, fluid formations that are descriptive rather than prescriptive of the identities that emerge within them.

Emerging from these nodes are "chaotic, unintended and non-linear social consequences" (Urry 10). Actors engaging in the textual event of imaginative geographies are located within a broader context of lived experiences that are translated into texts within this geography. It is in this way that we can begin to look at and make sense of the emergent capacities of fluid social spaces such as imagined geographies that exceed the sum total of any one part. Urry describes this application of mobility theory as one that interprets "how chaotic, unintended and non-linear social consequences can be generated which are distinct in time and/or spaces from where they originate and which are of a quite different and unpredictable scale" (10).

This project conceives of disciplinary formations as event spaces in which the imagined geography of a discipline is continually (re)imagined by the authors of disciplinary texts. Knowledge passes *through* these imagined geographies that (re)emerge at critical moments in a discipline's history such as the "moment" that I examine in the 1990s. These fluid spaces are located within broader geographies across which they establish an impermanent visibility, a visibility that is temporally located within disciplinary formations that simultaneously provide structure while introducing change. In this way, these (re)visioned imaginative geographies are coherent descriptions of an emergent collective articulation of knowledge.

Continuity within this fluid imagined geography is a result of the repeated textual movements of individual authors within what I describe as the mobility system of a discipline. These repeated movements by authors within their texts occur vis-à-vis textual identities that are (re)constructed across individual texts. It is in this way that I draw on both Said and mobility theory not to put them into conflict with each other, but rather to see how they complement each other and *together* can give us a more complete understanding of the inception and change of disciplines.

I apply this conception of fluid space to the emergent imaginative geography of Basic Writing that we see in the 1990s. I suggest that this "moment's" coherent understanding of the Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor, and the Basic Writing classroom occurs as a result of specific movements by authors within their texts. The mobility of the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor within these texts is enabled by three textual identities of these authors as

17

mobile agents: the authorized speaker within the text, the speaker who inhabits the drama of the Basic Writing classroom, and the speaker who speaks in and to the lived experiences of instructors of Basic Writing. It is as a result of these fluid and overlapping mobile textual identities that embodied writers move into their texts as active agents. Repeated by multiple authors within multiple texts, these textual identities gain critical mass and emerge as *social fact* within the imagined geography of the discipline. No longer maintained by a critical distance between an *us* and a *them*, the relationship between the textual Basic Writer and Basic Writing instructor is relational and fluid. It is in relation to the moored Basic Writer that the Basic Writing instructor is a mobile textual identity. It is through this textual identity that the embodied authors of these texts are active agents both in their texts and in the (re)emergence of this disciplinary formation.

I suggest an operationalization of mobility theory that regards the agency of individual embodied authors within this discipline as explicitly linked to their mobility within texts. This mobility is illuminated once we step outside of the Saidian treatment of an imagined geography as a static closed system that is prescriptive of the knowledge represented within it. The dynamic cohesion of this second "moment" is analyzed using the same questions that were posed earlier: Who is the Basic Writer? Who is the Basic Writing instructor? What is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? As I answer these questions, we see the disciplinary texts of this data set as expressions of the embodied writer's mobility, their agency within the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing. Located as they are within the fluid formation of a discipline, these authors and the textual identities through which they are mobile (re)emerge within the imaginative geography of Basic Writing. Within this imagined geography the classroom becomes a textual location that engages and responds to the broader cultural forces that surround the discipline and the students and teachers who are textually represented within these texts, a textual location that reflects the agency of the embodied writer within a (re)emerging disciplinary formation.

1.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study uses a composite methodology to ask how we can account for the emergence and change of a discipline and what is the role of the individual in this change. I offer two frameworks through which to look at a discipline. The first is a rearticulation of Said's

post-colonial critique, *Orientalism*. I use this framework to account for the emergence of a discipline. In this "moment" of emergence the Basic Writing instructor is defined by that which she is not, the Basic Writer. These disciplinary identities and the critical distance that forms between them are textually constructed through a process that Said refers to as Strategic Location. These texts acquire "mass density" and a referential power through the Strategic Formation of the classroom. The second framework that I use is derived from the more contemporary interdisciplinary methodology of mobility theory. Mobility theory enables this project to account for change within a disciplinary formation that Said frames as stable. Using these frameworks in a case study of the discipline of Basic Writing, I argue that a discipline is a form of mobility and that individuals are active agents in this change. As I do this, I look at two critical moments in the discipline of Basic Writing: its inception in the late 1970s and an example of its change during the 1990s. The body of texts that I will look at center on Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations*, Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner's *Representing the 'Other,'* and the first four issues of the *Journal of Basic Writing* as well as the first two years of the journal published in the 1990s.

CHAPTER TWO

EMERGENCE

Mina Shaughnessy stood before the Modern Language Association at its 1975 meeting in San Francisco and delivered "Diving In," an address for which she received a standing ovation. This speech was a turning point for both her career and the subdiscipline at the helm of which she stood. In her biography of Shaughnessy, Jane Maher writes:

> After the address . . . she was no longer merely an "expert"; her authority, her conviction, and her eloquence inspired those who heard her speak – and those who heard about her speech – in a manner that was simply unprecedented at the Modern Language Association, or anywhere else, for that matter. (163)

Recalling Shaughnessy's speech, David Bartholomae reflects, "I had committed my career to the students she called Basic Writers and to the task of easing their precarious entrance into the world of the university. At the same time, however, I was painfully aware that my ability to understand or alter their actual performance as writers was severely limited" (qtd. in Maher 190). Shaughnessy's speech also drew the attention of Ed Corbett who, two days later, sent a note requesting to reprint the address in *College Composition and Communication*, the flagship journal of Basic Writing's parent discipline (Maher 164). Shaughnessy gladly agreed, and the article appeared in 1976 as "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing."

Introducing Composition to its new subdiscipline, this article enabled Shaughnessy to strategically bring herself and Basic Writing into alignment with the needs and interests of the University. Visibly and intellectually, she established Basic Writing as a discipline within which the newly arrived to the university were understood, known within the texts of this discipline. In "Diving In," Shaughnessy wrote:

> The phrase "catching up," so often used to describe the progress of Basic Writing students, is illuminating here, suggesting as it does that the only person who must move in the teaching situation is the student. As a result of this view, we are much more likely in talking about teaching to talk about students, to theorize about *their* need and attitudes or to chart *their* development and ignore the possibility that teachers also change in

response to students, that there may in fact be important connections between the changes

teachers undergo and the progress of their students. (234)

Assuming that her readers were already familiar with the Basic Writer under any other title –
"remedial, developmental, pre-baccalaureate, or even handicapped" – Shaughnessy lays out a
developmental scale for teachers in this article: Guarding the Tower, Converting the Natives,
Sounding the Depths, and finally, Diving In.

Here, a space, a student, and a teacher are articulated within what was emerging as the
disciplinary formation of Basic Writing. In this "moment" of Basic Writing's emergence as a
discipline, however, Shaughnessy and her peers did more than introduce their audiences to the
discipline. They established the authority of the discipline in knowing this *other* within the
university. This authority was derived from a critical distance that is maintained between an *us*
and a *them* within these texts. For Shaughnessy and her peers, it was through their authority,
their knowledge of the Basic Writer that they were able to articulate their identity as instructors
of Basic Writing. In its infancy, this fledgling disciplinary formation reconstructed the reality of
the Basic Writer in a manner that was comprehensible to Composition, English Studies, and the
universities in which these embodied writers were employed.

This chapter asks: How can we account for this emergence of a discipline? And, as we do
so, where is the agency of the individual in this emergence? I will answer these questions using
the methodology employed by Edward Said in *Orientalism*. This methodology will enable this
study to examine the textual arrangements of power that were solidified through the emergence
of this disciplinary terrain. This disciplinary formation established and maintains the authority of
individuals writing about the Basic Writer. Although remedial writers had always existed within
the university, Basic Writing constructs the Basic Writer as a means of coming to know this
writer and making her visible to and understood within the university. Similarly, it is through the
disciplinary formation of Orientalism that authors within that emerging discipline established
their authority and produced knowledge about the subject. Thus, in rendering the Basic Writer
known, the texts within this data set are also *creating* a reality within which the remedial writer
becomes known as the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor has the authority to know
and construct knowledge about this student.

2.1 Theoretical Framework: Orientalism

21

Said defines Orientalism as "a distribution of geopolitical awareness" and an "elaboration of geographical distinction and interests" (12). This distribution and elaboration of knowledge within a disciplinary framework denies the "possibility of development, transformation, human movement" to the Orient and the Oriental. This stability is manifest within the *radical realism* of the texts within my study's data set and maintained within what Said describes as an ontologically stable imaginative geography. A stable imaginative geography is constituted by the collective articulation of Basic Writing; this textual geography is not made visible by any one text, but rather by the collection of texts within this disciplinary formation. Here, "essential ideas" have been distilled into what Said describes as an "unchallenged coherence." The coherence of these textual identities and the discipline's understanding of them are established by the "beginning principles" that are articulated at the moment of inception that we see in the texts of this data set (3).

This chapter argues that the "moment" of Basic Writing's emergence as a discipline can be traced across Mina Shaughnessy's canonical text, *Errors and Expectations*, as well as those of her peers published in the first four issues if the *Journal of Basic Writing*. Situated in the wake of the adoption of an Open Admissions policy by City University of New York, Shaughnessy and her peers found themselves caught in what Shaughnessy describes as the interstices of:

> [a]cademic winners and losers . . . the children of the lettered and the illiterate, the blue-
> collared, the white-collared, and the unemployed, some who could barely afford the
> subway fare to school and a few who came in the new cars their parents had given them
> as a reward for staying in New York to go to college. (1)

Errors and Expectations is both, as its subtitle suggests, "A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing" and a narrative of the arrival of "the sons and daughters of New Yorkers" who entered the writing classroom in a reflection of the "city's intense, troubled version of America."

Writing from the front lines of the changing face of American education, Shaughnessy tells *her* story and, as she does, becomes *the* Basic Writing teacher. With little administrative support and less preparation, Shaughnessy and many others like her found themselves sitting before students previously unseen within academia. These students entered with voices and skill-sets that reflected neither the values nor the standards of the institutions that had been opened to them. Not speaking the academic language of their new environment, Basic Writing students

22

were put in the care of Basic Writing instructors who were charged with the responsibility of incorporating these students into the cultural and academic practices of higher education.

This chapter also reads across the first four issues of the *Journal of Basic Writing*. Published over four years, these issues bear titles that reflect their focus on concerns perceived to be of immediate importance to this young discipline: *Error*, *Courses*, *Grammar*, and *Evaluation*. The journal emerged from the collaborative relationships that Shaughnessy formed with her colleagues while writing *Errors and Expectations*. It was at her weekly meetings with these colleagues at CUNY that *JBW* was conceived. Its first issue was published in the spring of 1975. The editorial board for this issue included nine members, all of whom were women. The budgetary constraints were so tight that shortly after publishing the first issue Shaughnessy was not sure if funds would be available to publish a second. The following is from a letter written to this editorial board in regards to their chair, Patricia Laurence:

> Meanwhile, this means that there is no provision for Pat to serve as editor. The only solution I can see at this point is for this office to handle the administrative duties that Pat has been managing since the spring and for all of us to share in the editorial work of reviewing manuscripts. (qtd. in Maher 184)

The individuals who submitted articles and sat on its editorial boards were more than administrators and isolated practitioners within this nascent discipline; they were individuals with a personal investment in Basic Writing. As Shaughnessy and her colleagues faced walls of dissension from their colleagues and threats of budget cuts, *JBW* reflects the supportive community that enabled the emergence of this discipline. The role of this community is reflected in the following response given by Shaughnessy to a man who wrote her for advice on how to set up a basic writing program at his institution. Jane Maher writes:

> First of all, she advised, be prepared to work harder than you've ever worked before. Next, develop a camaraderie among all the people assigned to teach basic writing: let them get to know each other, enjoy each other's company, and learn from each other. Make sure there are enough meetings and discussion for this to take place. In addition, try to recruit people from the senior faculty because that is where some of the best teachers are often found, and they will become the most effective teachers in the program not simply because of their experience, but because of the knowledge and influence they have on campuses. (96)

These texts, *Errors and Expectations* and those of *JBW,* reflect the politically aware articulations of a fledgling community that actively promoted their visibility and alignment with centers of power and (re)constructed themselves within these texts as a means of rendering the subject of their professional careers known.

Although the narrative of Basic Writing's emergence as a discipline is easy to reconstruct from these texts, this study aims to account for this emergence and the agency of individuals within a discipline that is uniquely bound to questions of identity and identity construction. Central to the texts in this data set is the establishment of *who* the remedial writer is and *who* disciplinary author becomes when they enter the Basic Writing classroom. As this chapter asks how can we account for the emergence of a discipline and what is the role of the individual as an active agent in this emergence, I turn to the methodological framework employed by Said in his seminal work of cultural criticism, *Orientalism.*

A text that explores the textual formation of identity, *Orientalism* is a study of the imperial self-definition of the West. The disciplinary formation of Orientalism was a critical mechanism by which the West identified itself through its creation of the Orient, a means by which it came to know the East. Said argues that the subject of this disciplinary formation, the Orient, never existed other than within the text of the Orientalist. A means by which the East was brought *to* the West, this understanding of the East was purely textual. Through this explicitly textual creation of the "other," the West was able to construct *its* identity. That which it was not distinguished the boundaries of this Western imperial identity. While the Orient is external to the West, without it the West would be indistinguishable and powerless. This study employs four key components of Said's study of textual disciplinary identities: the critical distance between an *us* and a *them*, the *radical realism* that is manifest within a disciplinary formation, the fixed imaginative geography that maintains this *radical realism*, and finally the Strategic Location and Formation that occurs within and across these texts.

The frame of Orientalism allows for this study to critically engage the clear *us* and *them* that emerge from the disciplinary texts of Basic Writing. Written by authors located within and employed by the university, these texts deal with a *them* that is the Basic Writer. Outsiders to the university, it is this status as outsider that is confronted by the insiders of the university who are writing these texts. This distinction between an *us* and a *them* is a critical component of Said's framework for two reasons. First, Said writes that these authors intensify their sense of self by

"dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away" (55). Through this process of designating what she is not, the author of these texts is able to define herself in terms of a textually constructed Basic Writer. This distance between textual figures is critical in what Said describes as an "ontological and epistemological distinction" that is made between the Orient and the Occident (2). This distinction that Said observes between the East and the West marks the starting point of the disciplinary trajectory within which these disciplinary texts are located.

This starting point, or what Said describes as the "beginning principle" of a disciplinary formation, enables what comes after. This starting point is not "merely given, or simply available" (16). "Beginnings," he writes, "have to be made for each project in such a way as to *enable* what follows from them." The beginning point of Orientalism establishes the ontologically stability of an *us* and a *them*. Similarly, in this "moment" of Basic Writing's emergence as a discipline, a textual distance is established between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor that maintains the ontological stability of these textual identities. Said suggests that it is this "polarizing" distinction that is at the center of the theory and practice of a discipline.

This constructed "radical difference" between an *us* and a *them* maintains a "Scientific Truth" – a manifestation of a vision and material reality that mutually supports each other as well as a structure of power and systematized knowledge that at once represents and contains the Basic Writer (Said 72). This radical difference as described by Said is central to the *radical realism* of a text. This reality is textual, one in which the distance between an *us* and a *them* is dramatized for readers. It is a version of reality that is *not* reality, but a textual recreation of it, a textual recreation that renders this reality known, understood to others. Said writes:

> Philosophically, then, the kind of language, thought, and vision that I have been calling Orientalism very generally is a form of *radical realism*; anyone employing Orientalism, which is the habit for dealing with questions, objects, qualities, and regions deemed Oriental, will designate, name, point to, fix what he is talking or thinking about with a word or phrase, which then is considered either to have acquired, or more simply to be, reality. (72)

This study suggests that this is what we see occurring within the disciplinary "moment" of emergence that I examine in the data set for this chapter. The term Basic Writer elicits a reality, a

reality in which the authors of this data set are active participants in creating, a reality in which they are constituted by that which they are not, the Basic Writer.

This *radical realism* of the Orient is contained in a closed system that Said describes as an imaginative geography. He writes, the "Orientalist attitude":

> [s]hares with magic and with mythology the self-containing, self-reinforcing character of a closed system, in which objects are what they are *because* they are what they are, for once, for all time, for ontological reasons that no empirical material can either dislodge or alter. (70)

A closed system that is maintained with a trajectory set by the beginning principles of this disciplinary formation, this imaginative geography is the location within which the plurality of individual experience is brought into alignment with the singular articulation of a disciplinary formation.

A critical tension that operates within an imaginative geography is between this plurality of individual experience and the unified disciplinary articulation of this experience. This tension is resolved, however, as this imaginative geography provides the discipline with an ontologically stable subject. A means of maintaining the *radical realism* of a discipline's texts, this imagined geography establishes and maintains the distance between an *us* and a *them,* here the Basic Writing Instructor and the Basic Writer, as fact. Said writes, an "imaginative geography legitimates a vocabulary, a universe of representative discourse peculiar to the discussion and understanding" of what is here the Basic Writer (49). This geography maintains the "beginning principle" of a discipline, the critical and ontologically stable distance between an *us* and a *them*, and the *radical realism* that reflects this understanding of the Basic Writer within individual texts. It provides a structurally supported disciplinary formation within which authors approach the subject Basic Writer in their disciplinary texts through a vocabulary of representative tropes and figures – tropes and figures that are dramatically played out across this data set.

Maintaining the tropes that make disciplinary knowledge visible and palatable to an audience located outside of the discipline, the imaginative geography of Basic Writing functions as a stage on which the Basic Writer is made known to the university. This stage represents a trialectic relationship between what Said refers to as a three-way force: the Orient, the Orientalist, and the Western consumer of Orientalism. The Orientalist's construction of this stage ensures the truth of what he is saying. In this the Orient is corrected and penalized from lying

outside of our world (it is Orientalized) and becomes the province of the Orientalist. This requires the initiated Western reader to accept Orientalist codifications as *the* true Orient, as a truth that becomes a function of a learned judgment taught through the imagined geography of a discipline.

In my study, this trialectic relationship is enacted between the Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor, and the university, resulting in the coherent articulation of a discipline and the learned judgment that determines the *truths* understood by these authors and their audiences. As the Basic Writer is put on stage, the language of this imagined geography filters these authors' experiences of reality. In the case of the Orientalist, Said writes that their travels to the East were done to validate the truths that Orientalism had already established. He writes, "For there is no doubt that imaginative geography and history help the mind to intensify its own sense of itself by dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away" (55).

Orientalism introduced the Orient to the West on a stage that was constructed *for* Western-European consumers. Actors on this stage were made to perform for an audience that vacillated between "contempt for what is familiar and its shivers of delight in – or fear of – novelty" (54). This vacillation allowed Orientalism to bring together an immense number of encounters that, while not identical, were articulated as a singular experience by that disciplinary formation. As the Basic Writing texts within the data set for this chapter function in a similar manner, we see a formation within which the plurality of individual experience is brought into alignment with the singular articulation of the discipline of Basic Writing. For the Orientalist, the imagined geography of this disciplinary formation acted as a means of controlling threats that lay beyond the Western reach. In this vacillation between delight and fear, that which was foreign became *more* rather than *less* familiar: it was Orientalized.

The final methodological concept that I draw from Said's discussion of Orientalism is that of Strategic Formation and Strategic Location. This will frame my analysis of this data set below as it is through these two components of a textual disciplinary formation that we can trace two primary relationships of the trialectic that is played out on the "stage" of the imagined geography of Basic Writing. My analysis will explicate the relationship between author and student that is dramatized within this data set through the textual identities of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. The second relationship that my analysis will illuminate is that between these authors and the collective articulation of the discipline – the beginning principle of

which we see emerging within this data set. Together, Strategic Location and Strategic Formation help these authors to tackle the problems of "how to get hold of it, how to approach it, how not to be defeated or overwhelmed by is sublimity, its scope, its awful dimensions" (Said 20). While for Said this "it" was the Orient, for this study the "it" is the Basic Writer.

