THESIS

RECONSIDERING THE FOUTH CANON: RHETORIC, *MEMORIA,* AND COMPOSITION IN THE

DIGITAL AGE

Submitted by

Meagan Clark

Department of English

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2013

Master's Committee:

    Advisor: Donna Souder

    Doug Eskew
    Derek Lopez

ABSTRACT

RECONSIDERING THE FOUTH CANON: RHETORIC, *MEMORIA,* AND COMPOSITION IN THE

DIGITAL AGE

In this thesis, I argue that the rhetoric we teach and the context included in composition textbooks *should* comprise the discourse applicable not only to the academic discipline of composition but be equally relatable to current and modern demands of professional and business communities in which most composition students will be expected to write proficiently in the future. The consideration of the rhetorical cannon of *memoria* in the modern day writing classroom is one seldom recognized, yet exists as a highly influential area of discourse that has the power to prepare students in a composition classroom to enter any career path, academic in nature or otherwise, in the digital age. The distinct abandonment of *memoria* is an element that should be recognized and discussed by the field since the creation and selection of first-year composition textbooks relies heavily on disciplinary, institution, and program *memoria.* In this thesis, I have developed a four-way test by which composition textbooks can be judged, objectively. Through a qualitative study and analysis of five composition textbooks from the top publishing companies, using the four-way test, I have found that the most commonly used first-year composition textbooks rely on *memoria*. My findings not only provide reason for revisiting how the fourth canon is considered in the field of composition, but also that the current state of first-year writing textbooks do not provide adequate practice or instruction for writing in the digital age.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The field of composition studies has arrived at an impasse where scholars must

decide what traditional concepts to value and which to let parish in a world that is

becoming more and more digital. Hugh Burns, in his essay on the importance of research

titled, "Four dimensions of significance: Tradition, method, theory, originality," presents a

question which is vital for rhetoric and composition scholars to consider as first-year

writing classes make a place for themselves in a largely technological atmosphere. The

question that Burns poses is this, "How do computers assist the recovery and the discovery

of knowledge?" (7). As more and more writing classrooms are fitted with computers, and

the professional world that these general education courses are designed to help prepare

students for require digital literacy[1], composition studies is faced with the decision of just

how much emphasis is to be put on composing with technology, what type of writing

should be required of students, how computers change the writing process[2], and how these

elements influence the content that composition textbooks should contain.

---

[1] For the purposes of this work, the definition of "digital literacy" draws from the definition given by the past chair of CCCC, Cynthia Selfe, of "technological literacy" in her text *Technology and Literacy in the 21st Century: The Importance of Paying Attention,* which reads, "The ability to use computers and other technology to improve learning, productivity, and performance"(3). Selfe's definition of technological literacy is comprehensive and can be applied to the consideration of digital literacy since one must have basic technological literacy in order to compose digitally. Therefore, to draw from Selfe's definition, I mean digital literacy to be understood as the ability to use technology in a way that specifically renders the effective consumption and production of digital compositions.

[2] The "writing process" refers to the pedagogical shift started by Peter Elbow and Donald Murry in 1972 which emphasizes the writing process that a writer goes through over the final product. Composition courses that employ process pedagogy are characterized by, most predominantly, the requirement that writing students submit multiple drafts of writing project and to attend frequent conferences, a notion championed by Murry specifically. Process pedagogy has been implemented frequently since its conception and is emphasized here due to the way the emphasis on both invention and revision, among other factors, is particularly well suited for composing with computers.

The technological element that is being increasingly implemented in writing classrooms, which brings an immense amount of information and resources to students' and instructors' fingertips, challenges the purpose of the textbook. In a class fitted with computers, is it really necessary to have composition textbooks at all? If texts are truly progressive to a students learning in first-year writing, what type of content should these textbooks contain in order to supply students with the skills necessary to write effectively in a largely technological, digital atmosphere? The answers to these questions can be discerned through considering the distinct lack of attention to *memoria* in composition studies, as the fourth canon holds considerable influence on both the production and selection of composition textbooks. Specifically, I argue that the combination of disciplinary[3], institutional[4], and program[5] *memoria* heavily influence the creation and selection of first-year composition textbooks, which should be reevaluated because unacknowledged, *memoria[6]* hinders the development of a practice of writing adequate for the digital age.