As these authors tackle the remedial writer in their texts, they strategically locate themselves within their texts in relation to the Basic Writer. Within this study, Strategic Location "is a way of describing the author's position in a text with regard to the Oriental material he writes about" (20). This position of the author is rooted in the critical, ontologically stable distance between an *us* and a *them* that is maintained across these texts. The defining characteristic of this textual location of the author is that she must always remain outside of and distinct from the subject *them* of her text. These disciplinary authors are locating themselves within texts as a means of distinguishing that which they are not. These locations affirm the distance between an *us* and a *them.* This distance textually creates the Basic Writer as a means of clarifying the boundaries of the Basic Writing instructor. It is this distance and the vocabulary and learned judgments that are used to establish it that form the "beginning principles" of Basic Writing as a discipline.

These identities that reflect the Strategic Location of an author within her text gain referential power within the discipline through Strategic Formation. A "way of analyzing the relationship between texts and the way in which groups of texts, types of texts, even textual genres, acquire mass, density, and referential power among themselves and thereafter in the culture at large," Strategic Formation enables this study to illuminate the relationship between authors and the collective articulation of the discipline that *these* authors are initiating (20). While the methodological device of Strategic Location enables this study to look at the textual position of authors in relation to their subject, Strategic Formation provides this study with a means of examining the relationship between the authors and the other texts of a discipline with which they share the imagined geography of Basic Writing. This relationship gives these texts a referential power that is critical to the establishment of an imaginative geography as a formation providing the vocabulary and collective understanding of Basic Writer that is reflected across the individual voices that write within it.

Together, the methodological devices of Strategic Formation and Strategic Location enable this study to look at the emergence of a discipline through texts that create an

ontologically stable distance between an *us* and a *them*. As we see this distance established in the Strategic Location of authors within their texts, the *radical realism* of these texts is accounted for in this study. For it is in their relation to the Basic Writer that authors situate themselves within a textual reality that places the Basic Writer on the stage of an imaginative geography through which it becomes understood within academia. The *radical realism* that is collectively presented to readers as an imaginative geography asserts the authority of these authors within their texts, collectively initiating a knowledge about and understanding of the Basic Writer.

This chapter applies these methodological devices to the disciplinary emergence of Basic Writing as it asks the three methodological questions discussed in chapter one: Who is the Basic Writing instructor? Who is the Basic Writer? And, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? As a nascent discipline emerges within the texts explicated in this study, we see the formation of the imagined geography, a *radical realism* that illuminates the Basic Writer and its relationship with a sovereign center. The stability of this formation establishes the ontological fact of *the* Basic Writer in relation to which *the* Basic Writing instructor is defined.

The geography maintained by this data set neither presents nor maintains an accurate depiction of an empirical reality. Instead, these authors create and present a reality that is for the consumption of writing teachers, administrators, and other members of the university. These authors are collectively articulating the "beginning principles" of an imagined geography, the stage that gives this discipline a visible and cohesive understanding of the Basic Writer. The textual identity of the Basic Writer is known and controlled within these texts. The terrain of these relations, the classrooms in which the Basic Writer is met, becomes the topography across which the Basic Writing instructor is defined vis-à-vis the Basic Writer. Just as it is within the imaginative geography of Orientalism that the Oriental is Orientalized, it is within the imagined geography of this discipline that the remedial writer is transformed into the stable construction of the Basic Writer. Although perhaps small in its scope, Basic Writing creates a textual universe through which the plurality of remedial writers becomes known through these texts. It is this textual universe that is maintained within the disciplinary formation that emerges across the data set that this study seeks to illuminate.

My analysis of these texts will focus on the ways in which the disciplinary textual identities of both the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor emerge across the data set for this chapter. This study will trace the emergence of these identities through the Strategic Location of the

author within her text. "A way of describing the author's position in a text with regard to the Oriental material he writes about," the Strategic Location of the Basic Writing instructor within these texts positions this identity in regard to the Basic Writer that these authors construct and come to know within their texts (20). This analysis will progress through a discussion of the textual identity that emerges of the Basic Writing student. Then, I will turn to the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor. This means of progressing through the analysis will illuminate the critical distance between these two figures that is anchored in an ontological stability. Seeing the Basic Writing instructor through the corresponding identity of the Basic Writer will also provide a clear illustration of the *radical realism* that is manifest across these individual texts and maintained within the imagined geography that emerges for this discipline. The final section of this chapter's analysis will move to look at the Strategic Formation of Basic Writing. Here, this study looks at the way in which these texts gain a referential power that is coherently articulated through the imagined geography of Basic Writing and the vocabulary that presents the strategic location of individuals within their texts as *fact*.

2.2 Strategic Location

2.2.1 Basic Writer as Otherwise Lacking Access to Standard English

The Basic Writer that emerges within the data set for this chapter is a perennial newcomer to the University who is otherwise lacking access to Standard English. The *radical realism* that is manifest within individual texts in the data set of this study is one in which these students arrive not as clean slates, but with a narrative from which they emerge as having lacked access to Standard English. This textual identity marks an ontologically stable location in relation to which the instructor of Basic Writing will emerge at a critical distance that I will illustrate further in the following subsection. Understood as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English, the disciplinary textual identity of the Basic Writer enables the emergence of the Basic Writing instructor as an agent of good will and social justice who provides needed access to these students.

Mina Shaughnessy strategically locates herself in relation to the Basic Writer in the first issue of the *Journal of Basic Writing* subtitled "Error." Here she elicits a reality in which the policy of

Open Admissions was one "that reaches out beyond traditional sources for its students, bringing to a college campus young men and women from diverse classes, races, and cultural backgrounds who have attended good, poor, and mediocre schools" (1). Here, the *radical realism* of this text constructs the Basic Writer as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English. Remedial writers are placed on a stage for the instructor that Shaughnessy describes as "shocked" and understood as *the* Basic Writer. The misunderstood remedial writer re-emerges from these texts as the known Basic Writer. Later in this introduction Shaughnessy describes these students as "young men and women who want to be in college, who have the intelligence to do college work, but who are not skilled enough when they arrive on campus to survive in a rigorously academic environment" (3). Here the problems faced by these students, problems that "shock" unprepared teachers, are explained largely as rooted in a previous lack of access to Standard English. Thus, a misunderstood outsider to the university, the Basic Writer that emerges within these texts is a figure deprived of access, access that the Basic Writing instructor is critical in providing as an agent of good will and social justice that is discussed later in this chapter.

This emerging textual identity of the Basic Writer as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English appears elsewhere as a means of explaining why these writers have problems with areas of "orthography, inflections, syntax, and punctuation" (D'Eloia, "Teaching Standard" 5). In "Teaching Standard Written English," Sara D'Eloia strategically locates herself within the text as she weighs the arguments made for and against teaching standard written English. After a lengthy summary of the opposition to teaching Standard English, D'Eloia writes:

> We agree with the ends sought by the opponent of teaching Standard English: a more equitable social order and the psychological well being of our students. However, we believe these ends are better served when students enjoy the wider range of options opened to them by fluency in the standard dialect. (8)

Having otherwise lacked access to this "standard dialect," the Basic Writer emerges within these texts as a figure that arrives in these classrooms needing that which they have been denied access to: Standard English. It is for this reason that D'Eloia believes that teaching Basic Writing is synonymous with teaching Standard English. D'Eloia's strategic location in regards to the Basic Writer enables her to next construct an identity of the Basic Writing instructor that is constructed in fulfillment of the Basic Writer's need for Standard English instruction.

The disciplinary identity of the Basic Writer in need of access to Standard English is also elicited in the textual reality created by Helen Mills in her piece "Language and Composition: Three Mastery Learning Courses in One Classroom." Her Strategic Location within the *radical realism* reflected within this text is especially clear in a section subtitled "Recognizing Students' Needs." Here the emerging disciplinary identity of the Basic Writer as having lacked access to Standard English is reinforced as she writes:

> Investigating the reasons why they had not had adequate preparation in the first twelve years of school, I learned that some had been in overcrowded classrooms where they did not get enough individual help, or where teachers could not possibly grade all the written work. Some of the teachers were not adequately trained to teach writing; others had been forced to teach English even though it was not their major. (54)

In this example, the Basic Writer as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English is embedded within a narrative that integrates this disciplinary identity within the *radical realism* of Mills' classroom. This narrative locates Mills' piece within the imagined geography of Basic Writing as it maintains a critical distance between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. This critical distance enables the Basic Writer to be *known* by Mills and ensures the ontological stability of this identity within the imaginative geography of Basic Writing. This ontological stability, however, is incomplete without the corresponding identity of the Basic Writing instructor that establishes and maintains the a critical distance between an *us* and a *them*, a distance from which these authors as instructors of Basic Writing are able to speak with authority about the Basic Writer.

2.2.2 Basic Writing Instructor as Agent of Good Will and Social Justice

As this study reads across the data set for this chapter, a critical distance is established between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. This distance can be identified in the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor as an agent of good will and social justice that emerges in regard to the Basic Writer who otherwise lacks access to Standard English. The critical distance that separates this student who lacks access from the writing instructor who provides this access enables these authors to present a known remedial writer who, as *the* Basic Writer, needs access to Standard English, something that is provided by *the* Basic Writing

instructor as an agent of good will and social justice. These textual identities are supported by the *radical realism* that is manifest within and across these individual texts and maintained as the imagined geography of Basic Writing.

Locating the Basic Writer within her text as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English, Helen Mills articulates her identity as an instructor of Basic Writing that is strategically located in regard to this student. An agent of good will and social justice, she writes, "I recognized that I had no alternative but to offer a very basic course in which students had time to master a single concept and apply it before they could go on to the next one" (54). Here, we see that her disciplinary understanding of the remedial writer as *the* Basic Writer enables Mills' response within the classroom as an agent of good will and social justice providing access to these students. In other words, it is her construction of the *other* within the text that enables her to delineate her own identity as this agent who provides these students with access to Standard English. Mills' approach, however, is not only to provide students with access to Standard English, but to help students discover "that learning to write effectively is important to them" (44). Here we see that the access she provides is inextricably linked to her good will within the classroom.

Another author who is strategically located in relation to the Basic Writer as having otherwise lacked access to Standard English, is Jeanne Desy who writes as an agent of good will and social justice in her piece "Reasoned Writing for Basic Students: A Course Design" (6). She states:

> Motivation: my students want to learn how to write research papers, because here at Capital most upperclassmen do so every semester. That isn't true everywhere. But, if it were not true here, and if I were not required to teach the research paper, I would still do so, because I believe that education is in part knowing how to find out. Moreover, my own memory is that those issues I know and care most about are the issues I wrote a paper on. And, most importantly, I believe in the moral and intellectual virtue of having made at least once an intelligent, informed decision. My students know I believe these things, and many seem to respect these beliefs, although few, at 18, understand them. (15)

This is followed by, "Of course, I work myself (and them) to death. I gather my rewards, not financial." Within this piece readers are led to believe that her reward is, instead, located in her

students' successes in the classroom. Responding to their lack of access to Standard English, Desy poses two questions. First, "Can reasoning be taught to students who are academically and intellectually below average, either in preparation or ability?" And, secondly, "Is it the providence of the writing class to teach reason?" Considering that that these students need to know "how to think" and that "they cannot write if they cannot think," Desy concludes that students already use logical modes or reasoning and can be taught to reason within the university. Thought, for Desy and her colleagues, is writing. "If students are to learn to make thought plain on paper, they must be taught to do so in a writing class" (7). Here, within her text, Desy's identity within the Basic Writing classroom as an agent of good will and social justice that is strategically located in relation to the Basic Writing student who has otherwise lacked access to Standard English emerges with a degree of clarity that is unique to the *radical realism* that is manifested within these disciplinary texts.

This textual identity of the instructor of Basic Writing as an agent of good will and social justice appears in other places through writers' personal tones of frustration that is eventually assuaged within the Basic Writing classroom. Describing Strategic Location, Said writes that this "location includes the kind of narrative voice that [the author] adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kinds of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text" (20). I suggest that we see a tone alluding to this disciplinary identity of good will and social justice in Valerie Krishna's piece, "The Syntax of Error." She writes: "Perhaps the most vexing problem that teachers of basic writing face is the fact that the most serious errors that appear in student papers are those that we are the least equipped to handle, those that are in fact next to impossible to deal with by traditional methods" (43). Here, she rallies the teacher that "despairs" and "feels that such errors are random, unpredictable, and impossible to handle." Failed by the assistance of traditional grammar books, Krishna emerges within this text as an instructor of Basic Writing who is able to understand these seemingly illusive errors as she overcomes her personal frustration. Here, her textual identity as an instructor of Basic Writing is strategically located in regards to *the* Basic Writer who has otherwise lacked access to Standard English. The critical distance between the author and the Basic Writer enables this frustrated author assuage her frustration through her knowledge about and understanding of the Basic Writer.

Patricia Laurence echoes a similar personal tone of frustration in her writing: "I am stymied," she writes (23). "My students, generally seventeen to twenty years old – Black,

Chinese, Greek, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Puerto Rican and Slavic – sit in front of me, inexperienced in and confused about written words, and, in some cases, no longer even curious about them" (23). Despite the challenge that faces her in teaching these students who have not otherwise had access to Standard English, the "stymied" Laurence proceeds to illuminate the perceptual difficulties of students as she reinforces the ethos of the Basic Writing instructor as an agent of good will and social justice and her critical distance from the Basic Writer. As Said discusses in Orientalism, the critical distance that is maintained in Laurence's text between an *us* and a *them* enables her understanding of this textual subject that is located within the *radical realism* of a disciplinary text. This distance is reinforced within the text through moments in which a personal tone of frustration emerge only to be resolved by the author's eventual knowledge about and understanding of the Basic Writer.

These authors were in many ways mavericks, active agents shaping the emergence of Basic Writing during the late 1970s. Their agency is expressed both through their articulations of the identities that are constructed within these texts and the narratives that these identities are woven into. This agency, however, extends beyond these texts as these articulations are part of a broader disciplinary project to *define* the Basic Writer, to render this newcomer to the university both visible and understood. It is important to see this maverick component of the Basic Writing instructor in the context of the chaotic university where she worked during the era of Open Admission. Teaching an otherwise unknown presence within the university, Basic Writing instructors were entering territory that was perceived to have been previously unexplored. As they mapped this territory and gained an understanding of it, Basic Writing instructors established a strategic disciplinary body of knowledge, a body of knowledge within which they held authority as experts.

2.2.3 The Basic Writer as Logical

A second means by which these maverick authors strategically locate themselves within their disciplinary texts is in regards to the logical Basic Writer. This logical writer within the Basic Writing classroom enables a textual identity of the instructor of Basic Writing that is scientific and consequently granted access to the logic of these otherwise elusive writers. It is through these critically distant identities that the authors of these texts are able to understand the

Basic Writer and present the discipline's collective knowledge about and understanding of this student within the *radical realism* of their texts. This *radical realism* is not a reflection of reality, but rather a construction of reality, a radical reality that is ontologically stable, located in the critical distance between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor that is maintained within these texts and enables the latter to *know* the former. It is in this way that the remedial writer is displayed through the imagined geography of this discipline as an understood Basic Writer whose performance is imbued with logic.

Mina Shaughnessy strategically locates herself in regards to the logical Basic Writer in *Errors and Expectations* when she informs her readers that, yes, they *can* understand the errors of students in the "eleventh hour" of their academic careers:

> But if they stick with their decision to teach, they will slowly begin to discern a "logic" to
> their students' difficulties with writing, a path that leads inexorably back through all the
> schoolrooms where these students did not learn to write but learned instead to believe that
> they could not write or even make sense of the confusion of do's and dont's they mistook
> for the subject of English. (5)

In this introduction to *Errors and Expectations*, a text that is largely devoted to explaining the logic of student error, Shaughnessy prepares her readers for what is a systematic illustration of the logic behind student error. The instruction that she outlines in this text is instruction of the logical Basic Writer by the scientific Basic Writing instructor. Take, for example, the Basic Writer's handwriting. The pedagogical approach to handwriting that is presented in *Errors and Expectations* focuses on helping students look objectively at their own writing. Shaughnessy writes: "Handwriting styles become extensions of ourselves and are therefore difficult to see let alone change. Yet it is this "seeing" of the handwriting through other eyes that is the most important experience for the student" (15). As students learn to see what readers would see in their writing, they learn to articulate towards a specific audience, and come into alignment with the expectations of academia.

We see the implicit logic of Basic Writers reflected in the activities that Shaughnessy suggests scientific instructors include in handwriting lessons. First, she suggests projecting various writing styles on a screen and inviting students to see their handwriting as a potential reader might. She also suggests presenting materials on developmental stages in writing and, finally, giving students examples of amateur handwriting for analysis. As students become

increasingly "at home" with the skill of handwriting, the pen becomes a natural extension of the hand, "and the hand [a natural extension] of the mind itself" (16). Thus, as a result of learning to see themselves in a trained objectivity, students will be increasingly motivated to "take pains" to remedy the errors of their writing. Shaughnessy goes on to write, "and it is this matter of taking pains rather than changing the writing style that is most often at issue" (16). Thus, the problem with this common error among Basic Writers is not that they are unable to understand or that their errors are illogical. Within the *radical realism* of the classroom that Shaughnessy presents in *Errors and Expectations*, the Basic Writer is logical, and their handwriting errors are both understandable and easily fixable through experience and instruction from a scientific instructor of Basic Writing.

As students improve their handwriting as a means of articulating the "silent speech" of their minds, Shaughnessy moves on to punctuation. Here again, her instruction is for the logical Basic Writer. These errors, like those of handwriting, reflect a student's inexperience with writing. Shaughnessy characterizes punctuation as a "code that serves to signal structural, semantic, and rhetorical meanings that would otherwise be missed by the reader" (16). Thus, the degree to which a student errs in her use of punctuation reflects the degree of a student's inexperience. The scientific instructor of Basic Writing can appreciate this. Attributing these errors to a lack of experience, once they are understood through the logic of the Basic Writer these errors can be easily amended under the guidance of the Basic Writing instructor.

Shaughnessy again locates herself within *Errors and Expectations* in regard to the logical Basic Writer when she introduces punctuation as a means of giving instructors a deeper scientific insight into the interior workings of their students. Here, it is because of this student logic that Shaughnessy and other instructors of Basic Writing gain what I suggest is a scientific access to the inner workings of the Basic Writer. For example, she writes: "What one senses through such punctuation is a caution about losing control of the sentence by allowing it to become too long – too full, that is, of embedded structures, which to the unpracticed writer may well echo their deeper origins as sentences" (28). In addressing this issue, the student's study of punctuation ought to begin with the broader structures with which punctuation must correspond. When students learn to identify those parts of sentences that elicit specific forms of punctuation, a framework of "punctuation situations" is put into place. It is within this framework that the logical Basic Writer then begins to place their writing through analogy. Here, punctuation

becomes not only a code by which an author guides a reader through a piece of writing, but also a code through which a scientific teacher can gain insight into the inner workings of her students.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the problem addressed here is not that Basic Writers have no punctuation skills. These skills have been "at least partially learned by Basic Writing students" (18). The problem lies in students' partial understandings that often result in inconstant punctuation, the omission of punctuation, or the invention of punctuation by students. The scientific Basic Writing instructor is not introducing new competencies, but instead building on the competencies that the student already has. Thus, once instructors of Basic Writing appeal to the logic of the Basic Writer, these errors are understood and remedied.

There are two levels of "understanding" that are functioning within this study's analysis of this textual identity. The first level of understanding occurs within the *radical realism* of these texts and the textually constructed identities of the Basic Writer and Basic Writing instructor that are present in this reality. Here, the later gains access to the interiority of the former by way of the Basic Writer's logic and the scientific understanding that this logic enables the Basic Writing instructor to have. The second level of understanding within this section is that which is enabled within the disciplinary formation that emerges across this chapter. This understanding is a result of the critical distance that is maintained within these texts between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. By distinguishing from themselves that which they were not, authors of these texts are able to claim an intimate knowledge of this *other*, of this Basic Writer.

Barbara Quint Gray strategically locates the instructor of Basic Writing in regard to the logical Basic Writer ("Dialect Interference" 14). The logic of the Basic Writer that she discusses, however, is one that is expressed through the logic of "dialect interference" that she traces across student writing. Logical in their efforts to compose, the Basic Writer merely applies the wrong logic as the logics of multiple dialects converge within his writing. Gray writes:

> Such a representation leaves behind any implication that failure to use standard forms has been due to carelessness or sloppiness. English teachers have too long applied such humiliating and inaccurate explanations to non-standard interferences in their students' writing, resulting in confusion and distress for the writers, who may, in fact, have been quite careful and neat. (14)

The source of error for Gray and her colleagues is rooted in the Basic Writer's perception of written language. Because the error of the Basic Writer is logical, however, the perceptions that cause this error can be understood and remedied by the Basic Writing instructor.

Patricia Laurence strategically locates herself in regard to the logical Basic Writer in her discussion of these perceptual confusions in student writing. In "Errors Endless Train: Why Students Don't Perceive Errors," she writes: "However, in practice, language is perceived through both visual and auditory shapes, and is therefore as much perceptual as conceptual" (24). Removed from any cultural context or broader cultural meaning, these logical perceptual errors can be easily fixed within the *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom that is constructed within these texts. Laurence describes her strategy as one in which "we must begin to link the student's perception, what he sees and hears when writing words with his conceptual understanding of word formation, grammatical rules and relationships" (29).

The logical Basic Writer is an important way through which the authors of these texts strategically locate the instructor of Basic Writing. With a textual identity that is articulated vis-à-vis this logical student, the instructor of Basic Writing is discussed in the next section as scientific. These identities and the critical distance between them which is ontologically fixed within the imaginative geography of the discipline reflect the agency of these authors both within their texts and within the universities in which they worked. The textual identity of the Basic Writer as logical challenges a general perception of remedial writing that had frequently followed this student into the writing classroom and rendered them unseen within the academy. Emerging as the Basic Writer during this "moment" in the discipline's history, the underprepared and unseen remedial writing student becomes visible and understood within a disciplinary formation. This visibility, however, was as a result of power dynamics implicit to the disciplinary formation as we see it here through the lens of Said in *Orientalism*. The student identity that is known within this data set is known as such because of the critical distance that is maintained by the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing. This distance in one between an *us* and a *them*. This distance at once established the distant other in relation to which the Basic Writing instructor is defined. This distant other, however, is brought close to the Basic Writing instructor through the logic of this student and the ability of the scientific Basic Writing instructor to decipher this logic, to understand and to know this textually constructed student.

2.2.4 Basic Writing Instructor as Scientific

As these authors strategically locate themselves in relation to the logical Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor emerges as scientific. Although the logic of these writers is flawed and results in error, this logic is understandable to the scientific Basic Writing instructor. This identity maintains the critical distance between the instructor and the student of Basic Writing. This distance is enacted within the individual texts of this data set, as it is only within the *radical realism* of these texts that these figures of the Basic Writing classroom exist. These textual identities, however, have an ontological stability that is maintained within the imaginative geography of the discipline. It is within this geography that the individual articulations examined in this chapter emerge. As they do so, these authors are part of the coherent articulation of Basic Writing that presents a distilled and cohesive understanding of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing classroom that is aligned within surrounding power structures and visible within the university.

Strategically located in regard to the logical Basic Writer, Shaughnessy opens *Errors and Expectations* encouraging instructors of Basic Writing to take the time to understand these students. This understanding, I suggest, is a scientific one. In her introduction to the first issue of the *Journal of Basic Writing*, Mina Shaughnessy opens with a passage that describes "the shock and challenge" of the diversity that Basic Writers introduced to the University during the era of Open Admissions (1). She follows this passage, however, with two examples of student writing from students preparing to enter City College. While the first passage represents the writing of a standard first-year college student, the second passage is that of a Basic Writer. Shaughnessy writes that a teacher presented with this passage would "not likely to know where to begin or even whether to begin" (2). A teacher's training would have taught them to see this writing as coming from a student who was not very bright. Shaughnessy, however, reaches out to her audience, assuring them that if they set about teaching these students in "as thorough and deliberate a way as possible" they will find themselves in unmapped territory that will be navigatable because of the logic behind the error that they are confronted with and their ability as scientific instructors of Basic Writing to decipher this logic.

Shaughnessy presents her reader with a similar scene in the opening of *Errors and Expectations*. This canonical text of Basic Writing opens with the image of a young Mina

Shaughnessy who sits "alone in a warn urban classroom where [her] students had just written their first essay and where [she] now began to read them" (vii). Although her lack of preparation for this task is undeniably clear, Shaughnessy writes, "we need not learn everything at our students' expense and that even among independent English teachers there are methods and insights to be shared, ways of reducing somewhat the costly lessons of experience." Taking up her own call, Shaughnessy proceeds into a seminal text of this discipline in which readers, teachers of Basic Writing, come to know the Basic Writer through that which marks them as Basic Writers: error. These error however are logical and the Basic Writing instructor who sets out to understand them, scientific. The most visible author to position herself within a text in relation to error, Shaughnessy was outspoken in her insistence that the error of Basic Writers was based in a logic that, although flawed, was understandable and thus able to be remedied within the Basic Writing classroom. The textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor within her texts is defined and enabled by the logic of the student that she is coming to understand. This disciplinary instructor scientifically understands the errors and the Basic Writers who make them.

Betty Rizzo and Santiago Villafane also locate themselves as the scientific Basic Writing instructor within their text, "Spanish Language Influences on Written English." They write: "It is difficult to isolate what appear to be characteristic errors made by Spanish-speaking students in our urban schools when they are writing English; their writings are palimpsests through which the effect of many influences may be glimpsed" (62). While it is nearly impossible to reference a "typical" student, these authors qualify their statement saying:

> [n]evertheless, as those of us who have taught the writing of English to these students for several years know, there are certain kinds of errors which show up again and again in their papers, so that frequently we are able to say with accuracy, "This is the paper of a student from a Spanish-speaking background." (63)

Rizzo and Villafane are able to make this assertion because of the implicit logic of the Basic Writer that they are working within the textually constructed *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom. Separated from the Basic Writer by a critical distance between an *us* and a *them*, Rizzo and Villafane's Basic Writing instructor is able to articulate a scientifically coherent understanding of the Basic Writer, the Basic Writer of which they are in a unique position to *know* within this disciplinary formation. Their knowledge of this student is rooted in the

imagined geography across which the drama of the Basic Writing classroom is played out within these individual texts.

Evaluation is a critical way in which this scientific identity of the Basic Writing instructor is formed in regard to the logical Basic Writer within this data set. Evaluations of Basic Writers give these practitioners quantifiable evidence of the students they teach, rendering this student scientifically known and visible. In "With No Apology: Teaching to the Test," Rosemary Hake follows an excerpt from an essay by a Basic Writer with the following commentary:

> This is not an isolated example, nor a hypothetical paper. It is a fact of life at urban Chicago State University (CSU), as at many other colleges and universities in the country. The fact, evidenced by the above entering test paper, is that a high proportion of our students arrive unable to write competently. The question – again one confronting many English departments besides ours – is what can be done to insure that such students are not equally poor writers when it comes time for them to leave the university. The purpose of this article is to describe the program of testing and instruction we have developed over the past several years at Chicago State to see that our students meet at least a minimal standard of competence in writing. (42)

Hake expounds on the importance of developing an examination that measures "the competence we aim to produce." In the development of such an exam, Hake discusses the formation of "collective judgment" within her program. Hake and her colleagues aimed to produce "maximum uniformity." As she outlines the procedures for developing this exam she reflects: "The assumption reflected in these procedures is that although we vary among ourselves in our observation and judgment, we are all professional and, within a predictable range, systematic and consistent within ourselves" (50). Here, I suggest that, as the author of this text, Hake is making another assumption, a disciplinary assumption that strategically locates the Basic Writing instructor as scientific in regard to the logical Basic Writer. The evaluation of her program can be uniform and track the progression of the Basic Writer precisely because of the scientific logic of this progression and the subsequent scientism of the Basic Writing instructor who can track the development of this logical writer.

When the identity of the Basic Writer emerges in the *radical realism* that is manifest within the texts of this data set, the Basic Writing instructor emerges as able to understand this writer, to make sense of the otherwise boggling errors that they introduce to writing classrooms

across the nation. Marie Ponsot describes the before and after tests that she administered in a summer session titled Total Immersion. She writes: "We used standard tests before and after, and recorded no staggering over-all changes in test scores. The slightly higher final scores were not discouraging for we felt we lacked instruments calibrated to gauge the real and dramatic changes in students' work" (32). Here Ponsot reflects a faith in these evaluations to enable a factual understanding of her students. Although the evaluation did not work particularly well here, it was not because of the relationship between evaluations and the students they evaluate. It was not because the Basic Writer was illogical and unable to be consistently evaluated for progress. The problem arose between evaluations and the tools available to construct them. The potential success of this exam rests on the scientism of the Basic Writing instructor and the logic of the Basic Writing student.

In understanding and evaluating the error of these students, the data set of this chapter strategically locates a scientific instructor of Basic Writing in regard to the logical Basic Writer. The critical distance that is maintained between these two textual identities is rooted in the fact that, despite their logic, the Basic Writer cannot understand their error. For this, they need the scientific instructor of Basic Writing who can understand their errors and, through instruction, remedy it. The drama of this critical distance is played out within the *radical realism* of *the* Basic Writing classroom that is constructed within these texts. The ontological stability of these disciplinary identities is, however, located in the imaginative geography from within which these texts emerge during this "moment" of disciplinary formation in the 1970s.

2.3 What is the location of the Basic Writing classroom?

After looking at the configuration of textual identities in this "moment" of disciplinary emergence, my analysis will now turn briefly to the topic of the Basic Writing Classroom. The previous section employed Said's methodological concept of Strategic Location to describe the way in which the authors of these texts positioned themselves in relation to the Basic Writer. Here, this study looked at two of the most prominent pairs of textual identities that emerge across this data set: the Basic Writer as otherwise lacking access to Standard English / Basic Writing Instructor as Agent of Good Will and Social Justice and the Basic Writer as Logical / Basic Writing Instructor as Scientific. The explication of these two sets of corresponding disciplinary

identities discussed the ways in which individual authors incorporate these ontologically stable identities into the *radical realism* of their texts as well as the way in which these identities represent a cohesive distillation of *fact* that is reflected in the imaginative geography of Basic Writing.

I now turn to the Strategic Formation of the discipline. As I do so, I will focus on the emergence of the Basic Writing classroom as a location that forms across these individual texts. These individual texts gain referential power in their collective construction of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. Said writes that Strategic Formation is a "way of analyzing the relationship between texts and the way in which groups of texts, types of texts, even textual genres, acquire mass density, and referential power among themselves and thereafter in the culture at large" (20). Using Said's methodological framework from *Orientalism* to illustrate the emergence of Basic Writing as a discipline in the 1970s, this study analyzes the emergence of the Basic Writing classroom within "the ensemble of relationships" that emerges across these texts. This space is critical because of the both the visibility that it gives the Basic Writer through a designated space within the university and because of the way in which this physical space is shaped by our understanding of the textually created disciplinary identities that are located within it.

This final section analyzes the relationship between these texts in terms of the location of the Basic Writing classroom that emerges from this emergent disciplinary formation. A critical referential power of these texts as they both understand the Basic Writer and make this student visible within the university is the space that is created by and for these newcomers to the university, these outsiders, these underprepared students in the "eleventh hour" of their academic career. The character of this space, I suggest, is one of incorporation as it is within the Basic Writing classroom that the Basic Writer transitions into the university by learning to speak its language. This space *resolves* the Basic Writer's previous lack of access to Standard English. Here the Basic Writing instructor as an agent of good will and social justice provides this access. Secondly, the Basic Writing classroom *assimilates*. It is a space where the logic of the Basic Writer is assimilated, rendered known by the scientific Basic Writing instructor and brought into alignment with the logic of the University through efforts to eradicate student error.

A space of resolution and mediation within which the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor are located, the Basic Writing classroom maintains the critical distance between an *us*

and a *them*, a distance that is dramatized so as to enable the instructor of Basic Writing to know and understand the Basic Writer. It is within this classroom that the vocabulary of Basic Writing's imagined geography is enacted, where this understanding of the Basic Writer is put into practice. After looking at this space as it emerges across the data set of this chapter, I will then turn to briefly describe the instructor of Basic Writing beyond these texts. Here, the agency of the individual in this "moment" of a discipline's emergence becomes clear. What Said's methodological framework has enabled us to see of the incorporation of authors' lived experiences into the cohesive and unified articulation of the imagined geography plays out in lived experiences of these authors that are not obscured by their writing, but instead empowered these "beginning principles" that are articulated in their disciplinary texts. Thus, the referential power of these texts extends beyond merely this data set, the *Journal of Basic Writing*, and the *radical realism* that is maintained within this imaginative geography. The referential power of these texts is reflected in the lived experiences of the active agents who show up "on Monday morning" to meet the student in the "eleventh" hour of her academic career.

2.3.1 Location of Resolution

Emerging in a context that was characterized by social, economic, and political conflict both within and outside of the university, the Basic Writing classroom is a location welcoming "young men and women who want to be in college, who have the intelligence to do college work, but who are not skilled enough when they arrive on campus to survive in a rigorously academic environment" (Shaughnessy "Introduction" 3). The Basic Writing classroom that is reflected in this passage does not challenge the prestige of the traditional writing classroom. Instead, it creates a *new* space, a space within which the Basic Writer's lack of access to Standard English is resolved by the agent of good will and social justice, the Basic Writing instructor.

In this new writing space, newcomers to the university are taught Standard Written English in an effort by these instructors to enable these students to succeed within the university, to gain access to this social institution. This, for example, is the motivation of Sarah D'Eloia in her piece, "Teaching Standard Written English":

It is however, simply fallacious to argue from the presumed stylistic weakness of the standard dialect to the presumed stylistic strengths of non-standard dialects: each has its "flavor"; each is capable of both obfuscation and directness. It is equally fallacious to confuse the linguistic equality of dialects with their social inequality." (10)

Maintaining that students come to the university to improve their economic and social status in life, D'Eloia argues that the classroom is not a site of conflict that teaches "a radical critique of our present social order" (11). Rather, it is a site of resolution equipping students to deal with the existing social order.

This location of the classroom within individual texts such as D'Eloia's gains referential power across this data set as these authors are confident in their successes in shaping the Basic Writer into "an educated person." In her article clarifying dialect interference in writing, Barbara Quint Gray is able to produce a number that empirically measures the perception of a writer as educated or non. She writes: "As long as dialect interference in writing does not exceed [two percent], it can easily be ignored. When interference rises above that level it overtaxes a reader's filtering processes" (22). The Basic Writing classrooms that emerge over these texts grant the Basic Writer access to higher education through an introduction that teaches them to successfully navigate existing social realities without threatening the position of those invested in them.

2.3.2 Location of Assimilation

Once their lack of access is resolved under the instruction of the Basic Writing instructor, the Basic Writing student within this data set is assimilated into the University through their acquisition of Standard English. Again, D'Eloia describes Basic Writers as students coming to college to gain, "essential skills of economic and professional survival" (5). She suggests "[a]ll evidence indicates that most students, including those at City College, are in college because they wish to improve their economic and social status in life" (9). Implicit in the Basic Writer's success in reaching this goal is this student's ability to become proficient in Standard English. The central focus of all of these texts, Standard English is the language of success both within the Basic Writing classroom and the university. Entering the Basic Writing classroom with other dialects and other native languages, the Basic Writer must learn the boundaries of one way of speaking, one way of knowing and adopt another – Standard English.

Nancy Lay illustrates this distinction in, "Chinese Language Interference in Written English." In her effort to help students understand the logic of their error, Lay produces charts for her readers that illustrate the differences between Chinese and English grammar (53). In her "Contrast Table," for example, Lay generalizes a rule about a part of speech and then illustrates the differences between the two languages with a specific example. She presents this linguistic information in her argument that Basic Writers are influenced either directly or indirectly by their native language or dialect. Helping students amend these language differences, the interference of which creates error in their writing, Basic Writing instructors need to have an awareness of and understanding of the causes of these problems (51). Thus, as students assimilate within the university, Lay offers the Basic Writing instructor "a method of working with students which heightens the teacher's awareness of the problem" (51).

Patricia Laurence also (re)constructs the Basic Writing instructor as a cultural agent working with the assimilating Basic Writer. In "Errors Endless Train: Why Student's Don't Perceive Errors," she attributes student error to difficulties in perception. Perceiving language through both "visual and auditory shapes" the difficulties of these students emerge from a failure to see – a failure to distinguish a more familiar and incorrect form from what is Standard English and correct within the university. Laurence writes:

> The origin of these various types of word confusions differs depending on the student's language background, awareness and training, but in writing this exploratory paper I am groping toward an explanation of why certain remedial writing students fail to *see* certain errors in their own writing even after focused attention and seemingly effective grammatical instruction and practice. (26)

Here, it is the instructor of Basic Writing that helps these students accommodate by helping them to *see* what is correct. Consequently, students come to see their native language habits as incorrect as they adopt the correct Standard English of the university.

Assimilating to the university, these Basic Writers can never fully enter the university. For once they do they are unknown as Basic Writers; they are no longer present in the illumination of the imagined geography of this discipline. The critical distance between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor is lost, and the former can thus no longer be known by the latter. These authors who orient themselves within their texts vis-à-vis this student of Basic Writing place themselves in critical locations of power for audiences who are anxious over the presence of

47

remedial writers within the university. As the writing instructor is textually (re)constructed as a Basic Writing instructor, her textual identity gives her a special knowledge of this *other* within the University, an *other* that threatens to transgress the boundaries of the sovereign center, but instead reifies these boundaries through the disciplinary construction of Basic Writing.

Here we see the Basic Writing classroom emerging as a location that grants Basic Writers access to the university; the Basic Writing classroom is a core component of the *radical realism* of the discipline's imagined geography. These classrooms emerge across these texts as physical spaces within which the "familiar habits of thought, feeling, and perception" maintained within the imagined geography of Basic Writing are enacted (Said 101). Reflections of the discipline's alignment with centers of power that enable its material, economic, and intellectual visibility, the Basic Writing classroom emerges through the knowledge produced about this disciplinary location and the textual topography provided by this location for interactions between students and teachers. The Basic Writing classroom becomes a location within which these authors stage the textual identities of both the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. Forming knowledge about and understanding of the Basic Writer, these disciplinary texts "make [the Basic Writer's] management easy and profitable" (Said 36). This knowledge grants individuals within the discipline visibility, but also power that extends beyond the pages of text that they create.

It is in this way that the strategic formation of the Basic Writing classroom as a location of resolution and assimilation within the University resonates beyond the texts examined in this data set. Through both their texts and their public appearance, Shaughnessy and her peers constructed a Basic Writing classroom that was both intellectually understood and publicly perceived as a safe location of access for remedial students within the University. Through their alignments with various centers of power, both she and these early authors created a space within which the Basic Writer could be given access to Standard English and assimilated into the logic of the University without challenging the integrity of higher education.

In a two-page memo addressed to the chair of the CUNY English Department, Edmund Volpe (1964-1970), Shaughnessy wrote in September of 1967:

> And while I am being negative, I must again bring up the subject of office space. Everyone is aware of the space problem; the disgruntlement rises more directly from the fact that every teacher in the regular English program has some kind of office space

whereas not one teacher in the Pre-bac program has any office space. The counseling time that is worked into the teachers' schedules is not an adequate substitute: no one can reach the teachers by telephone except in the evening, and the teachers, in turn, run up their telephone bills at home; they have no place to "land" when they get to campus; they cannot meet students' requests for appointments; and most important, their contention that they are invisible is seriously reinforced by the failure of anyone to allot them space.