---

[3] "Disciplinary *Memoria"* refers to the collective memory and values held by a specific discipline. It is through the act of *memoria* that a person continuously draws upon these commonly held values in the consumption and production of scholarship catered to a designated discipline.

[4] "Institutional *Memoria"* refers to the elements of value and objectives as designated by a specific institution, specifically, a university. Through the act of recollection, a member of such an institution will draw upon their prior knowledge of a institutions values in order to select materials or to produce work or scholarship for or in representation of the institution.

[5] "Program *Memoria"* refers to the collective values and objectives as designated by a specific program with in an institution, such as a department or degree program that exists within a college that is part of a larger university. In producing work or scholarship for a program, a person would be forced to recall the stipulations of the program in order to positively represent and uphold the program and the larger institution to which it is a part.

[6] "*Memoria"* the Latin term for memory is the fourth of the five rhetorical canons, appearing after *invention* (invention), *disposition* (arrangement), *elocution* (style) and before *hypokrisis* (delivery). As the purpose of this paper revolves around the modern considerations and usefulness of memory and how that impacts composition textbook production and selection, the classical definitions and renderings of memory as

LITERATURE REVIEW

Kathleen Welch, in her 1987 article, "Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production: The place of Theory in Writing Pedagogy," argues that the content presented in most textbooks "bears little relation to the large work on composition theory that is widely available" and that there are "books which actually present unconscious theory" (296). I bring up Welch's 1987 discussion of composition textbook production not only because it still exists as one of the most focused and seminal texts on the subject to date, but because the claims made in this article continue to be remarkably relevant to contemporary composition. The ideologically based structure of freshmen writing textbooks characterized by "unconscious theory" continues to be the structure dominating composition textbooks published nearly twenty-five years later. The "unconscious theory" that Welch refers to is the structure of textbooks characterized by an apparent void of theoretical backing but are actually informed by "unacknowledged theories" including "1) a truncated version of the five classical canons, and 2) the modes of discourse—basically, exposition description, narration, and argument along with various attachments" (296).

This inclusion of unacknowledged theory actually represents the dominating structure to writing textbooks, most of which include material including a discussion of the writing process, the modes, reading excerpts, and partial inclusion of the five rhetorical canons, with memory and delivery being abandoned. What is significant about this structure, among other things, is the fact that the use of the first three canons, occasionally

---

memoria are foundational. The conceptualization of *memoria* by Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle, his *De Memoria Et Reminiscentie* in particular, are paramount in the understanding of the evolution of memory and its place in rhetoric used in writing. In this paper I draw from this classical understanding as *memoria* as *mnemonic* tools used predominantly in oral communication, in order to discuss the ways *memoria* is still highly influential in contemporary composition when the understanding of memory's application is extended beyond mere memorization, to include an active and integral process of recollection.

appearing as headings in textbooks, has "received scant attention in the discussions of writing textbooks" even though "the reduction of the interactive five canons to three composition categories removes writing from a social context and from cultural power" (Welch 269-270). Despite Welch's call for textbook revolution and her explanation that it is the ideological status of the traditional textbook structure that keeps writing instruction and textbook material in a state of stasis, textbooks still follow basically the same make up.

Granted, Welch does warn that "any attempt to change writing textbooks and the unspoken ideology that produces them will have to take account of this 25000 year old tradition of technical rhetoric," but another key to progressing the evolution, quality, and overall purpose of the composition textbook may rely on an element that it has traditionally ignored—*memoria.* Welch notes that theorist such as Terry Eagleton have pointed out that "no other kind of criticism has offered us the completeness" that is offered by the five canons for the purpose of "generating and analyzing discourse" (270). Yet those producing and publishing textbooks have continued to eliminate the fourth canon from their content, just as they have, in parallel, neglected the role of *memoria* in the creation and consumption of these textbooks.