Is there nothing we can do and no one we can bother about this? (Maher 93)

Reflected in these words to the chair of her department is Shaughnessy's prescient awareness of the need to establish a visible and acknowledged presence of Basic Writing within her department at CUNY. The importance of this visibility, however, extended far beyond a location that Adrienne Rich described as "the prefab hut which houses the English Department" (qtd. in Maher 266).

Written the year that Shaughnessy began working at City College, this memo illustrates Shaughnessy's administrative savoir, a defining trait of her career. She was uniquely positioned within New York City politics and had connections that enabled her to create and maintain the network of a New York City socialite. This ability was a result of both her 15 years of residence within the city as well as her marriage to political insider, Donald Shaughnessy (91). While Shaughnessy maintained this social and political visibility, she was also keenly aware of the "publish-or-perish game" as this was ultimately *most* visible within academic circles (79).

As the textual identities explicated by this study emerge from within foundational texts of the discipline, these texts manifest critical power alignments that were made by Shaughnessy and her peers as they established and maintained the visibility of this nascent discipline. Mary Soliday writes in *The Politics of Remediation*:

Remediation's uses shift over time because it is often used to navigate broader institutional changes in mission, enrollment, curriculum, standards, and admissions, all of which affect the status of English studies and composition teaching. Institutions use composition and remediation in more complex ways to fulfill their own, not just students' needs. (23)

Emerging during the era of Open Admissions, Basic Writing fulfilled the financial need of institutions to increase admissions. As this occurred, however, these institutions admitted a

number of students who were underprepared and foreign to traditional college campuses. It fell to remediation to handle this crisis in the university.

This crisis experienced by universities in the 1960s and 1970s reflected a broader climate of social tension. Adrienne Rich describes this broader social context in her essay "Teaching Language in Open Admissions: A Look at the Context":

> Sometimes as I walk 133d Street, past the glass-strewn doorways of P.S. 161, the graffiti-sprayed walls of tenements, the uncollected garbage, through the iron gates of South Campus and up the driveway to the prefab hut which houses the English Department, I think wryly of John Donne's pronouncement that "the University is a Paradise; rivers of Knowledge are there; Arts and Sciences flow from thence." I think that few of our students have this Athenian notion of what college is going to be for them; their first introduction to it is a many hours' wait in line at registration, which only reveals that the courses they have been advised or wanted to take are filled, or conflict in hours with a needed job; then more hours at the cramped, heavily guarded bookstore; then, perhaps, a semester in courses which they never chose, or in which the pace and allusions of a lecturer are daunting or which may meet at opposite ends of an elongated campus stretching for six city blocks and spilling over into a former warehouse on Broadway. (258)

As instructors such as Adrienne Rich and Mina Shaughnessy found themselves surrounded by conflict both in and outside of the University, they sat at a crossroads ripe with the potential for the emergence of this discipline. Shaughnessy described this moment in an article published in *CCC* in the winter of 1973 entitled "Open Admissions and the Disadvantaged Teacher":

> Partisans of open admissions find it difficult to know these days whether they are in a rear- or a vanguard action. Viewed from the widest perspective, Open Admissions seems inevitable – part of a much vaster shift within and even beyond this society from a rural to an urban population, from an industrial to a service-oriented labor force, from a culture of conformity to one of diversity. (401)

She continues, however, and presents a different perspective:

> But viewed from a narrower perspective, the perspective of shrinking budget and growing pessimism about the importance or effectiveness of schools in righting even the

educational wrongs of the society, let along the larger inequities they reflect, Open

Admissions seems doomed. (401)

It is from within this context that Jane Maher describes Mina's response to criticism as stemming "in large part from the realization that confrontation was probably the least effective way to proceed as she sought to make City College a place where the professors would be willing, as she later explained in *Errors and Expectations*, "to make more than a graceless and begrudging accommodation" to the students' "unpreparedness" (293).

Teachers and students that Bruce Horner later describes as being at the bottom of the institutional hierarchy, Shaughnessy and her peers represent a "response to another, powerful public discourse on higher education and students deemed underprepared for college" (Birth 4). Although Horner argues that Basic Writing is silent in its acknowledgment of the "concrete material, political, institutional, social, and historical realities confronting basic writing teachers, students and courses," it is through responses to these realities and alignments with centers of power within them that the Basic Writing classroom was constructed as a visible and perceived location through which the university safely opened its doors to those it had traditionally excluded ("Mapping" 116).

2.4 Conclusion

As this chapter has accounted for the emergence of Basic Writing as a discipline, the personal stories of these authors have been woven through what is an observation of power hierarchies and the textual identities that facilitate the creation and maintenance of these hierarchies within disciplinary structures. Although the theoretical frame provided by Said in *Orientalism* enables this study to illuminate the agency of individual authors at the "moment" of Basic Writing's emergence, these authors were constrained by the looming power structure of the university within which they worked – a power that they aligned themselves with in order to gain visibility. As these authors strategically located themselves within the disciplinary texts of this data set, they did so in relation to the Basic Writer. This Strategic Location established *who* the Basic Writer was as a way of establishing *who* the writing instructor became in the Basic Writing classroom. Located within the fixed imaginative geography of Basic Writing, these identities are regarded as ontologically stable within the frame of Orientalism. These textual

identities are located within the Strategic Formation of the Basic Writing classroom. This classroom is a critical component of the imagined geography of Basic Writing. Within *this* classroom these outsiders of the university are known, understood by *the* instructor of Basic Writing, known to institutions of higher education. The next chapter will question the assumption that disciplines are stable formations as it asks, how can we account for the change of a discipline and the agency of individuals in this change?

CHAPTER THREE

CHANGE

In her preface to *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Gloria Anzaldúa writes, "Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy" (19). She goes on to reflect, "It's not a comfortable territory to live in, this place of contradictions. Hatred, anger and exploitation are the prominent features of this landscape" (19). Here, in her preface, this Chicana lesbian writer and activist moves *into* a text that offers no resolution to conflict other than an understanding of the self as a process of becoming rather than a stable phenomenon of being. This sense of becoming is reiterated in an unpublished poem that she wrote in 1974: "I/slithered shedding/ my self/ on the path/then/ looked back and/contemplated/ the husk/ and wondered/ which me/ I had discarded/ and was it the second/ or the two thousand and/ thirty-second/ and how many me's/ would I slough off/ before voiding/ the core/ if ever" ("Reincarnation" 21). The imagery of this poem is that of the continually (re)emergent body, the (re)emergent self. As her skins slough away, Anzaldúa engages in a recurrent becoming that constitutes her *mestiza* identity within the texts that she writes as well as in her lived experience. She affirms the importance of recurrent becoming:

> However, there have been compensations for this *mestiza*, and certain joys. Living on borders and in margins keeping intact one's shifting and multiple identity and integrity, is like trying to swim in a new element, an "alien" element. There is an exhilaration in being a participant in the further evolution of humankind, in being "worked" on. I have the sense that certain "faculties" – not just in me but in every border resident, colored or non-colored – and dormant areas of consciousness are being activated, awakened. Strange, huh? And yes, the "alien" element has become familiar – never comfortable, not with society's clamor to uphold the old, to rejoin the flock, to go with the herd. No, not comfortable but home.

These passages from Anzaldúa's preface, as well as the trope of recurrent becoming, reappear in

the writing of Min-Zhan Lu as *she* moves into her chapter "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?" in *Representing the 'Other'*.

In this piece Min-Zhan Lu draws on Gloria Anzaldúa as a figure analogous to that of the Basic Writer. Discussing the regeneration of a self predicated on conflict, Anzaldúa extends a comparison between stagnation and death as she unequivocally refutes the possibility of ontological stability. The emergent self sloughing off its shell is ontologically unstable, fluid in its navigation between two spaces. There is no core essence of these identities, only evolution, awakening, becoming. Lu connects that metaphor to the Basic Writer. Like Anzaldúa's *mestiza consciousness* shedding its husks, the textual identity of the Basic Writer is generative, shedding old husks to reveal new iterations of the self. In this metaphor, the Basic Writer arrives home and is yet never comfortable there. Or, in the texts explicated within this chapter, the textual identity of the Basic Writer emerges in the "moment" and despite its belonging to the text, is never comfortable, never stable, there. In other words, the textual identities of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor emerge from a borderland that *is* the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing. These textual identities are not fixed in a stable essence. Instead they emerge from the generative conflict of a borderland, in other moments and in other texts where they are at home and yet never comfortable.

In this chapter, I argue that, at the same time Anzaldúa provides Lu with a productive metaphor for the Basic Writer, she also provides this study with a productive metaphor for the discipline that constructs the identity of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor: Basic Writing. A disciplinary structure, Basic Writing constitutes a borderland in which lived experience abuts textual narratives of this experience, narratives that create what Said describes as a *radical realism*: a version of reality that is *not* reality, but a textual recreation of it, a textual recreation that renders this reality known, understood to others. Likewise, the discipline of Basic Writing transforms the lived experience of authors into a cohesive component of a larger whole that holds meaning beyond the immediate context of the individual.

Within the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing, "two cultures" are "edging" each other, sharing the same territory. This territory shrinks the distance between the ambiguity of lived experience and the hyperclarity of a *radical realism*. It is within this territory that the ambiguity of lived experience is flattened into what becomes a *social fact*. These *social facts* are expressed within individual texts through the *radical realism* in which their constructed disciplinary

identities are couched. This hyperreality, however, exists within a fluid space of becoming, of (re)emergence, of renewed articulations of shared knowledge about and understandings of the subject. It is through this (re)emergence that the *social fact* of disciplinary identities shed their shells in this borderland. Once established, disciplinary identities are uprooted and (re)formed by individual authors negotiating this borderland of lived experience that is expressed through the *radical reality* of a disciplinary text.

This chapter looks at a "moment" of disciplinary (re)emergence in the 1990s focusing on four issues of the *Journal of Basic Writing* published in 1990 and 1991 as well as Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner's collection of essays largely written in the early 1990s, *Representing the 'Other.'* Writing during a period in which the academy at large was marked by the influence of post-modernism in what was for many a massive re-conception of identity and social continuity, these authors respond to circumstances that are significantly different from those of Shaughnessy and her peers in the 1960s and 1970s. Described by Mary Soliday as engaging in a "politics of access," Shaughnessy and her peers increased their visibility by positioning their work in alignment with bureaucratic centers of power. Authors writing within the discipline during the 1990s, however, engage in what Soliday describes as a "politics of agency." Surrounded by a massive restratification of higher education, these authors are no longer aligning themselves with the bureaucratic context of the era of Open Admissions. Instead, these later texts focus on the identity and productive plurality of student backgrounds within the Basic Writing classroom. Shifting away from a perspective that engages the surrounding bureaucratic structures of the University, the focus of authors in this second data set is on curricular change in the classroom.

These texts affirm that, yes, disciplines do change. As I explicate this data set using the frame of mobility theory, this study will illustrate both this change *and* the agency of individuals in creating this change. A moment of becoming, these texts reflect a "moment" in which the husks of old identities are shed and the discipline of Basic Writing (re)emerges through the writings of these authors. In order to illustrate this discipline's change, this chapter traces the movement of authors as active agents through fluid and overlapping identities within their disciplinary texts.

Said's examination of disciplinarity through his case study of Orientalism reduces disciplinary formations to *one* "moment" of emergence: inception. In this "moment" he explores the agency of individuals as they align the discipline with surrounding power structures and

initiate the collective articulation of a discipline's knowledge about and understanding of the subject. Perhaps more importantly, however, these individuals determine the trajectory of a discipline that reifies the ontologically stable identities that it claims to know. This knowledge is maintained through the textual identities that support this understanding. These identities are located within an imagined geography that is prescriptive of subsequent texts within a discipline. As these later texts are written, what occurs within this imagined geography is a series of replicated moments of emergence in which these authors locate themselves and their texts within a predetermined trajectory that claims to maintain ontologically stable textual identities. Change within this frame occurs only on a manifest level while beneath that surface the ontological stability of the subject is maintained, and latent Orientalism continues to hold sway.

If we view a discipline after its initial "moment" of emergence through this Saidian frame, authors within the discipline are no longer active agents in the creation of their texts. These post-emergence authors are understood within Orientalism as passive subjects whose work is constrained by the fixed disciplinary trajectory that is established by the "beginning principles" articulated in that "moment" of emergence. For Anzaldúa, this stability is analogous to death. The stability of Said's imagined geographies reflects a state of *being*, a stability of identity that is contingent on a stable context. Anzaldúa prompts us to realize that if disciplinary identities were stable as suggested by Said, the discipline would have ceased to exist. As stable identities cannot exist within the implicit instability of lived experience, we are forced to reexamine what Said assumed to be ontologically fixed within a disciplinary structure. In doing so, mobility theory offers a lens through which this study can begin to make sense of the ontological *instability* of the textual identities that Said locates within the closed system of his imaginative geography. Mobility theory enables this study to look more closely at a discipline's change and the agency of individuals within this change that occurs beyond the initial "moment" of a discipline's emergence.

While Said is essential for a fine-grained analysis of a discipline's initial moment of emergence, for example, of Shaughnessy and her peers, their savvy maneuvering of multiple forces that clearly have implications for the future history of this discipline, Said's frame does not allow for moments of (re)emergence, moments that destabilize the imagined geography of disciplinary identity, moments in which individual authors are active agents in the creation of disciplinary textual identities. Mobility theory, with its emphasis of fluidity and becoming,

provides a framework by which we can perceive disciplinary change and the agency of individuals who contribute to this change. This chapter provides insight into disciplinary change by analyzing texts that configure a significant "moment" of becoming for the discipline of Basic Writing. In what follows I will expand on what this theoretical lens has to offer this study and proceed into my analysis of the data.

3.1 Mobility as a Theoretical Framework for Mapping Disciplinary Change

The questions that this chapter addresses are: How can we account for the change of a discipline? And what is the role of the individual as an active agent in this change? In contrast to Said's top down explanation of disciplinary formation, this chapter articulates a bottom up explanation of disciplinary (re)formation. Viewing disciplinary change in this way, mobility theory begs a close reading of the configurations of textual identity within this data set. This chapter focuses on both the change that is marked by this "moment" in the 1990s as well as the role of individuals as active agents in this change. I argue that this disciplinary change becomes apparent *only* through close attention to the configuration of individual writers within their texts. The different authorial identities that they construct in the same text are at once fluid, overlapping, and reflective of the writer's mobility within her text. It is through these local, individual movements within a text that change occurs on a disciplinary scale. As this broader change is rooted in the local movement of writers within their texts, the individual is cast within this chapter as an active agent in the change of a discipline. Here's how this project will illuminate both this change and the agency of individuals.

This study focuses on three components of mobility theory that are important for illustrating the change and agency that I argue are present in this chapter. First, mobility theory enables this study to practice a nuanced understanding of movement and mobility. This understanding begins with an acknowledgement of a universal *potential* for movement, or motility. Secondly, the textual identities that give evidence of a writer's mobility gain critical mass when repeated by other writer's in this data set. Finally, mobility theory enables a discussion of *social fact* as fluid and (re)emergent. This discussion of *social fact* will complicate Said's discussion of *radical realism* as a means of describing the stable tropes of textual constructions of a hyperreality within disciplinary texts.

Critical to this study's understanding of mobility as a means of disciplinary production within these texts is an awareness that both the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor have the potential for movement, or motility. Paradoxically, the mobility of these writers within their texts is contingent on the moored constructed identity of the Basic Writer. The potential for the Basic Writer to move, in other words, is circumscribed *by* the different authorial identities of embodied writers within these texts. These authorial identities are not *contingent* on the constructed identity of the Basic Writer as suggested by Said. Rather, the mobility of these identities *is relational to* the moored textual identity of the Basic Writer. It is in this way that the movement of the former through different and overlapping textual identities within these texts is enabled by the embodied writer's anchoring of the latter within her text.

This paradoxical relationship between mobile author and moored student provides insight into the agency of the embodied writer within a disciplinary formation, a central focus of this project. These authors, I argue, are active agents in a translation between lived experience and textual narrative, between the nuance of lived reality and hyperclarity disciplinary texts. These authors are active agents navigating the fluid edge that separates these two realties. This fluid edge is negotiated by the embodied writers of these texts through a dialectical relationship between mobilities and moorings. This relationship is a departure from the subject-other relationship that maintained the static distance between the Oriental and the Orientalist. Within this chapter a new subject-other relationship emerges. This relationship is not the result of a static critical distance between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor, but a result of a textual affiliation with the Basic Writer. In this textual affiliation, the Basic Writing instructor is defined within these texts via movements that are relational to the anchored Basic Writer.

Movements of authorial identity within the texts of this data set are generative of disciplinary identity *because* multiple writers repeat these same authorial identities across different texts. These recurring textual identities establish a unified and collective articulation of this discipline's understanding of the subject, eventually gaining a critical mass within the descriptive imaginative geography of this discipline. This critical mass emerges as *social fact*. Played out in the *radical realism* of these texts, these *social facts* are the products of the embodied author's translation of lived reality into the *radical realism* of these disciplinary texts. These *social facts* are thus excerpted from the flattened lived experiences of these authors within the classroom. This excerption occurs through tropes of mobilization that recur across the

individual texts of the critical mass that is reached within a disciplinary formation and subsequently reflected within the descriptive imaginative geography of Basic Writing.

In the business of creating *social fact*, disciplines act much like mobility systems in that the repetition of movement is configured by writers through the constructed authorial identities that are repeated across this data set. It is in this way that individual texts are sites of social production that emerge within a disciplinary constellation of repeated movements by author identities within texts. The repetition of textual identities that enable this movement, along with the moored textual identities of the Basic Writing student, are what give this constellation shape as a discipline, a discipline in a "moment" of (re)emergence.

Finally, the disciplinary change of Basic Writing that I am arguing for highlights the agency of embodied writers within these texts. This disciplinary change is predicated on two observations that are made within this chapter. First, authors inhabit multiple identities within one text. Secondly, these multiple identities are repeated by multiple authors across individual texts. This highlights the agency of the embodied writer as this chapter observes the author's movement through multiple textual identities that are fluid and overlapping within the individual texts of this study. In his text, *Mobilties,* Urry opens with a list of what he refers to as "some new mobile rules for sociological method." Among these rules he includes: "to consider things as social facts – and to see agency as stemming from the mutual intersections of objects and peoples" (9). In its examination of these mutual intersections, mobility theory returns us to the relationship between agency and mobility where:

> [d]ifferential mobility empowerments reflect structures of hierarchies of power and position by race, gender, age and class, ranging from the local to the global. Mobility is a resource to which not everyone has an equal relationship. It is not a question of privileging a 'mobile subjectivity,' therefore, but rather of tracking the power and politics of discourses and practices of mobility in creating both movement and stasis. (Hannam, Sheller, Urry)

Tracking these creations of "movement and stasis" through practices of mobility, this study enables us to see both disciplinary change and the role of individuals as active agents in this change. These active agents are the embodied writers of disciplinary texts who translate lived experience into textual narrative through their movement among multiple fluid and overlapping authorial identities that are constructed in other texts by other writers.

In summary, these three components–motility, repetition, and social fact–enable us to see the way in which movement functions within the disciplinary texts of this data set and as a result destabilize the ontological stability of the disciplinary identities discussed in chapter two – those of the individual author as Basic Writing instructor and the Basic Writer. The prescriptive, closed system of Said's imaginative geography is reconfigured within this chapter as a fluid disciplinary formation that is descriptive of the *social facts* that emerge from the repeated movements of writers as they configure different authorial identities within and across texts. It is within this geography that the movements of writers within their texts–movements that are repeated across texts–gain critical mass and signal the change of a discipline. A motile agent, embodied writers configure their mobility within these texts through fluid and overlapping textual identities. The mobility of these constructed authorial identities within these texts reflects the presence of embodied writers as active agents in constructing textual identities that are detached from a stable ontology. A close reading of this movement enables us to see both the change of a discipline and the role of individual authors as agents in this change, in this (re)emergence. Here, the identity of the embodied writer translates into the multiple identities of the author throughout her text. In addition, as mobility theory emphasizes, these author identities are motile, the potential mobility of which is reflected in the movements of both these individual author identities within these texts *and* the movement of the embodied writer moving as an active agent through these fluid and overlapping identities within her text.

My data set reveals three fluid identities that are created as writers construct a narrative of the Basic Writing classroom. These identities infuse each other and flow together as the embodied writer ingresses, traverses, and exits her text. As these authorial identities coalesce across texts, each yields a *social fact*, establishing who can speak, what role the speaker inhabits in the drama of the classroom, and finally who the speaker is in the lived experience of her readers, specifically, the lived experience of readers in *the* Basic Writing classroom. Because of the fluidity of these identities the three organization questions that structured chapter two – who is the Basic Writer, who is the Basic Writing instructor, and what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom – condense within each authorial identity. In my discussion of each of these three identities a coherent answer to these three organizing question forms a kind of mini-narrative. In what follows the coherence of these answers is illustrated by this study through an account of each of the three authorial identities: who is authorized to speak within the text, the

role the speaker inhabits in the drama of the classroom, and finally who the speaker is in the lived experience of her readers.

3.2 Textual Identity: Authorized within a Disciplinary Text

3.2.1 Authorizing Identity: Facilitator of Plurality

Faced with the challenge of bridging the gap between the nuance of lived experience and the hyperclarity of a discipline's *radical realism*, the writers of this data set employ the first fluid identity that this study will discuss: the authorizing identity of the textually constructed author as a mobile agent. Establishing who can speak within texts that create a textual narrative of the Basic Writing classroom, the authorizing identity of this data set is that of the Basic Writing instructor as a facilitator of pluralism within the classroom and the University. Authorized to speak within these texts, writers construct this textual identity as an expression of the good will that has traditionally characterized much of the work done in Basic Writing. The mobility of the author's fluid identity within her text is relational to the moored identity of the Basic Writing student as diverse. It is not as, as a Saidian frame would illustrate, a result of establishing the Basic Writer as diverse that the Basic Writing instructor is constructed as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom. Instead, through the framework of mobility theory, the authorization of the author to speak within her text as a facilitator of plurality is reciprocally linked to the mooring of the student as diverse. In such a reciprocal relationship, the critical distance between teacher and student, an *us* and a *them,* that characterized Said's discussion of disciplinarity emergence disappears. Instead, what is seen within this chapter is a distance that is relational and enables the mobile textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor. In addition, as the identity of facilitator of plurality is repeated across the discipline, it gains a critical mass, effecting a disciplinary shift away from Orientalism and the ontological stability of the subject.

The first authorized identity through which these writers speak is that of the Basic Writing instructor as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom. An ethos of good will has been a foundational element of Basic Writing since the discipline's inception (as well as a basic element of its parent discipline Composition). Writing within a field that is invested in the access to and the quality of writing instruction, writers in the 1990s authorize their authorial presence within

these texts as mobile agents imbued with the ethos of this discipline. However, while the ethos may linger, the textual identity through which it is expressed has changed.

In chapter two I suggested that the Basic Writing instructor was strategically located as an agent of good will and social justice that facilitated access to the University. Within Said's framework, this strategic location of the writing instructor engaged with a reciprocating relationship in the textually constructed "other" within classrooms as locations of both access and resolution. During the 1990s, the "agent of social justice" constructed in the texts of Shaughnessy and her peers (re)emerges through a different authorial identity within the text. Here, the textually constructed agent of good will and social justice who facilitates plurality within the classroom is a means by which the embodied writers of these texts are authorized to speak within texts that espouse the value of plurality within the Basic Writing classroom. Ontologically uprooted from the fixity suggested by Said in this project's reading of the discipline's emergence, social justice and good will have a distinctly different implication within these texts in the 1990s, one that involves a facilitation of plurality rather than a masking of it.

Peter Rondinone authorizes his presence within his text, "Teacher Background and Student Needs," as a facilitator of plurality. In his article, Rondinone's lived experience within the classroom is connected to his own experience as a Basic Writer. He recalls "how that label 'basic writer' did have an impact on my self-image. I felt that the lack of writing skills was also a sign of a lack of intelligence. And no doubt there were teachers who reminded me that grammar was something *real* college students mastered in the 5th grade" (43). As he tells us about his experiences as a Basic Writer, the Basic Writing instructor *(re)emerges* through *his* identity within this text. It is through this textual capacity that Rondinone transitions from the nuance of his lived experience into the hyperreality of the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing via his textual identity as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom. Unlike Shaughnessy and her peers, he is not trying to undifferentiatingly offer the apprehensive student access to the university. Instead, he acts from a "politics of agency" that focuses on the student's identity, Rondinone's role in facilitating this identity, and the student's awareness of his own identity as it is changing within the university. Here, we see Rondinone authorizing the application of his lived experience within his text through his textually constructed identity as an author within his text who is an instructor of Basic Writing and an agent facilitating plurality within the classroom. Thus, the embodied writer is an active agent emerging through the authorial identity of the Basic

62

Writing instructor as a mobile agent facilitating plurality within the *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom.

A facilitating agent of good will and social justice, Rondinone promotes the plurality of his students. For instance, he initiates a dialogue with students about *why* they are in a Basic Writing course. He prompts them by asking, "Well, then, if there isn't anything wrong with us, why are we in basic writing? Why?" He describes the dialogue initiated by this questioning as "equally open and supportive." From this dialogue students are able to critically see not what language keeps them from, but the "crucial role language plays in binding them to their communities" (46). Thus, as students are taught new language skills and bound to a new community within the university, they are aware of the way that this will change their relationship with their home community. He writes, "After all, we don't just give students skills. We provide alternate world views. Educating students often means passing on values which may be different from those of the home and/or the peer group" (52). Here we see a reiteration of the ontological shift between the good will of the writing instructor who moves into Shaughnessy's frontier to provide resolution and access to the natives of the Basic Writing classroom and the writing instructor whose good will and advocacy of plurality within the classroom is expressed through a promotion of a deeper understanding of language use and community in the classroom. In other words, Rondinone gains the power to speak–to translate lived experience into textual narrative– through his textual identity as a facilitator of plurality within the Basic Writing classroom, an identity that is mobile within his text in relation to diverse students who navigate identities within the classroom.

In her essay "A Piece of the Streets," Rose Marie Kinder similarly authorizes her presence within her text as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom. As the instructor of Basic Writing, Kinder's pedagogical approach is designed to respond to apprehensive students such as the young Rondinone. The diverse students who experience this approach are those who are "reluctant to discuss assigned readings" and who find the classroom inaccessible (72). It is an act of social justice and good will for Kinder to allay the fears of students and welcome them into these classrooms with pedagogies that incorporate familiar elements and facilitate the plurality of the classroom.

Furthermore, Patricia Bizzell authorizes her presence within "Power, Authority, and Critical Pedagogy," through the same textual identity: that of the Basic Writing instructor as a

facilitator of plurality within the classroom. In her description of the "theoretical impasse" that many left-liberal educators are caught in, Bizzell writes, "Another way to describe this impasse would be to say that we want to serve the common good with the power we possess by virtue of our position as teachers, and yet we are deeply suspicious of any exercise of power in the classroom" (54). Ingressing into her text through the textual identity of an agent of good will and social justice who facilitates plurality within the classroom enables Bizzell to critically negotiate her power within the classroom and the agency of students. An agent of social justice, Bizzell's ingress is as a teacher suspicious of the exercise of power within the classroom. Engaging the diverse student in her classroom, Bizzell strategically re-constructs her lived experience within this text as a means of moving into a disciplinary text where she challenges the status quo of pedagogies as an agent of social justice while maintaining her position as an instructor of Basic Writing. This transitional textual identity enables a narrative through which she argues for an application of power within the classroom where "[p]ower exercised by A over B instrumentally in the sense that sometimes B must do what A requires without seeing how B's best interests will be served thereby, but A can exercise such authority over B only if B initially grants it to A" (57). In this mini-narrative of Bizzell's ingress, her authorized textual identity is fluid and overlapping with other identities through which she is present within her text. *This* authorizing identity, however, enables her to repeatedly ask questions that challenge existing power structures and move away from the textual identities supported by them, many of which remain linked to the textual identities that we saw constructed in the texts of Shaughnessy and her peers.

These three examples of the authorized identity of the author as a facilitator of plurality reveal two key points. First, embodied writers individually speak within their texts through a constructed authorial identity, one that provides them the agency to translate the nuances of lived experience into the hyperclarity of a discipline's *radical realism*. Second, these embodied writers collectively speak through the same identity. As this authorizing identity of the author as facilitator of plurality is repeated across different texts, it becomes a *social fact*. This repetition creates a critical mass that gains visibility within the descriptive imaginative geography of Basic Writing. It is this visibility that establishes textual identity as *social fact* and, in the process, constitutes a moment of (re)emergence for the discipline.

3.2.2 Basic Writer as Diverse

Authorized to speak as facilitators of plurality, the writers within these texts acquire their identity as facilitators through their affiliation with the Basic Writer as diverse, a moored identity that enables the mobility of the authorial facilitator of change. Identities of instructor and writer are engaged in a reciprocal relationship. As this textually constructed identity of the diverse Basic Writer collectively emerges from these texts, the multiple iterations of this identity in an writer's lived experience is reduced, made coherent, and rendered known. The multiple students become the singular diverse student, one subsequently shared with the reader. It is moored.

Boyd Doelher and Kathryn Swanson are authorized to speak as facilitators of plurality within their text, "Basic Writers and the Library: A Plan for Providing Meaningful Bibliographic Instruction," in relation to the moored textual identity of the Basic Writer as diverse. They write:

> Although it is quite certain that the students who find themselves together in a class of basic writing (called Developmental Writing where we teach) comprise one of the most diverse groups of learners imaginable in a college setting; their diversity ends with an absolutely unanimous response to certain words. (52)

In this essay outlining an approach to teaching these students library skills, the "certain words" that Doehler and Swanson refer to are a list of library terms. It is through their affiliation with this "diverse group of learners" that is collectively moored as diverse within this text that Doelher and Swanson are authorized to speak as facilitators of plurality.

This moored identity of the diverse Basic Writer (re)emerges through a number of texts in this data set. One group of these texts addresses the ESL student within the Basic Writing classroom. In "Promoting Literacy Through Literature: Reading and Writing in ESL Composition," Jacqueline Costello writes that "[n]on-native speakers need special schooling not only in grammar and syntax but also in the cultural assumption of the American academy and in the rhetorical conventions of English discourse" (20). Costello is followed by Barbara Kroll who writes in "The Rhetoric/Syntax Split: Designing a Curriculum for ESL Students" that variations in performance are more extreme for ESL students. These students "operate not only within a complex system of discourse and rhetorical rules that they have had limited exposure to but also according to an entire linguistic system (English) that may be but partially mastered" (41). The diversity of these students is highlighted even further when she writes, "[e]ven error-free prose by an ESL student often has a very non-native quality about it" (42). It is this diversity that

allows the nuance of the lived experiences of these authors who are authorized to speak through their textual identity as facilitators of plurality within the classroom to be meaningfully (re)located into these texts. This (re)location of the students with whom these authors work through as moored enables the mobility of the author as an active agent within her text.

Elsewhere, the textual identity of the moored Basic Writer as diverse is repeated in texts that highlight students' racial and ethnic diversity. For example, Jane Zeni and Joan Thomas address African-American Basic Writers scoring below their White classmates in a district-wide holistic assessment. This article focuses on students in elementary school, but comments: "Not only do African-American writers score significantly below their White peers, but they do not close the gap as they move through secondary school" (17). Here, authors who are authorized to speak in these disciplinary texts as facilitators of plurality (re)create their lived realities within the *radical realism* of their disciplinary texts. In doing so, the Basic Writer is brought into focus through the moored textual identity of the Basic Writer is diverse. Again, this identity at once (re)locates the Basic Writer from the lived experience of these authors into a textual narrative that recreates the Basic Writing classroom and creates a textual identity that supports the reciprocal affiliation of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor. In this relationship the Basic Writing instructor is authorized to speak as the facilitator of plurality. The mobility of this textual identity is relational to the moored Basic Writer as diverse – the embodied presence of plurality in relation to which the author is a mobile agent within this mini-narrative.

Peter Rondinone is another author who draws our attention to the race, ethnicity, and class of Basic Writers through his narrative of rising through the ranks of academia. In "Teacher Background and Student Needs" he describes his upbringing in the South Bronx during the 1960s. He describes his life as a college senior in terms of his drug abuse and gang violence. After mixing prescription pills with alcohol, rolling unconscious under a parked car, and being carried home by two girlfriends, Rondinone reflects: "My parents came to the door and there I was: a high school graduate, a failure, curled in ball in a pool of blood" (41). Rondinone gives readers of the *Journal of Basic Writing* this background information about his youth as a way of highlighting the choice he made as a Basic Writer. He writes:

That is, I can make my students aware that in deciding to become educated there will be times when they will be forced to choose between their home culture and that of the school, which means that, at some point, they will have to reject or *betray* their family and

friends in order to succeed – as I did. (42)

Within this text Rondinone's lived experience as a Basic Writer within the university is highlighted through the graphic detail that translates this lived experience into a textual narrative that re-constructs his student identity as diverse. Rondinone's authorized mobility within his text is in relation to this moored textual identity of the Basic Writer as diverse.

A similar story is played out in the narrative told by Sally Reagan of Javier. This story, however, has a different ending. Diverse within the *radical realism* of Reagan's text, Javier is introduced into Reagan's narrative as a "fact of diversity" that reinforces the textually emergent *social fact* that these students are diverse. Animated within the pages of the *Journal of Basic Writing*, Javier's identity is textually re-constructed as a moored identity in relation to which Reagan's authorized presence within the text as a facilitator of plurality is mobile.

Readers are introduced to the diverse Javier in "Warning! Basic Writers at Risk: The Case of Javier" (100). In this article Reagan argues against a reductive definition of the Basic Writer that influences pedagogical approaches. She suggests that there are many cultural and idiosyncratic factors functioning within this group of students and to not acknowledge this is to blame the Basic Writer for the failure of Basic Writing pedagogies. She describes this as a "reductionist view of the causes of some Basic Writer's education failure" (101).

Immigrants from Puerto Rico, Javier's parents made him go to college. Reagan sums up her thorough description of Javier's background writing, "In sum, Javier came from a bilingual environment" (103). This brief summary, however, glosses over other elements of Javier's environment that she goes into great detail about. She also discusses his parents' jobs, their nightly rituals of watching Spanish television, his hobby of collecting comics, and the financial problems that Javier cited when he ultimately dropped out of college. Javier's distance from the university is clearly more than linguistic. It is, however, flattened and moored by the textual identity of the Basic Writer as diverse within the mini-narrative of Reagan's ingress into the text. This constructed textual identity flattens the nuance of Reagan's experience with these writers and enables her experience to resonate within the drama of the Basic Writing classroom that is constructed within her text. It also, as I have illustrated, flattens this otherwise nuanced student identity within a text in which the author is mobilized in the dynamic relation between the textually identified diverse Basic Writer and the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom and the university.

In addition to being textually constructed as diverse by nature of their language, race, and ethnicity, the diversity of these students is also established by their scores on assessment tests. In "Pragmatic Politics: Using Assessment Tools to (Re)Shape a Curriculum," Linda Meeker effortlessly re-constructs the students in her Basic Writing Program:

> When I became Coordinator of the Basic Writing Program at Ball State University in the Fall of 1985, I inherited a smoothly running program. The approximately 1100 students we were serving each year (27% of the incoming class) were identified by SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) verbal scores of 360 or below, TSWE (Test of Standard Written English) scored of 36 or below, or ACT (American College Test) English scores of 15 or below. (4)

Meeker is followed by Donald McAndrew who identifies the subject of his article "Handwriting Rate and Syntactic Fluency" as college students chosen from:

> [f]our sections of English 100, Basic Writing (SAT Verbal ≤ 350), and four section of English 101, College Composition. From the 152 students in these eight sections, the thirty fastest and the thirty slowest handwriters were identified using the highest score on any one of the four tests descried below." (34)

Students within these two articles are illuminated according to numbers – numbers reflecting performance on assessment tests, numbers that flatten the nuance of lived experience into the *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom within which these students are moored as diverse. These numbers enable the re-location of these students into texts by writers that are authorized to do so through their mobile textual identity as facilitators of plurality within the Basic Writing classroom. The nuance of diversity becomes manageable within these texts that are making distinctly non-scientistic arguments. Meeker uses these statistics to make an argument for no longer defining Basic Writing as a task of teaching "discrete grammar instruction" to "remedial" students. She argues that through assessment this perception can be changed and the university can come to regard Basic Writing courses as "developmental," as a "complex integration of listening, speaking, reading, thinking, and writing skills rather than as a simplistic parceling of grammar, sentence construction, and paragraph construction" (4).

Noteworthy about these interconnected texts within a disciplinary formation is the degree to which they converge to form a critical mass and establish the identity of the moored diverse Basic Writer as a *social fact*. The disciplinary change that this chapter is claiming to observe is based in the ontological instability of textual identities that become *social facts*. Instead of being

rooted in an ontological stability, these textual identities instead emerge in response to active agents responding to and writing from the nuance and instability of lived experience. While there is an ontological shift in the expression of good will that is manifest in the textually constructed identities of these authors as facilitators of plurality, there is also an ontological shift in the "diverse" Basic Writer that is the receptacle of this "good will." This shift occurs as this textual identity (re)emerges through the process of repeated movements by authors in relation to these moored textual identities that consequently become established as social fact. *This* diverse basic writer (re)emerges in the individual texts of this "moment." We are not observing a figure that is maintained as ontologically stable within the closed system of an imaginative geography as described by Said in *Orientalism*. Instead, we are witnessing a textual identity that is only regarded as ontologically stable within Orientalism because of the critical mass that it garners, a critical mass that establishes these identities as *social facts* that are mistaken for ontologically stable identities when disciplines are regarded as having only *one* "moment" of emergence.

3.3 Drama of the Basic Writing Classroom

Implicit to the disciplinary texts of this data set is what (re)emerges as a common narrative of the Basic Writing classroom. Having authorized their presence within these texts, these embodied writers reconfigure their authorial identities to create a new role for themselves in the drama of the classroom: that of the obscured native. Here, once the writer's presence within the narrative is secured through the authorial identity of the facilitator of plurality, a new authorial identity enters the stage in concert with a new identity for the moored Basic Writer, that of the Border Resident. The facilitator of plurality does not cease to exist; it has merely moved aside as these authors traverse their texts. Likewise, the identity of Basic Writer as diverse has shifted to allow space of the Basic Writer as Border Resident. The dynamic of (re)emergence continues, however, to remain the same. Repeated across this data set, these identities gain critical mass and become visible in the descriptive imaginative geography of the discipline and established as *social fact*. Again, this (re)emergence of *social fact* reflects the fluidity of what was considered within Orientalism to be an ontologically stable subject. This fluidity is further apparent when we contrast the subject's emergence in this "moment" to the subject's emergence in the "moment" of Basic Writing's inception.