In the act of compositing a first-year writing textbook or choosing one that will be required for a composition course, *memoria* holds more impact than is seldom recognized. In deciding what content a textbook should contain, the scholar writing the text, or the professor selecting the text calls upon *memoria* to subjectively judge the quality of the textbook and the material it covers. Specifically, disciplinary, institutional, and program *memoria* are enacted when considering the value of a text. For example, when a writing program administrator or professor for a particular course is set with the task to choose

between three different texts to require for a composition course, they have no choice but to recollect the information they already know about what content their field, or discipline currently values, how those values fit into the requirements of the institution, and finally how well the content fits into the objectives of the program in which the course is offered. This process draws on the ideology Welch describes in that textbook publishers "want to provide material that writing teachers will know and feel comfortable with," which is, more often that not, a text that continues to be structured around the partial canons (Welch 275).

When accessing and drawing upon an ideology common to a particular discourse, one must involve themselves in the act of recollecting the information that makes up that ideology. In Aristotle's *On Memory and Reminiscence* he discusses recollection as something that "always implies remembering, and actualized memory follows [upon the successful act of recollecting]" (129). The situation where someone is forced to draw upon ideology, then, actually exists as a mnemonic occasion where collective memory must be accessed, which puts the fourth canon to use every time such a situation arises. Selecting or writing a textbook is a clear example of a situation that requires recollection of ideology, and is consequently a mnemonic act. In deciding what text to choose or what content to include in a text that they are creating, one must recall, or remember, the information they already know about the discipline, the institution, and the program from which they belong. Only if the content of a textbook fulfills all the requirements recalled by the person evaluating the text, will it pass the test and be put to use for a particular course.

This process of textbook selection is inherently subjective since the standards to which a textbook is held, are relative to the memories and power of recollection of the person set to judge the text. The role of *memoria* in textbook selection is one seldom

recognized or discussed, which is in large part due to the overall neglect of the fourth canon in the field of composition, as reflected by its overall abandonment is the traditional structuring of composition textbooks. It is through enhanced focus on *memoria* that scholars may be able to develop an objective way to create and judge textbooks that will be progressive to writing instruction for a contemporary, digital age writing course. The apathy directed towards *memoria* is an element worthy of attention by composition scholars and instructors of first-year writing because *memoria* exists as an important area of discourse, not only because the rhetorical canons were designed to work synergistically in the writing process, but more importantly because it provides a lens through which to consider the quality and relevancy of writing curriculum presented to students both in the classroom and in their textbooks.

It is evident that the writing platform students are expected to write in is becoming more and more digital. This electronic writing platform is becoming increasingly common across academic discourses and in many elements of society. The writing instruction that students receive in general writing courses should then be conscious of and cater to the demands of the academic and professional realms in which they will be expected to write proficiently. Jeff Rice, in his *The Rhetoric of Cool Composition Studies and New Media,* recognizes that the type of writing that students are expected to do, and the instruction they receive from textbooks, does not correlate with the digital literacy required by contemporary students of writing, both in everyday life and in the workplace. In regard to composition studies going beyond simple "literacy," Rice states that, "The problem is not set: We need a practice of writing adequate to the internet/Web, and it will not look very much like what is recommended in most composition textbooks" (XIII). Rice's statement

makes Welch's examine of textbook ideology all the more relevant, since it is that ideology that must be acknowledged so that it can be challenged in a way that will allow it to evolve to include the needs of digital age writers.

This idea of curriculum catering to the demands of present society is not necessarily new. In fact, it has been articulated by Kenneth Bruffee in his 1984 article, "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'" as he states, "Much of what we teach today—or should be teaching—in composition courses is the normal discourse of most academic, professional, and business communities" (643). Bruffee's logic then continues as he states, "The rhetoric taught in our composition textbooks comprises—or should comprise—the conventions of normal discourse of those communities" (643). Universities, and those who live and work in them, tend to become comfortable surviving in the ivory tower of academia, separated from the outside world. It is however imperative, for all discourses, but composition studies especially, to recognize the need to evolve in order to meet the demands of the work force outside of the ivy-covered walls, in the realm of business. It is that world that many graduates, who start their education in first-year writing courses, will eventually enter. This is a notion recognized by many scholars, especially as the world continues to become more technological and globalized.