69

3.3.1 A New Role in the Drama of the Classroom: Obscured Native

The new role that the Basic Writing Instructor assumes in the classroom in that of the obscured native. Here, the textual identities of these authors step into the shadows, their agency written out of the spotlight by the embodied writers of these texts. Sandra Schor offers a exemplary illustration of the obscured native in her piece "The Short Happy Life of Ms Mystery." Schor opens this piece: "The intensive summer encampment of motivated students is an ideal occasion to depart from conventional time schemes and methods, and at the same time to focus collaborative faculty spirit on literacy through interdisciplinary and innovative syllabi" (16). These "motivated students" were among those that scored the lowest on the June placement exams in reading and writing at Queens College in New York City. Corresponding with students as Ms. Mystery, Schor's textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor is native to the writing classroom (so "native" in fact, that she doesn't actually need to be present in that space in order to engage with it). This obscures her presence within the classroom, leaves *her* embodied presence as a writer outside of the text unaccounted for within the narrative that she constructs of Basic Writing within this text. Without having to identify herself as an author beyond authorizing her presence within this classroom, Schor is figured within the text as the (mobile) obscured native and thus her presence is regarded as implicit to this space.

An example of the mobility of Schor's textual identity as an obscured native occurs when Schor describes herself in the narrative of the Basic Writing classroom: "But I was no pen pal. That is not what our basic writers, our lowest scorers, our pissed-off failures needed. Although I had several secret personae in play, I was above all a writer – a writer-teacher" (20). This articulation of her native identity within the classroom as "writer-teacher" is played out in the letters that we read in this article. In these letters students discuss their feelings about the course, their lives outside of school, and their families among other things. Ms. Mystery, however, does not reciprocate the personal tenor of her students' letters. Rather, she responds with questions and informal responses to their letters. For example, in a letter to Ms. Mystery Bobby writes:

> Hello! What's going on. What am I supposed to write to a person I never met before.
> First I'll ask how you are feeling. ... My name is Bobby. It's a beautiful day out. I wish I
> could have gone to the beach, but I had to get paid at work. So I didn't have time to get

there & to get back home. College is O.k. ..... I'll probably go broke this summer, I found the pink ball machines. I lost 50 cents today... My mother went away yesterday and is coming home Monday. A whole week with just me & my brother Marc in the apartment. (22)

The response to this letter from Bobby as it is excerpted in Schor's piece in the *Journal of Basic Writing* opens:

Your last letter was indeed long. In a few weeks you'll be mailing me pounds of writing each time. I'm still hopeful you will stick to a subject for a few sentences so that you can develop your ideas and find out how complex some of them are. Try, perhaps, to confine yourself to an idea for five or six sentences before you turn out a new paragraph on another idea.

In this brief exchange as it is represented within her article Schor authorizes herself as able to speak within this narrative of the Basic Writing classroom through her textual identity as the obscured native. Although she had student test scores, knew them as "real people, with legal names," these students had to invent her. She knew their names and other bits of personal information and her students knew nothing of the woman who received their letters on the opposite side of Long Island and whom they did not meet until the last day of class that summer.

Robert de Beaugrande and Mar Jean Olson are also authorized to speak within the narratives of the Basic Writing classroom as obscured natives. Their piece, "Using the Write-Speak-Write" Approach for Basic Writers" focuses on the Basic Writer as a communicative participant within the classroom. These authors argue that the primary focus of Basic Writing instruction should not be stable constructions of language or the texts that emerge from such constructions. Rather, the focus should be on the Basic Writer as a communicative subject. As the main idea of this article takes shape, it is not the formal correctness of students that should be the focus of these writing classrooms. Rather, as the Basic Writing instructor responds to the Basic Writer, the emphasis is placed on "communicative success" over "formal correctness."

Within this approach the Basic Writer is regarded as a phenomenon to be illuminated, and the teacher as illuminator remains obscured in the shadows. Beaugrande and Olson write: "We must above all understand the conditions of basic writing as a linguistic, psychological, and social phenomenon in its own right, and not a mere negation of some other phenomenon or as an anarchy of deviations and disruptions" (12). Here, the phenomenon is the dislocated Basic

71

Writer, *not* the native Basic Writing instructor. The reader's focus is on the Basic Writer, *not* the Basic Writing instructor. Beaugrande and Olson are authorized to speak within this narrative by remaining in the shadows of their text. Because the Basic Writing instructor is a native to the classroom, she is not a phenomenon that warrants illumination.

We again see the authorization of the embodied writer to speak within the drama of the Basic Writing classroom as the obscured native in Rexford Brown's piece, "Schooling and Thoughtfulness." Textually constructed as the obscured native, the Basic Writing instructor is articulated:

> Overall, we found two main approaches to thoughtfulness. One is to define, very precisely, something like critical thinking or tactics or metacognitive skills and teach them and test them one at a time. The other is the "whole-language" approach to getting kids to immerse themselves in reading, writing, and discussion in ways that will naturally lead them to use their minds and go through many of the kinds of things I mentioned as characteristics of a good mind. (6)

Brown constructs the Basic Writing instructor within this text as the distant and obscured native that can elucidate the erring Basic Writer. The focus on the Basic Writer that is enabled by this textual identity of the instructor within Brown's narrative of the Basic Writing classroom obscures the identity of the Basic Writing instructor beyond that he is a native to this space. Thus, what is illuminated in this narrative is the student who is taught within the Basic Writing classroom, not the teacher who instructs her.

Having already been authorized to speak within their text, these authors are able to fade into the background as the obscured native performing in the drama of the Basic Writing classroom. However, they can inhabit this role only in concert with that of the moored Basic Writer, who is now starring in the role of Border Resident, partner to the obscured native.

3.3.2 Basic Writer: Border Resident

The mobility of the role of obscured native in the classroom drama is relational to the textual construction of the moored Basic Writer as a border resident. The degree to which the two roles are reciprocally linked is evident in the previous section: Schor can disappear only to the extent that she can coax her students into the spotlight through their letters. Beaugrande and

Olson focus not on a single "the language or text" of the classroom, but rather on discussions that focus on language varieties among social groups. Through this approach the student as "communicative" moves into the spotlight, while the instructor falls into the background as an obscured native within this classroom space. Min -Zhan Lu makes these subtle linkages explicit when she discusses education as a process of repositioning (31). She writes, "readers and writers necessarily struggle with conflicting information and points of view as they reposition themselves in the process of reading and writing." It is with this in mind that that her research "recognize[s]" the location of political and linguistic conflict that is inhabited by students within the university.

In "Mapping Errors and Expectations for Basic Writing: From the "Frontier Field" to "Border Country" Bruce Horner writes:

> I argue that redefining the "territory of basic writing" as "border" territory and writing as negotiation, while introducing new difficulties for teachers and students, effectively resolved the dilemmas powered by earlier conceptions of basic writing by identifying both students and teachers as active participants in negotiations of power and thus improving the expectations of both for the work they face in confronting one another.
> (118)

This passage explicitly acknowledges the dislocation of the Basic Writer within the writing classroom, the negotiation that must take place here, and the Borderland in which the Basic Writer takes residence. The Basic Writer moored as border resident must continually negotiate *our* power, *our* language, *our* cultural norms. The details of the nuanced presence of these writers within the classroom is flatted within the *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom where they are moored as textually constructed border residents.

This disciplinary identity is, however, nuanced by the discipline of Basic Writing's unique political exigence, and it is from this location that the Border Resident "reacts on rather than to" the borderland in which they are positioned (Lu 31). However, it is also in this way that the Basic Writer is afforded a degree of agency within a territory of which they are natives, a Border territory, and within which the Basic Writing instructor can never be a native. The Basic Writing student as Border Resident naturalizes and stabilizes depictions of the dislocated and negotiating Basic Writer.

So far, this chapter has developed two interrelated arguments: disciplines are fluid

73

structures that change and individuals are active agents in this change. The agency of these individuals is expressed in two ways. First, individual authors translate lived experience into their narratives through textual identities. These identities, I suggest are mobile within the text. Secondly, as these textual identities are repeated within a disciplinary structure, they acquire critical mass and emerge as *social fact*. This process of (re)emergence is reflective of the ontological fluidity of disciplines and the knowledge that they produce. The authors of this second data set are authorized to speak within their texts through the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom. Moored to the textual identity of the Basic Writer as diverse, this identity through which the embodied writer of these texts is authorized to speak is a mobile agent within the text. These authors position themselves as an authorized speaker in the narrative of the Basic Writing classroom as the obscured native, a mobile identity that is moored to the Basic Writer as border resident. As these are fluid and overlapping through the text, the embodied writers writing through these identities are also mobile agents mobilized within a disciplinary formation. Thus, we are seeing more than manifest change within the discipline. These changes that uproot the ontologically fixity of the identities discussed in the previous chapter reflect change on a latent level. My last example of mobile identities–practitioners of assessment coupled to the Basic Writer as negotiator–illustrates this two-pronged dynamic as well.

3.4 Lived Experience of Readers

The textual identity of the instructor of Basic Writing as a facilitator of plurality within the classroom authorizes the embodied writers of these texts to speak, to translate lived experience into textual narrative; the obscured native provides a stance–and a role for acting–in the classroom drama. Finally, the last identity *re*connects the *radical realism* of the Basic Writing classroom to the lived experience within the Basic Writing classroom. This identity responds to the unspoken question of the implied readership of Basic Writing instructors: what do we do when we enter our classrooms on Monday morning to face students in the eleventh hour of their academic careers? The textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor through which the embodied writers of these texts express their agency in the classroom is that of practitioner of assessment. The mobility of this practitioner is in relation to the moored textual identity of the

Basic Writer as a negotiator within the classroom. As the embodied writer constructs this authorial identity within her text, she becomes a participant in the lived experience of her readers' classrooms, classrooms in which the nuance of students in the eleventh hour of their academic careers is flattened and reconstructed through the moored textual identity of Basic Writer as negotiator.

3.4.1 Basic Writing Instructor: Holistic Assessment of Linguistic Skill

Authors in this data set become speakers in the lived experience of their readers through a textually constructed identity that enables these authors to make a connection between their lived reality within the Basic Writing classroom and that of their readers. The textual identity through which this connection occurs is that of the practitioner of holistic assessment, an identity that gains the status of social fact within the discipline as it is repeated across the texts of this data set.

A first example of this identity occurs in "Myths of Assessment," a text in which Pat Belanoff challenges four myths that guide writing assessment: "that we know what we're grading," "that we know what the results mean," "that we can agree to practice on the relative weight of various criteria," and "that is it possible to establish absolute standards and apply them uniformly." Belanoff exercises her agency as a practitioner of assessment when she elaborates on the myth that "we know what we are testing" (54). She questions if standardized tests in particular are testing ability or quality in timed essays. Having critiqued standardized tests for making the assumption "that we have some precise notion of what skills students need to master in order to be good or better writers and that we know in what order these should be learned," Belanoff writes the Basic Writing instructor into a position within this article from which she goes on to critique the structure of standardized testing (56). The three main parties involved in these tests are test makers, test graders, and test takers. While one party sets standards, another applies them through grading. Both of these parties, however, are separated from the consequences of the tests and standards that they create and apply. The writing teacher, Belanoff observes, is noticeably absent from this equation (59). Belanoff's agency in this piece and her authorized application of assessment enables her to speak within and to the lived experience of her readers.

75

Belanoff goes on to argue for the "validity of assessments developed within particular environments for particular purposes agreed to by those teaching within those environments." She cites "a movement afoot in elementary and secondary schools to give teachers more say in the running of schools and in the make-up of curricula" as well as "a developing institutional awareness of the value of a classroom teacher's knowledge" (62). Belanoff capitalizes on this shift that she observes in her lived experience of Basic Writing and propels herself into a textual discussion of the importance of forming a community centered on grading and assessment. She makes this argument through the textually constructed identity of the Basic Writing instructor as practitioner of holistic assessment. This textual identity bears a direct link to her lived experience and that of her readers within the Basic Writing classroom, an experience that when cohesive supports their visibility within institutions of higher education. She writes, "Let's not apologize for our lack of agreement – let's make it work for us. How can we do that?" (63). We can do this, she suggests, through pooling individual judgments into a collective unified judgment. Even when teachers are not grading, she argues that they should be engaging in conversations about teaching and the standards that they apply to student writing. Belanoff concludes: "The more we talk about evaluation with our colleagues, the better we'll become at giving feedback to our students on their writing and the better we'll be able to guide our students into making their own evaluations of all sorts of texts, including their own" (64).

Here, Belanoff has constructed a textual identity that aligns itself both within the narrative of her text and the lived experiences of her readers. This alignment links what is established within the *radical realism* of this data set with the lived reality of practitioners and suggests a specific and advantageous, an authorized, means of application. It is *through* the textual identities of the Basic Writing instructor as a practitioner of assessment that Belanoff and her readers develop a location from which to enact their agency locally within the Basic Writing classroom and globally within the university. Enacting this agency as the embodied writer of her text and modeling this agency as an author authorized to speak within her text, Belanoff is capitalizing on the *social fact* of student error and the testing that is perceived within institutions of higher education to be necessary for measuring this error.

Another example of the agency of an author speaking within the lived experience of her readers as a practitioner of assessment is Linda Hanson Meeker. In her text, "Pragmatic Politics: Using Assessment Tools to (Re)Shape a Curriculum," Meeker speaks within the text as a

practitioner of holistic assessment speaking within the lived experience of her readers as she is an active agent in the authorized application of assessment. This text is responding to what she describes as the "inordinate" emphasis on discrete grammar instruction. She writes, "If we are ever to create a positive public and legislative perception of basic writing courses – as developmental rather than remedial; as a complex integration of listening, speaking, reading, thinking, and writing skills rather than as a simplistic parceling of grammar, sentence construction, and paragraph construction – we must reshape the public messages we send" (5). Implicit to changing this perception is a need to change our tools of assessment. Implicit to our tools of assessment are the values of our programs. Meeker goes on to locate her work within a "politics of accountability" that exists at both institutional and state legislative levels.

This article outlines Meeker's analysis of data on Basic Writing students between the fall of 1985 to the spring of 1987. Reading across a broad data set that included both standardized and holistic test scores, Meeker writes that "the analysis allowed us to examine earlier correlations between performance on spelling and essays and subsequent course grades and to judge formal grammar instruction separately from instruction in revision and editing on the language skills test" (9). Meeker's article closes with a narrative of the curricular change that she introduced to her home institution, Ball State. Her writing program incorporated "new objective assessment tools" that were a critical means through which the public perception of Basic Writing was shifted in her institution as well as moving away from a curriculum that focused on discrete grammar instruction.

The textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor within Meeker's text reflects a means through which Meeker is able to speak within the lived experience of her readers. The link between the Basic Writing instructor within this text and the interests of the university is explicit. Having woven a textual narrative of Basic Writing, Meeker constructs an identity that is able to reconnect with her lived experience through an authorized application of assessment. This textual identity is one of a Basic Writing instructor that can affect the change illustrated within the narrative of her text.

3.4.2 Basic Writer: Negotiator

The authors examined within this data set are active agents speaking within and to the lived

77

experience of their readers. This agency within the classroom is enacted through the textual identity of the Basic Writing instructor as a practitioner of holistic assessment. A critical question asked by this study as well as the authors of these texts is *who* is the Basic Writer? Flattened into discernable and cohesive textual identities, two of which have been illuminated within this study, *the* Basic Writer remains a nuanced figure both within these texts as well as the lived experience of their embodied writers. Given this nuance, the second question that persists to varying degrees across these texts is, what are we teaching these Basic Writers? Clearly, these texts have moved beyond discrete grammar instruction. The broad brushstrokes of this instruction as it is presented within the descriptive imaginative geography of this discipline facilitate forms of linguistic awareness that are both social and formal. As this is reflective of what is taught within the Basic Writing classroom, how is this knowledge assessed? This assessment is what frames these writers for the University and often frames the success or failure of these writing programs. This final section suggests that the *who* and *what* of Basic Writing instruction is critically important to the development of assessment tools. Thus, the mobility of the practitioner of assessment within these texts is relational to the moored identities of the students they teach and assess. Here, the nuances of the Basic Writer who is being assessed are flattened and rendered visible by the moored textual identity of the Basic Writer as negotiator.

This moored identity of the Basic Writer is one of a student who negotiates active dialogue within the classroom. The nuance of this student's presence within the classroom is flattened within the *radical realism* of these disciplinary texts, flattened in a way that enables to mobility of the Basic Writing instructor as an active agent within both this nuance of student presence in the classroom and outside pressure from the university to succeed in producing positive assessment results. The student that is being assessed within the Basic Writing classrooms presented by these texts is no longer assimilating to classroom practice, but negotiating with it. This begs a new means of assessment by the practitioners of holistic assessment who actively respond to this moored textual identity of the Basic Writing student as negotiator within the classroom. In what follows, then, I will discuss the textual identity that emerges of this student who is holistically assessed.

In their text, "Self-Esteem and Writing Apprehension of Basic Writers: Conflicting Evidence," Walter Minot and Kenneth Gamble are active agents that construct textual identities that enable them to speak within the lived experiences of their readers in a way that (re)connects

the *radical realism* of their disciplinary text to their lived reality and the lived realities of their readers. Minot and Gramble write that "[c]alling students basic writers implie[s] that they are writers who will eventually succeed in becoming more skilled and more accomplished with appropriate specialized attention" (116). This is not reflective of the realty that is translated through the disciplinary texts of this data set. Bruce Horner challenges Minot and Gamble when he writes in "Mapping Errors and Expectations for Basic Writing: From the "Frontier Field" to "Border Country":

> I have been arguing that basic writers, like all writers, have "some freedom," and that to act on that freedom is not a matter of sloughing off immaturity; nor does it require students to sell their soul. Students, like all writers, can negotiate as writers for particular positions for particular occasions, vis-à-vis particular readers, if only we can persuade them, and ourselves, that they can. (136)

If Basic Writing instructors are going to facilitate this negotiation within their classrooms, Patricia Bizzell observes that liberatory instructors must acknowledge the conflict implicit to their position within an oppressive system. Acknowledging this conflict, student trust becomes a critical element of a productive classroom dynamic. In "Power, Authority, and Critical Pedagogy" Bizzell writes, "I fear that some will accuse me of recommending blind faith to students who have little reason to trust that the American educational system has their best interests at heart" (58). Students cannot give instructors their blind faith because they are in a constant state of negotiation as a Basic Writer. Entering classrooms within an institution that cannot be trusted to have their best interests at heart, the Basic Writer becomes a negotiator within the classroom. This textual identity moors the Basic Writer in relation to whom the active agent of the Basic Writing instructor as a practitioner of holistic assessment is mobile within texts that describe the enactment of new means of assessment that respond to these moored student identities.

Adele MacGowan-Gilhooly is also an active agent speaking within the lived experience of her writers, "Fluency First: Reversing the Traditional ESL Sequence," through a mobile identity of the Basic Writing instructor as a practitioner of assessment that moves in relation to the textual identity of the Basic Writer as negotiator. In this article the Basic Writer is figured through a textual identity that excels through what she describes as a "whole-language approach." Through this approach, Basic Writers were introduced to a pedagogy that focused on

79

fluency and a holistic knowledge of language. This focus on fluency over traditional grammatical instruction resulted in students who "showed more growth in the affective domain, specifically more confidence, better ability to work with groups, and more tolerance for divergent views" (83). Knowing more about language empowered students to write a greater quantity with increasing proficiency.

Thus, as instructors of Basic Writing encounter these negotiating students within their lived experiences of the classroom, these instructors must adjust their pedagogies to reflect the exigencies and the complexities of the Basic Writing classroom. A critical part of this adjustment is that which perhaps most dramatically flattens the Basic Writer within the perceptions of individuals outside of the classroom and is consequently a critical piece of staving of judgments of inefficacy: assessment. So, as the authors of these texts are positioned as mobile agents practicing holistic means of assessment, their mobility through this identity is moored to the Basic Writer as a negotiator within the classroom.

3.5 Conclusion

The *social facts* of disciplinary textual identities that (re)emerge within the *radical realism* of these texts are ontologically fluid. These identities emerge within a disciplinary structure that is fluid and that progresses through a series of (re)emergence. In chapter two this formation was assumed through Said's framework to have only one emergence: that was the "moment" of a discipline's inception. Reading across this selection of core texts from the beginning of the 1990s, I suggest, however, that we see a second "emergence" of the discipline.

This chapter illustrates this second emergence through the theoretical frame of mobility. My application of this frame focuses on what it shows us about the potential for movement (motility), the repetition of movement, and the establishment of *social fact* as a result of this repetition. In this chapter we have seen the (re)emergence of what was assumed to be ontologically stable *social fact* in chapter two. The fluidity of this *social fact* is expressed in this chapter's reconsideration of imaginative geographies as descriptive rather than prescriptive of the cohesive knowledge created within a disciplinary structure.

This cohesive knowledge that is articulated by these authors emerges from embodied writers who are active agents within their disciplinary texts. The agency of these authors is

expressed through the fluid and overlapping identities that they construct within these texts. This mobility locates these authors as active agents in the knowledge creation of a discipline rather than passive subjects to the formations within which they work. It demonstrates the degree to which individuals within Basic Writing share a mutually constitutive relationship with the disciplinary formation in which they are located. While this formation enables the (re)emergence of *social fact* and the visibility of individual scholars within a community that shares a collective knowledge about and understanding of the subject, it is the work of these individuals as active agents within their texts that ultimately enables the (re)emergence of a discipline.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In the first chapter of this study, I suggested that in *The Formation of College English* Thomas Miller operates *within* the ostensible stability of his discipline. While Miller capitalizes on his marginal position as a scholar of rhetoric in College English, he reifies the fixity of the very structure that marginalizes his scholarly work. Working within what he perceives to be a permanent structure, Miller renders himself subject to that structure. Thus, within his text, his agency is contingent on the stasis of College English. Operating as he does on the margins of this formation, Miller's agency is compromised by his perceptions of the framing mechanism of disciplinarity, one that he fails to acknowledge explicitly within his study of College English as a phenomenon. I suggest that here Miller is a subject through which the discipline is written, *not* an active agent actively participating in the shaping of the discipline. Without reflecting on the ways in which the disciplinary formation of College English is written through *him* in his text, Miller's critique of the marginalized location of rhetoric within this discipline acts less as an analysis and more as a reification of the framing mechanism that he never steps back to acknowledge.

This dilemma is one that I suggest all scholars face at some point in their careers. Our positions within a discipline afford our work with a specific kind of visibility that it otherwise would not have. These disciplinary structures within which we develop as intellectuals provide a common vocabulary, a shared understanding of the subject, and a cohesive knowledge of it. As our work develops and expands this knowledge without having to go back and re-invent the wheel, so to speak, disciplines give us jobs, offices in university departments, publications, and tenure-line positions. What happens, however, when the knowledge we create pushes back? What happens when we return to central concepts of the cohesive knowledge base of a discipline and challenge them? What happens when our work moves too fast, when it jumps ahead and lacks the disciplinary support that it needs to remain visible? These are questions that I suggest are asked by both new arrivals to and established voices within a discipline.

The discipline of Basic Writing, for example, is currently in a "moment" when these questions are frequently posed. We see hints of this "moment" in the data set that is explicated in the third chapter of this study. However, it is not until the late 1990s and early 2000s that this moment fully comes to fruition. Today, Basic Writing as a discipline is in a moment of crisis in which participants are questioning the knowledge base that provides both visibility and cohesion. This crisis can be seen most clearly in terms of two contingencies that have emerged over the past ten years. There are those who have distanced themselves from this discipline and those who conservatively made efforts to reconnect to the visibility of this discipline under the leadership of Mina Shaughnessy. The end result of these two factions is that, while a large and visible contingent of the field has argued that Basic Writing programs should be dismantled, others remain steadfast in their support of the Basic Writer, claiming the institutional space that this writer needs within the Basic Writing classroom. Here, as I pointed out in my critique of Thomas Miller, both of these contingencies are approaching the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing as a stable, closed system. In doing so, they render themselves passive subjects of the discipline, subjects that are themselves written *by* what they perceive to be the static disciplinary structure of Basic Writing. Working within this assumption there are two main trends that signal these contingencies. First, there is a contingency that is choosing to jump ship, to remove its work from the discipline of Basic Writing. The second contingency, however, is struggling to maintain a cohesive visibility of this field that is romantically linked back to Mina Shaughnessy and her peers.

This debate that has dominated the past decade of the discipline occurs within a broader context shaped by economic decline. As a result of this economic decline and the resurgence of conservative educational policy, Basic Writing programs across the nation have dwindled. Susan Naomi Bernstein dryly comments in the introduction to the most recent issue of *Basic Writing eJournal*, "we note that the landscape has changed drastically in the last eleven years." In 1999 CUNY's Board of Trustees voted to end the open admissions policy of its four-year colleges (qtd. in Otte 167). Students needing remedial instruction were sent to community colleges. In 2003 the University of Cincinnati abolished University College, a two-year open admissions program that was located on the University's main campus. This was followed in 2005 when the University of Minnesota also eliminated its General College, a program that Rebecca Williams Mlynarczyk and George Otte describe as having, "a distinguished history of offering basic

83

writing and other support services to underprepared students" (xvi). The result of this abolition of Basic Writing programs is that these writers have been moved out of universities and into adult community educations programs and community colleges.

As these closures reshaped the demographic of universities across the nation and revived their national rankings, Basic Writing was occupied by a conflict of its own. For the first time since its inception in the late 1970s, these teacher-scholars were questioning the need for Basic Writing programs in any venue. Arguments for the abolition of Basic Writing programs have formed a strong contingent with this field, a contingent, I will add, that has removed itself from this disciplinary formation. Ira Shor, David Bartholomae, Min-Zhan Lu, and Bruce Horner have been among the most vocal of this group.

In his 1997 essay, "Our Apartheid: Writing Instruction and Inequality," Schor argues that Basic Writing is a "sorting mechanism" for these students, a container that reifies the sorting mechanism of the university. His critique of the Basic Writing classroom is further fueled in that the introduction of these students to the University often first occurs within composition and Basic Writing classrooms. David Bartholomae agrees with Shor in his CCCC Chairs address that was republished as "Tidy House." Critiquing the "grand narrative of liberal sympathy and liberal reform," Bartholomae comments:

> Basic writing has begun to seem like something naturally, inevitably, transparently there in the curriculum, in the stories we tell ourselves about English in America. . . . I think it should continue to mark an area of contest, of struggle, including a struggle against its stability or inevitability. (315)

"Tidy House" argues that the narrative of liberal sympathies runs so deeply through the narrative of Basic Writing that these classrooms create what is misleadingly presented as a utopian community that is naturally conflict free. Here, Basic Writing becomes a "caricature" of a reality that doesn't exist. For Bartholomae, this caricature divorces these classrooms from their social and political contexts. This divorce "preserves narratives of class and gender" that shape the experience of these students within the University. Bartholomae distances himself and ultimately steps out of the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing when he writes:

> Shaughnessy's text, in a sense, is the quintessential liberal reflex; it demonstrates that beneath the surface we are all the same person; it writes her students' lives, needs, desires into a master text that she commands. (318)

84

From this perspective, Basic Writing extends Shaughnessy's moment and artificially locates students within the mold of the Basic Writer. When this happens, students are not able to critically emerge as individuals negotiating the conflict of the classroom.

A similar sentiment toward the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing circulates in Bruce Horner's conclusion of *Representing the 'Other.'* Here he observes that Basic Writing does not signify a "real" phenomenon. The students constructed within this discipline don't actually exist. Given this, he questions why universities would preserve Basic Writing programs. He follows this assertion reflecting: "Even teachers who agree that representations of basic writing are constructs that have functioned strategically but problematically may well argue that such theoretical critiques are not worth the immediate, perhaps long term, and significant material losses that such critiques may cost" (192). Across this recent work of Bartholomae and Horner, we see prominent members of this discipline stepping outside of a formation that seeks to address precisely the grievance that is at the base of their critique: just and equitable access of Basic Writers to the University. Bartholomae and Horner are turning against the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing with the assumption that it is a static formation. I would suggest that, like Thomas Miller, these authors assume that disciplines are closed systems that do not change. With this assumption, we see two things happening within the work of these scholars: either they jump ship *or* they struggle to maintain a status quo that is romantically linked back to Mina Shaughnessy.

We see this latter response in Susan Naomi Bernstein's article in *Basic Writing eJournal*, "Social Justice Initiative for Basic Writing." Published by this co-editor of the journal in the fall of 2008 issue, this piece illuminates the "systematic disparities in educational conditions," provides a "definition of insufficient access," and describes what support for these students would look like. To this end she writes, "As a profession, we must actively re-commit ourselves to the stated goals of the 1974 NCTE Resolution 'On Support for Motivated but Inadequately Prepared College Students'" Thus, in 2008, Bernstein returns to an NCTE resolution that she openly acknowledges to be 35 years old. In the final section of this article subtitled "Resolution," Bernstein calls on a "re-invigorated" commitment by the Conference on Basic Writing to support this 1974 resolution.

This moment of crisis beckons a nuanced examination of the ways in which disciplines change as a result of individual agency. The time is ripe for this examination that will illuminate

both the affordances and the limitations of this disciplinary formation. For, by either hanging on to the past as a means of maintaining one's visibility within this formation or by jumping ship, these scholars construe themselves as passive subjects within the disciplinary formation of Basic Writing. Jumping ship, we become invisible, as does the Basic Writer that we are advocating for. In harking back to the past, we become irrelevant and disconnected from contemporary discussions of pedagogy and identity.

Thus, as I ask how can we account for the emergence and change of a discipline, as I seek to identify the role of individuals as active agents in these events, we would do well to consider the findings of my study as we read Susan Naomi Bernstein's introduction to the most recent issue of *BWe*, "Metaphors and Material Realities for Basic Writing: An Introduction to *BWe* Double Issue 8.1 & 9.1," in which she draws her reflection of the field to a close:

> As we end one decade and begin another, I would like to offer an additional metaphor for basic writing, and for this new double issue. Basic writing continues to evolve like an old growth forest, an ecosystem that nurtures both the old and the new, and that recycles that which can no longer live on its own.

If teacher-scholars within this field are going to think through the metaphor of an ecosystem, understanding this system is a critical means of functioning within it and creating the change this field hopes to see: equitable access of the Basic Writer to institutions of higher education. As we enrich our understanding of disciplinary formations and the ways in which individuals function within these formations as active agents, we see the potential for change and (re)emergence. The conclusions of my study illustrate this potential and the ways in which individuals are active agents in this change.

4.1 Findings

The first question asked by this study was, how can we account for the emergence and change of a discipline? This two-part question was answered through a composite methodology that incorporated Said's framing mechanism from *Orientalism* with a re-articulation of mobility theory. As I discussed emergence and change, each of these framing mechanisms illuminated the way in which individuals function as active agents within the fluid formation of a discipline. The organization of each chapter illustrates the unique way in which these two methodological

frames answer the three organizational questions of this study: Who is the Basic Writer? Who is the Basic Writing instructor? And, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom? In answering these questions, each chapter reveals the dynamic of disciplinary emergence and change.

Chapter two answers these three organizational questions in terms of Strategic Location and Strategic Formation. In the Strategic Location of the author within her text, a critical distance is maintained between the Basic Writer and the instructor of Basic Writing. Establishing and maintaining this critical distance between an *us* and a *them*, enables the authors of these texts to *know* the Basic Writer. This knowledge of the textually constructed students of the Basic Writing classroom is reflected through what Said describes as the *radical realism* of these texts. This construction reflects a coherent core of knowledge that is maintained in the imagined geography of Basic Writing. This geography is a stage on which the Basic Writer is presented as known and understood to the University. The imagined geography of a discipline resolves the plurality of lived experience within the Basic Writing classroom with the coherent and unified articulation of the discipline. This unified articulation that is shaped in the moment of a discipline's initial emergence is a critical means through which a set of core beliefs about the discipline's knowledge and understanding is established.

In my explication of texts by Mina Shaughnessy and her peers in the first four issues of the *Journal of Basic Writing*, I illustrated two facets of the textually constructed Basic Writer that emerged from within the imaginative geography of this nascent discipline. First, the authors of these initial texts of the discipline were strategically located as agents of good will and social justice in relation to the Basic Writer as one who lacks access to Standard English. Secondly, these authors were strategically located as scientific in relation to the logical Basic Writer. Thus, as I asked who is the Basic Writing student and who is the Basic Writing instructor using the methodological framework of Said, a reading of the *radical realism* of the texts in this data set revealed the central tenets of the emergent Basic Writing's imaginative geography.

Said uniquely positions this study to account for the *emergence*, or inception, of Basic Writing because of his emphasis on the importance of the "beginning principles" of a disciplinary formation. The understanding of the Basic Writer that is reflected above *created* this disciplinary subject within the University at a poignant moment in the history of American educational policy. Writing during the era of Open Admissions, Shaughnessy and her peers

negotiated the political terrain that surrounded their classrooms and they choreographed the emergence of the textual figure of the Basic Writer within the University. As they did so, the remedial writer became at once visible and innocuous, no threat to the coherence of the traditional University. Observing the referential power of these texts across this data set, this study illuminated the Strategic Formation of the Basic Writing classroom. Here, the classroom was a space of resolution as the Basic Writers within them were given access to Standard English. Within the Strategic Formation of this discipline, the Basic Writing classroom also emerges as a space of assimilation. Here, the Basic Writer's logic was understood and guided into the fold of the University by the Basic Writing instructor.

A Saidian framework also highlights the agency of individual authors within these initial articulations of Basic Writing as a discipline. The most prominent agent in this moment of inception was Mina Shaughnessy. Considered by many to be the founder of the field, her influence within the "moment" of inception that I trace in chapter two is inarguable. No study of the inception of this discipline would provide an accurate reflection of this "moment" without accounting for her overwhelming influence on the discipline. For Shaughnessy and her peers Basic Writing was a personal project, a huge assertion of their agency within the University. To not acknowledge the agency of these individuals in the articulation of Basic Writing's "beginning principles" would be to provide an inaccurate reflection of this discipline's inception.

Said's framework, however, becomes problematic as the imagined geography across which the Basic Writer was introduced to the University as a known commodity becomes permanently tied to these "beginning principles." Said suggests that in this moment of emergence a trajectory is established within which the imagined geography and core knowledge of the discipline is maintained. Here, the only change that occurs is that at the level of what he describes as Manifest Orientalism. Latent Orientalism, or the core distillation of a discipline's knowledge of the subject, remains untouched. Thus, his configuration of the prescriptive nature of a discipline's imaginative geography denies the potential for substantive change of a disciplinary formation.

As the third chapter of this study reads across a second critical "moment" in the history of Basic Writing, Said's framework elides the change that we see and the agency of individuals in this change. In order to remedy this, I introduced mobility theory as the second theoretical frame of this project. Mobility theory enables us to see the discipline of Basic Writing as a fluid

formation that undergoes repeated moments of (re)emergence, one of which we see in the 1990s. Tracing this (re)emergence of a discipline through the three key methodological questions of this study (Who is the Basic Writer? Who is the Basic Writing instructor? And, what is the location of the Basic Writing classroom?), I tracked three movements of the author into her text. This study illuminated these movements through three textual identities that I have suggested enable the author's movement both from lived experience to textual narrative *and* within the narrative through fluid and overlapping identities. These identities include: who is authorized to speak within the text, what role does the speaker inhabit in the drama of the classroom, and finally who is the speaker in the lived experience of her readers. The movement of these mobile authorial identities within the text is relational to the moored Basic Writer. Here we see not only the dislocation of an ontologically stable subject, but the explicit agency of the individual in the (re)emergence of the discipline.

It is the repetition of the movement of authorial identities throughout their texts that enables Basic Writing to (re)emerge into an imaginative geography that is descriptive rather prescriptive of this discipline's knowledge about and understanding of the Basic Writer. These identities provide the writer with roles authorizing his or her right to speak out of lived experience, act in the classroom, and speak to the lived experiences of the Basic Writing instructors reading the text. There are several key differences in the textual relationship between the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor in chapters two and three of this study. First, the relation between these two textual identities in chapter two is predicated on a critical distance that establishes the authority of that author to know that which it is dramatically positioned not to be. This critical distance that is maintained through a Saidian reading of the first data set of this study invites us to configure these textual identities as ontologically stable within the closed system of a discipline's imagined geography. However, the relationship between the mobile Basic Writing instructor–the one who moves through different textual identities–and the moored Basic Writer –who changes in concert with authorial identity–suggests no such critical distance. These identities are explicitly *not* ontologically stable as they flow into and overlap each other across the individual texts. Then, as these authorial identities (re)emerge and are repeated across the individual texts of different writers, they gain critical mass through this repetition, thus effecting change in the discipline's imaginative geography.

89

The second key difference between the relationship between the Basic Writing instructor and the Basic Writer that emerges in these two chapters is in regards to identity construction. *Orientalism* is a study of identity. Within this text Said illustrates the way in which the West defined itself *through* its textual construction of the East as the Orient. This study suggests that in accounting for the emergence of the discipline in the 1970s, we can see a similar construction of identity. An outsider to the University, these instructors within English departments *became* Basic Writing instructors within their texts and, as they did so, they constructed an *other* in relation to which *their* identity was made more clear. Within the frame of mobility theory, the Basic Writer is (re)presented within the second data set of this study as a textually moored identity the enables the writer to move within her text as an active agent. This textual identity is not, then, a means of establishing the writer's textual identity. Instead, the textual identity of the Basic Writer within this frame is one that enables the mobility of the author within her text. The moored and mobile identities that I discussed in chapter three were those that were repeated by multiple authors across multiple texts within my data set. Thus, as various movements are repeated across multiple texts, so are the moored and mobile identities that enable these movements. As these identities are repeated they gain a critical mass, as we saw in chapter three. The formation of this critical mass creates a *social fact*. Thus, as I asked how we can account for the change of a discipline, mobility theory enables us to see the ontological fluidity of textual identities and the process through which *social facts* (re)emerge from a disciplinary formation.

4.2 Implications

For academics working, writing, and defining ourselves within disciplinary frames, this study acknowledges and nuances the reciprocal relationship that forms when intellectuals within a discipline write their own identities as they write disciplinary formations. These frames are not, as Miller assumes, fixed formations, the imagined geographies which prescribe the work done within them. This study is, instead, a counter narrative of disciplinarity that challenges traditional definitions of this space of cultural production as one that is stable and fixed. In what follows, I will look at three areas of implication for this study. I will begin with a look at the implications of this study for the discipline of Basic Writing. Then, I will turn my attention to the more general implications of this study in terms of the theoretical frames that I have employed.

Finally, I will close with a comment on the implications of this study for our reconception of identity within a discipline that finds itself in a moment of (re)emergence.

The most urgent implication of this study is in regards to Basic Writing. In the closing chapter of *Basic Writing*, George Otte and Rebecca Williams Mlynarczyk describe the "scene of devastation" that enveloped Shaughnessy and her peers during the economic downturn of the 1970s. Faced with budget cuts and institutional downsizing in the first decade of the Twenty-first century, Mlynarczyk and Otte comment: "Basic writing came back from that scene of devastation, and it may once again in a new century, but not as a unified project. Coherence, if it ever exists in academic research or its application, is a property of beginnings. Maturity breeds complexity" (163). This complexity has bred an increasingly heterogeneous collection of voices within the discipline of Basic Writing. In many respects this heterogeneity seems to signal the dissolve of what was once a vibrant and coherent disciplinary structure.

I suggest, however, that when we begin to regard this discipline as slowly disappearing from the academic terrain of Composition, we are relying on a stand-by binary. This binary is defined by two end points: heterogeneity and homogeneity. Perceived as homogenous formations, disciplinarity is seen to function at its best when the voices within it are homogenous in their alignment within the disciplinary imagined geography, which then presents a clear, concise, and cohesive understanding of the subject. As Basic Writing has moved away from this homogeneity, it is clear that many, George Otte and Rebecca Williams Mlynarczyk among them, believe that the cohesion of this disciplinary structure is faltering. If coherence is central to a disciplinary formation, once this coherence is lost, what is to be made of the formation that once supported it? Does this formation wither and disappear?