What is surprising is that those who create and publish composition textbooks have not taken the advice of Welch or Bruffee in incorporating those components of instruction that students need to become successful in the world beyond the walls of writing classrooms. In modern day society, the writing that our students are expected to consume and produce are, frequently, of a digital nature. The ways in which students are interacting with computers in order analyze and produce multimodal compositions with clear

rhetorical intent requires them to use all of the rhetorical canons, synergistically, as they were originally designed. *Memoria* has traditionally been discarded and thought of as mere memorization, a canon necessary only to the classical rhetoricians delivering compositions orally. This notion is one challenged by several composition scholars, in particular, John Frederick Reynolds and contributing writers, including Welch, in his *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication.* As stated by Reynolds, "Rethinking memory, however, requires that one first correct the record and challenge the firmly entrenched and faulty assumption that memory issues are limited to 'memorizing the speech,' and therefore without written or electronic equivalents" (4). Many scholars explain the abandonment of memory and delivery in composition studies by stating that these two canons are simply less relevant in cultures that are not orally dominant. Welch disagrees by stating that "many issues of culture, ideology, society, and the construction of public and private lives reside in functions of memory and delivery" (Welch 18). To take the discussion a step further, Welch not only dismisses status of *memoria* as mere memorization, but describes it as a valuable canon and tool of writing which does not loose importance in writing but is rather "growing [in the] dominance of writing" by taking on "different attributes " (Welch 18).

What is vital for scholars within the field of composition studies to consider, is that because of the nature of writing with computers, *memoria* is called upon as much more than memorization and is evoked through every stage of the writing process. The value for students to understand *memoria* is evident and can be elaborated, but what is more significant for the purposes of this work is that those creating and choosing which textbooks to use in composition courses should consider the significance that *memoria* has

on writing in a digital age. While it would be progressive for first year students of writing if contemporary composition textbooks contained material addressing how to use the rhetorical canons synergistically, memory especially, when writing is done and often published on a digital platform, what needs to be accomplished first is for textbook developers to understand the role *memoria* has in textbook creation. Welch mirrors this idea in stating that "both sides must change, but the change must begin with the textbook publishers" (279). Only when textbook publishers begin to realize that breaking free of the traditional structure is progressive to the field, will scholars and students benefit. Furthermore, once scholars recognize the way that *memoria* is influencing what content textbooks contain, and which textbooks are frequently selected for use in composition classrooms, the cycle can be broken and a new *memoria* can be developed. Until the current influence of *memoria* is recognized and a new one developed, it is important that the textbooks selected for courses today are judged objectively. Only through objective analysis can the *memoria* influencing text be identified and at times, avoided. Based on the warnings and commentary provided by Welch, Bruffee, and Rice, I have developed a four-way test that can be used to help objectively assess the quality of instruction provided to students writing in the digital age, while congruently helping to identify the *memoria* relied on in the creation of frequently used contemporary composition textbooks.

The arguments made in this work are based on the results of a qualitative analysis of the top composition textbooks used in contemporary composition courses today. The four-way test on which the analysis of the following texts including, *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing, Joining the Conversation, Everything's an Argument, A Brief Guide to Writings*

from Readings, and *The Norton Field Guide to Writing* are derived is as follows:[7]

1. To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

2. To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

3. To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

4. To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction application for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

The elements of this test are intended to help composition scholars to objectively consider the content of course materials being used in modern first-year composition courses in order to present the strengths and the shortcomings of the textbook content used to teach writing to digital natives. The standards incorporated into this four-way test have been thoughtfully composed and aim to include and address the issues presented by leading scholars of composition regarding first-year writing objectives today.

---

[7] An expanded view of the four-way test can be found on Appendix A and the full analysis of each text of the previously listed textbooks can be found on Appendix B-F, respectively.