Before I provide an answer to this question based on this study, I will briefly describe the responses to this perceived crisis within Basic Writing. In these responses there is a clear response of yes. When the coherence of a discipline appears to be lost, the discipline loses its viability and, as a result of this disarray, is on its way out. As we saw in the introduction to this chapter, Lu, Horner, and Bartholomae are effectively jumping ship. In doing so they no longer write about the Basic Writer. This writer disappears within the texts of this contingency as the Basic Writer is re-located, mainstreamed within traditional writing classrooms of the university. The counter response to voices such as Lu, Horner, and Bartholomae seeks to reclaim the past.

This later response reifies the core tenets of Basic Writing and clings to the coherence that these tenants once provided.

Within the context of this study, however, I offer an alternative response to the question posed above. When a discipline appears to have lost its coherence, it does not wither and disappear. Instead, I suggest that it (re)emerges. I argue that we can see the inklings of this (re)emergence today. As Basic Writing is abolished from universities across the nation, alternative program structures are emerging in its place. In 1999 William Lalicker described these alternative structures of basic writing in terms of "six broad categories" (qtd. in Otte 174). Ranging from a traditional "credit 'skills' course" to the "mainstreaming" of Basic Writers with "students in regular composition," these categories gesture to what I would suggest will be a "moment" of re-emergence. As teacher-scholars who work with these students share their experiences and create new scholarship on remedial writing, the identities through which they are mobilized within their texts will (re)emerge as a critical mass to establish a new *social fact* of Basic Writing. Implicit in this suggestion is that individuals who are developing these alternative program structures are aware of their agency. As they are aware of and exercise their agency through the production of new knowledge about and new understandings of the Basic Writer, they enact this agency through the texts that they create. Despite its historic lack of material resources, the discipline of Basic Writing has perhaps the most important resource already: its disciplinary formation. As individuals write and create new textual identities of the Basic Writer and the Basic Writing instructor, a critical mass will develop that establishes new *social facts*. In this way the discipline will (re)emerge. It will change to meet the demands of the heterogeneity that envelops it now.

Thus, to describe the current moment of this discipline in terms of budget cuts and the subsequent mainstreaming of Basic Writing courses is to oversimplify the matter. The question begged by this is not "W(h)ither Basic Writing?" as Smoke and Otte put it in the title of a 1990 special issue of the *Journal of Basic Writing*. The question is, if we are going to address students in the "eleventh hour" of their academic careers, *how* are we going to do it? How is this student going to rise like a phoenix from texts within the discipline of Basic Writing? Whether Basic Writing courses stand alone or are mainstreamed into traditional English courses, the question remains: how are we going to *know* these writers as they are greeted by writing instructors on Monday morning?

This study draws our attention to the *value* of the discrete and coherent identities that are (re)formed and maintained within disciplinary structures. These identities enable the agency of authors that resonates beyond their movement within these texts. The textual narratives that support these identities are inseparable from the lived experiences of instructors who teach Basic Writers. These texts mobilize authors and give their experiences meaning within a broader context. Although reductive and problematic, I would suggest that the coherent and known identities of the subject that is maintained within a disciplinary structure is necessary if we are to create the change that we hope to see. This study at once illuminates the need for coherent identities in relation to which we move as active agents and acknowledges that such identities are *always* problematic. It is our responsibility, however, to recognize the mediated nature of our agency within a discipline that can put this problematic nature into perspective. Our agency as scholars is *always* mediated through a disciplinary identity that we create and participate in through our scholarship.

This brings me the second area of implications that I will address here. The theoretical frames that have been employed within this study lead us to reflect on the relationship between agency and identity. Said suggests in *Orientalism* that it was through the Orientalist's textual identity that was constructed vis-à-vis the Oriental that the Orientalist was able to claim control over the East. The disciplinary terrain brought that which was far away closer through the identities that were constructed within this discipline. My application of mobility theory looks at the ways in which authors are mobile agents within their texts through specific configurations of identities. The mooring and mobility that I discuss in chapter three occur through constructed textual identities. As the embodied writers of these texts are active agents, their agency is mediated *by* the fluid and overlapping authorial identities that they construct within their texts.

Together, these frameworks call into question the ways in which identities are constructed within our lived reality. At what cost are these identities constructed? Who is rendered mobile? Who is immobilized? Identities through both of these frames are imbued with complex arrangements of power that are reflected through both the constructions of our identities as well as the ways in which these identities enable movement and stasis. Here, I suggest that our identities are always mediated. These identities through which we live and work are never innocent or implicit to an ontologically stable identity. Instead, the identities through which we live and work emerge at intersections of individual agency and the surrounding context. The

Saidian frame of Orientalism holds us accountable for the constructed identities that we create and maintain across a variety of communities. The textual identities that we construct within our writing are necessary for the expression of agency within a text. Said, however, calls into question the complicity of these identities with surrounding power structures. How, he pushes us to ask, is our agency derived from alignments with power hierarchies in relationships that often remain obscured? Acknowledging the identities as products of social and material alignments, we must be aware of the hierarchies that are reified through our movement the agency that we draw vis-a-vis these identities. For example, this study has focused explicitly on the authors of these texts as instructors of Basic Writing. In doing so I have reified the hierarchy of the teacher-centered classroom as well as the vertical alignment of the university in which these texts are located and through which the "other" is maintained as an outsider to higher education.

The final implication of this study is that Basic Writing is in a moment of (re)emergence. Although reductive and problematic, I would suggest that such a coherent and known identity of the subject of this field is necessary if we are to create the change that we hope to see. If it is in relation to the coherent and discrete identity of the Basic Writer that we navigate, this coherent textual identity enables a movement that the field of Basic Writing is struggling to make today. I will qualify this final observation by stating that I am *not* suggesting that identities are mere social constructions. Instead, they are materially rooted in the embodied experience of individuals. Textual identities are reflections of an embodied lived experience through which we maintain affective relationships within the university, within our discipline, and within our classrooms with the Basic Writer that is recreated from this experience within our texts.

As this study draws to a close, I would like to optimistically suggest that Basic Writing stands poised to (re)emerge, to (re)create the Basic Writer and the location of this writer within higher education. Faced with mainstreaming and the disappearance of this student within the institutional hierarchy of the university, scholars within this disciplinary formation are active agents that can maintain the visibility of these students, these perennial newcomers to the university. As authors within the discipline create new textual identities that translate new lived experiences within the changing landscape of the university, they can collectively create a new Basic Writer, a new Basic Writing classroom, and a new instructor of Basic Writing that is visible and able to advocate for these students. The textual narratives of these authors enable this discipline to gain traction that it appears to be losing when faced with the abolition of Basic

Writing programs. As authors construct narratives that render their lived experiences known and meaningful to a broader audience, their movements within these texts and the textual identities through which these movements are enabled create new *social facts*. As this discipline changes, reshaping itself to meet the demands of the current moment, these *social facts* reflect the agency of individuals within it.

APPENDIX A

VOLUME ONE

Table 1: Volume 1, Number 1 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Error	
Spring 1975	
Author	Article Title
Mina P. Shaughnessy	Introduction
Sarah D'Eloia	Teaching Standard Written English
Barbara Quint Gray	Dialect Interference in Writing: A Tripartite Analysis
Patricia Laurence	Error's Endless Train: Why Students Don't Perceive Errors
Valerie Krishna	The Syntax of Error
Nancy Lay	Chinese Language Interference in Written English
Betty Rizzo & Santiago Villafane	Spanish Influence on Written English
Isabella Halsted	Putting Error in Its Place

Table 2: Volume 1, Number 2 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Courses	
Fall/Winter 1976	
Author	Article Title
Mina P. Shaughnessy	Introduction
Jeanne Desy	Reasoned Writing for Basic Students: A Course Design
Dianna S. Campbell & Terry Ryan Meier	A Design for a Developmental Writing Course for Academically Underprepared Black Students
Marie Ponsot	Total Immersion
Helen Mills	Language and Composition: Three Mastery Learning Courses in One Classroom
Ann Petrie	Teaching the Thinking Process in Essay Writing
Paul Pierog	Coaching Writing

Table 3: Volume 1, Number 3 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Uses of Grammar	
Spring/Summer 1977	
Author	Article Title
Sarah D'Eloia	The Uses – and Limits – of Grammar
David M. Davidson	Sentence Combining in an ESL Writing Program
Linda Ann Kunz	X-Word Grammar: Offspring of Sector Analysis
Barbara Quint Gray & Alice Trillin	Animating Grammar: Principles for the Development of Video-Tape Materials

Table 4: Volume 1, Number 4 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Evaluation	
Spring/Summer 1978	
Author	Article Title
Rexford Brown	What We Know Now and How We Could Know More About Writing Ability in America
Joseph Williams	Re-Evaluating Evaluating
Edward M. White	Mass Testing of Individual Writing: The California Model
Rosemary Hake	With No Apology: Teaching to the Test
Roberta S. Matthews	The Evolution of One College's Attempt to Evaluate Student Writing
Elizabeth Metzger	A Scheme for Measuring Growth in College Writing
Muriel Harris	Evaluation: The Process for Revision
Richard L. Larson	Selected Bibliography of Writing on the Evaluation of Students' Achievements in Composition

APPENDIX B

VOLUMES NINE AND TEN

Table 5: Volume 9, Number 1 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Spring 1990	
Author	Article Title
Linda Hanson Meeker	Pragmatic Politics: Using Assessment Tools to (Re)Shape a Curriculum
Jacqueline Costello	Promoting Literacy Through Literature: Reading and Writing in ESL Composition
Donald A. McAndrew	Handwriting Rate and Syntactic Fluency
Barbara Kroll	The Rhetoric/Syntax Split: Designing a Curriculum for ESL Students
Boyd Koehler and Kathryn Swanson	Basic Writers and the Library: A Plan for Providing Meaningful Bibliographic Instruction
Kyle Perkins and Sheila R. Brutten	Writing: A Holistic of Atomistic Entity?

Table 6: Volume 9, Number 2 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Fall 1990	
Author	Article Title
Lynn Bloom	Finding a Family, Finding a Voice: A Writing Teacher Teaches Writing Teachers
Jane Zeni and Joan Krater Thomas	Suburban African-American Basic Writing, Grades 7-12: A Text Analysis
Frances Zak	Exclusively Positive Responses to Student Writing
Patrick J. Slattery	Applying Intellectual Development Theory to Composition
Goran "George" Moberg	The Revival of Rhetoric: A Bibliographic Essay
Vivian Zamel	Through Students' Eyes: The Experiences of Three ESL Writers
Jody Millward	Placement and Pedagogy: UC Santa Barbara's Preparatory Program

Table 7: Volume 10, Number 1 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Spring 1991	
Author	Article Title
Rexford Brown	Schooling and Thoughtfulness
Sandra Schor	The Short, Happy Life of Ms. Mystery
Min-Zhan Lu	Redefining the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A Critique of the Politics of Linguistic Innocence
Peter Rondinone	Teacher Background and Student Needs
Pat Belanoff	The Myth of Assessment
Rose Marie Kinder	A Piece of the Streets
Adele MacGowan-Gilhooly	Fluency First: Revising the Traditional ESL Sequence

Table 8: Volume 10, Number 2 of the *Journal of Basic Writing*

Fall 1991	
Author	Article Title
Robert de Beaugrande & Mar Jean Olson	Using a "Write-Speak-Write" Approach for Basic Writers
Alan C. Purves	Clothing the Emperor: Towards a Framework Relating Function and Form to Literacy
Patricia Bizzell	Power, Authority, and Critical Pedagogy
George Otte	Computer-Adjusted Errors and Expectations
Donald Lazere	Orality, Literacy, and Standard English
Sally Barr Reagan	Warning! Basic Writers at Risk: The Case of Javier
Walter S. Minot & Kenneth R. Gamble	Self-Esteem and Writing Apprehension of Basic Writer: Conflicting Evidence

WORKS CITED

Adey, Peter. "If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities." *Mobilities*. 1.1 (2006): 75-94. EBSCO. Web. 2 Feb 2009.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2007.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. "Reincarnation." *The Gloria Anzaldúa Reader*. Ed. AnaLouise Keating. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2009. 21. Print.

Bartholomae, David. "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum." *Writing on the Margins*. Ed. David Bartholomae. New York: Palgrave, 2005. 312-326. Print.

Basu, Paul and Simon Coleman. "Migrant Worlds, Material Cultures." *Mobilities* 3.3 (2008): 313-330. EBSCO. Web. 2 Feb 2009.

Beaugrande, Robert de and Mar Jean Olson. "Using a 'Write-Speak-Write' Approach for Basic Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (1991): 4-32. Print.

Belanoff, Pat. "The Myth of Assessment." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 54-66. Print.

Bernstein, Naomi. "Metaphors and Material Realities for Basic Writing." *Basic Writing e-Journal* 8.1-9.1 (2009-2010): n. pag. Web. 20 May 2010.

-w. "Social Justice Initiative for Basic Writing." *Basic Writing e-Journal* 7.1 (2008): n. pag. Web. 20 May 2010.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Power, Authority, and Critical Pedagogy." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (1991): 54-70. Print.

Bloom, Lynn. "Finding a Family, Finding a Vice: A Writing Teacher Teaches Writing Teachers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.2 (1990):3-15. Print.

Brown, Rexford. "Schooling and Thoughtfulness." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991):3-15. Print.

Costello, Jacqueline. "Promoting Literacy Through Literature: Reading and Writing in ESL Composition." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.1 (1990): 20-30. Print.

Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998. Print.

D'Eloia, Sarah. "Teaching Standard Written English." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 5-13. Print.

---. "The Uses – and Limits – of Grammar." *Uses of Grammar*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.3 (1977): 1-48. Print.

Desy, Jeanne. "Reasoned Writing for Basic Students: A Course Design." *Courses*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.2 (1976): 4-19. Print.

Gray, Barbara Quint. "Dialectic Interference in Writing: A Tripartite Analysis." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 14-22. Print.

Gray, Barbara Quint and Alice Trillin. "Animating Grammar: Principles for the Development of Video-Tape Materials." *Uses of Grammar*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.3 (1977): 77-91. Print.

Greene, Nicole and Patricia McAlexander Eds. *Basic Writing in America*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2008. Print.

Hake, Rosemary. "With No Apology: Teaching to the Test." *Evaluation*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.4 (1978): 39-62. Print.

Hannam, Kevin, Mimi Sheller and John Urry. "Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings." *Mobilities* 1.1 (2006): 1-22. EBSCO. Web. 2 Feb 2009.

Horner, Bruce. "The 'Birth' of 'Basic Writing'." Horner and Lu 3-19. Print.

---. "Mapping Errors and Expectations for Basic Writing: From the 'Frontier Field' to the 'Border Country'." Horner and Lu 117-138. Print.

---. "Re-thinking the 'Sociality' of Error: Teaching Editing as Negotiation." Horner and Lu 139-165. Print.

---. "Some Afterwords: Intersections and Divergences." Horner and Lu 191-205. Print.

Horner, Bruce and Min-Zhan Lu. *Representing the 'Other'*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1999. Print.

Kinder, Rose. "A Piece of the Streets." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 67-72. Print.

Krishna, Valerie. "The Syntax of Error." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 43-49. Print.

Kroll, Barbara. "The Rhetoric/Syntax Split: Designing a Curriculum for ESL Students." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.1 (1990): 40-55. Print.

Kunz, Linda. "X-Word Grammar: Offspring of Sector Analysis." *Uses of Grammar*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.3 (1977): 63-76. Print.

Laurence, Patricia. "Error's Endless Train: Why Students Don't Perceive Errors." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 23-42. Print.

Lay, Nancy. "Chinese Language Interference in Written English." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 50-61. Print.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?" Horner and Lu 30-55. Print.

---. "Importing 'Science': Neutralizing Basic Writing." Horner and Lu 56-104. Print.

---. "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone." Horner and Lu 166-190. Print.

---. "Redefining the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A Critique of the Politics of Linguistic Innocence." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 26-40. Print.

MacDonald, Kenneth and Margaret Grieco. "Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity: The Changing Frontiers of Everyday Routine." *Mobilities* 2.1 (2007): 1-14. EBSCO. Web. 2 Feb 2009.

MacGowan-Gilhooly, Adele. "Fluency First: Revising the Traditional ESL Sequence." *Error*. Spec. issue of Journal *of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 73-87. Print.

Maher, Jane. *Mina P. Shaughnessy: Her Life and Work*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1997. Print.

McAndrew, Donald. "Handwriting Rate and Syntactic Fluency." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.1 (1990): 31-39. Print.

Meeker, Linda. "Pragmatic Politics: Using Assessment Tools to (Re)Shape a Curriculum." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.1 (1990): 3-19. Print.

Miller, Thomas. *The Formation of College English*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997.

Mills, Helen. "Language and Composition: Three Mastery Learning Courses in One Classroom." *Courses*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.2 (1976): 44-59. Print.

Minot, Walter and Kenneth Gamble. "Self-Esteem and Writing Apprehension of Basic Writers: Conflicting Evidence." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (1991): 116-124. Print.

Mlynarczyk, Rebecca and George Otte. *Basic Writing*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 2010. Print.

Murray, Heather. *Working in English*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996. Print.

Otte, George. "Computer-Adjusted Errors and Expectations." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (1991): 71-86. Print.

Petrie, Ann. "Teaching the thinking Process in Essay Writing." *Courses*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.2 (1976): 60-67. Print.

Pierog, Paul. "Coaching Writing." *Courses*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.2 (1976): 68-77. Print.

Ponsot, Marie. "Total Immersion." *Courses*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.2 (1976): 31-43. Print.

Reagan, Sally. "Warning! Basic Writers at Risk: The Case of Javier." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (1991): 99-115. Print.

Rich, Adrienne. "Teaching Language in Open Admissions: A Look at the Context." *Uses of Literature*. Ed. Monroe Engel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973. 257-274. Google Books. Web. 15 May 2010.

Rizzo, Betty and Santiago Villafane. "Spanish Influence on Written English." *Error*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 62-71. Print.

Rondinone, Peter. "Teacher Background and Student Needs." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 41-53. Print.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Schor, Sandra. "The Short, Happy Life of Ms. Mystery." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.1 (1991): 16-25. Print.

Shaughnessy, Mina. "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 27.3 (1976): 234-239. JSTOR. Web. 26 May 2009.

---. *Errors and Expectations*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977. Print

-- . "Introduction." *Error*. Spec. issue in *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.1 (1975): 1-4. Print

---. "Open Admissions and the Disadvantaged Teacher." *College Composition and Communication* 24.5 (1973): 401-404. JSTOR. Web. 26 May 2010.

---. "Some Needed Research on Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 28.4 (1977): 317-320. JSTOR. Web. 26 May 2009.

Slattery, Patrick. "Applying Intellectual Development Theory to Composition." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.2 (1990):54-65. Print.

Soliday, Mary. *The Politics of Remediation*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002. Print.

Swanson, Kathryn and Boyd Koehler. "Basic Writers and the Library: A Plan for Providing Meaningful Bibliographic Instruction." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.1 (1990): 56-74. Print.

Thomas, Joan and Jane Zeni. "Suburban African-American Basic Writing, Grades 7-12: A Text Analysis." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.2 (1990):15-39. Print.

Urry, John. *Mobilities*. Malden, MA: Polity, 2007. Print.

Williams, Joseph. "Re-Evaluating Evaluating." *Evaluation*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.4 (1978): 7-17. Print.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Katherine Bridgman

Katherine Bridgman was born and raised in Western North Carolina. She completed her Bachelors at the University of North Carolina-Asheville with a degree in Literature. Under the direction of Dr. Kristie Fleckenstein, Katherine completed her Master's degree in the summer of 2010. Her research interests lay at the intersection of location, identity, and writing pedagogy.