ARGUMENT

General education courses, such as English composition, are intended to help prepare and provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in their collegiate career and, ultimately, the professional work force. In post collegiate life, students will face an overwhelming number of jobs that require, at minimum, a complete and literate understanding of technology and how to communicate effectively through writing in electronic spaces. Therefore, the textbooks that are put to use in composition courses exist as primary sources of instruction, along with the instructor. As the main source of instruction outside of the classroom, textbooks are trusted to fulfill an important role in the education of students by providing a framework for curriculum and a source of reference. Since students often interact with textbooks more frequently than with the instructor, it is vital that the content included in these texts reflect modern pedagogical theories of composition in a way that promotes and is catered toward developing the skills most needed for the work force. As technology continues to evolve and become steadily more integrated into our everyday lives, composition curriculum and the content included in textbooks must be proactive in instructing students to develop digital literacy, particularly in electronic writing spaces.

Many factors show that the field of composition studies is already acknowledging and embracing the need for digital literacy in first-year writing. One of the key elements demonstrating this fact is the overwhelming number of composition courses taught in computer classrooms. The second significant element that reveals the beginnings of a shift toward enhanced integration of digital literacy in the composition course is the fact that many composition textbooks now have online components and/or contain a limited

amount of instruction on writing in electronic writing spaces like blogs, email, and websites. However, while many course curriculum and accompanying textbooks include some technological recognition, the amount of technological instruction is extremely limited in relation to just how digitized the world is today. Through an analysis of leading composition textbooks published by Bedford St. Martin, Pearson, and Norton publishing companies, I have found that each text integrates a restricted amount of digital literacy instruction, showing some recognition of the importance that technology has on writing in the digital age. Each text, including *The St. Martins Guide to Writing, Joining the Conversation, Everything's and Argument, A Brief Guide to Writings from Readings, and The Norton Field Guide to Writing* was held to a four-way test designed to assess how appropriately and effectively the text incorporates instruction adequate for providing contemporary students of composition the skills necessary to become successful writers in the digital age that is characterized by communicating through electronic environments and multimodal genres. While the amount of technological emphasis included in these texts is progressive, I have found that the amount of technological instruction is inadequate for the level of digital literacy required of students beyond the classroom. Based on the findings of my analysis, I argue that the inadequate amount of digital literacy instruction that is integrated into contemporary composition textbooks is a result of the influence that *memoria* has on those creating, publishing, and selecting the textbooks put to use in first-year writing classrooms today.

While a key component that the four-way test emphasized was how well digital literacy instruction was communicated and emphasized, the test also revealed a distinct pattern, evident in the structure and content of each text. This pattern, characterized by

what Welch described in 1987 as an ideology, which inserts and relies on "unconscious theory" is still highly recognizable in the textbooks published between 2010 and 2013. In my analysis of the five composition textbooks listed previously, there is a recognizable effort to include digital literacy as an important component of first-year writing instruction; however, due to the adherence to this traditional structure, the more relevant instruction is reduced to a simple online addition to the textbook or a mere chapter or two. The pattern of "unconscious theory," described by Welch, has become a key characteristic to the traditional structure that textbooks have followed for decades. It is that ideology which has become ingrained in the disciplinary *memoria,* causing a pattern of writing textbooks to follow the same format and structure of those that came before it. In other words, it is *memoria* that perpetuates the pattern and is the key force limiting the integration of new, more relevant content revolving around digital literacy instruction into textbooks.

While the amount of instruction progressive to students developing digital literacy of electronic writing spaces in each textbook is different, the pattern of an adherence to *memoria* is identifiable in each of the texts subjected to the four-way test. Bedford St. Martin publishing company published three of the five composition textbooks included in the analysis. The first of these is the ninth edition of the *The St. Martins Guide to Writing*, written by Rise Axelrod and Charles Cooper (Appendix B). As stated in the *St. Martin's Guides'* "Preface for Instructors," this text, published originally in 1985, "immediately became the most widely adopted text of its kind in the nation" (Axelrod v). The prominence of this text in the composition field is also acknowledged by Xin Liu Gale, in his analysis of its fifth edition, titled "The 'Full Toolbox' and Critical Thinking: Conflicts and Contradictions

in *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing"* where he states, "I venture to claim, [The *St. Martin's Guide]* is the prototype for all the other guidelines published subsequently" (185). *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* is also one of the only composition textbooks that has received the attention of a publication focused on analyzing its content. It is for these reasons that my analysis began with the most recent version of Bedford St. Martin's *Guide to Writing*, a text that has set the precedence for the content found in other texts of its kind, published by Bedford St. Martin and competing publishing companies.

One of Gale's critiques of the *St Martin's Guide's* fifth edition was that it "includes theories and pedagogies that are often competing and conflicting without explaining how these theories and pedagogies converse with each other. Nor is there explanation why they are included in the textbook" (Gale 191). This echo's Welch's earlier evaluation of the "traditional" textbook structure, noting that they traditionally include "unconscious theory," such as only including partial canons and "offer no discussion of why part of the classical structure [of the canons] is appealing and another part not, or what implications derive from cutting off nearly half a structure" (Welch 270). As a result, theories and pedagogies are often represented in a simplistic and reductive, sometimes erroneous manner" (Gale 191). This assessment is one that the Axelrod and contributors acknowledged in the ninth edition as they explicitly state, "Every aspect of the academic landscape has changed . . . the texts we read and write, the tools we use to find them, the options we have for communicating . . . are more varied and complex . . . [therefore] we believe [this ninth edition] is more pedagogically effective than any previous edition" (v). While it is progressive that the writers and publishers of this textbook are actively aware of the continually evolving pedagogical landscape of composition, and they make noticeable

changes reflective of that awareness, Gale's critique that the text's theories and pedagogies are frequently presented in a "simplistic" manner remains the same— particularly in the guide's explanation of the writing process, and in its buried attempt to communicate rhetorical concepts and writing strategies. While the recognition that the "academic landscape has changed" is stated, the instruction on digital literacy is extremely limited and is contained to only mentioning the availability of various digital tools, without dedicating pages to fully explaining how to use them throughout the writing process. Rather than providing writing activities that hold on to obsolete writing exercises, such as the modes, it would be more progressive for textbooks, and the ideology that informs their creation, to reflect the notion that digital age composition students would benefit more from being asked to create a blog, manage a wiki, or compose memos, emails, and advertising materials rather than explain or evaluate a reading in the traditional essay format. If the *memoria* and the ideology that is in force during the creation and selection of textbooks is not given the attention it deserves, writing teachers will continue to teach from textbooks that "invite [writing teachers] to teach writing as stasis" (Welch 271).

The next Bedford St. Martin text in my analysis was Mike Palmquist's *Joining the conversation Writing in College and Beyond* (*Joining the Conversation*) (Appendix C). *Joining the Conversation* does do a better job of breaking the traditional inclusion of unconscious theory than many others, considering the direct mention of Kenneth Burke's parlor metaphor as inspiration. In the preface, Palmquist provides a narrative explaining how he "spent a year observing a colleague teach two strikingly different writing courses" one teaching students to write to a general audience, allowing them to pick topics, and the other explaining to students that writing is a scholarly exchange and requiring each student

15

to follow Burke's metaphor and contribute to a conversation on one particular subject (v). Both classes produced skilled writers and the experience was clearly one that had substantial influence in the creation of *Joining the Conversation.* However, the conscious explanation of the theory that influenced the textbook is written in areas that are typically read only by instructors, not students—like the preface and other front matter sections. Burke's metaphor is summarized for students in chapter one, but is never attributed to Burke, which in turn creates the inclusion of unconscious theory to students. Perhaps this is evidence that the writers of textbooks consider the context from where certain pedagogical concepts originate as beyond student comprehension. Of course students do not necessarily need to have an understanding of Burke's theories or an advanced understanding of classical rhetoric to become effective writers, but if instructors and the textbooks they require ask students to make rhetorically informed choices in their writing regarding concepts such as audience and purpose, defining and providing context for basic "rhetoric" could only improve comprehension and therefore application of these principles.

The second part of Palmquist 's text titled—*Writing in College and Beyond*—takes the writing process a step beyond the parlor and its connections to technology and modern pedagogical influence to an attempt to make the writing instruction provided relevant not only in college, but outside academia into whatever place students might end up. The focus on digital literacy and the rhetorical focus is multidisciplinary and is explained to students in a way that is applicable to nearly any course they will enter. Furthermore, the readings and sample documents provided in the text also give students access and experience in applying these concepts to multiple genres—genres that will likely be more relevant to their futures than the traditional essay, including advertisements, blog entries, websites,

instruction manuals, Web article's, multimedia presentations, etc. Applying theory and

pedagogically informed writing instruction across genres, often those created and

published on a digital platform, make the text more comprehensive and have the power to

then enhance the students' writing ability beyond the first-year composition classroom.

Joining the Conversation then stands as one of the texts with the most integration of digital

instruction. However, even though Palmquist's text is more progressive than others when

breaking out of the traditional model, the areas focusing on electronic writing platforms

still make up only a small portion of the text with the rest continuing to follow and contain

content characteristic to the traditional *memoria.*

The last Bedford St. Martin text included in my analysis is the sixth edition of

Everything's an Argument by Andrea Lundsford, John Ruszkiewicz, and kieth Walters

(Appendix D). According to Gary Tate, "rhetorical pedagogy . . . in a very real sense,

underlies all others" (vii). *Everything's an Argument* is a text that helps to prove Tate's

premise in that, out of the composition textbooks included in my analysis, it is the text that

is the most obviously grounded in rhetorical pedagogy and is also the most effective text

according to the four-way test, particularly in the areas of modern pedagogical integration

and digital literacy. What is especially innovative and unique about *Everything's and*

Argument is the way that classical rhetoric is so easily integrated with important elements

of modern writing pedagogy and instruction, such as technology.

The writers of this text recognize that "Today, students (and instructors) at all levels

find themselves overwhelmed by the sheer number of sources technology makes available

for their projects; predictably, they want guidance on identifying, evaluating, integrating,

and documenting sources for academic projects" (Lundsford viii). The creators of the text

clearly recognize the importance of electronic writing situations that contemporary

students of writing are faced with on a daily basis when they state in the preface that

"students read and write in more digital formats than ever . . . [so] this edition features

integrated e-Pages selections online. These multimodal selections extend the breath of the

examples in *Everything's an Argument with Readings* to include speeches, audio slideshows,

and interactive infograpic, and more" all of which contribute to the digital literacy of

students who are congruently gaining classically-based rhetorical writing instruction

(Lundsford viii).

  While *Everything's an Argument* does not devote many pages to the formatting and

characteristics of multiple online writing genres, its comprehensive rhetorical instruction

and expansive understanding of argument (and therefore expanded look at what is subject

to rhetorical analysis) makes the instruction provided more effective for the contemporary

composition student. The success of this text, in terms of the four-way test, is that it

displayed the most dramatic and intentional break from the traditional pattern followed by

most composition textbooks that Welch has described. The authors state that their

"imaginative and winning approach" is characterized by "going beyond traditional pro/con

assumptions to show that argument is everywhere" and in doing so *begins* to break the

pattern of unconscious theory that most often includes a reliance on the modes of

discourse and an inclusion of partial canons. While the rhetorical canons are nearly the

only major rhetorical concept not distinctly mentioned, the text still applies each of the

canons more completely than many competing texts by including detailed sections on style,

research and organization, and presentation. As usual, any real discussion of *memoria* is

absent. Where *Everything's an Argument* does a better job of breaking free from the

structure that Welch identified is with abandoning the inclusion the modes as a way to teach writing across genres—nowhere in the text are essays divided into types like evaluation, explanation or argument---because everything is an argument, only arguments are analyzed by categories like "fact" or "definition."

The highly rhetorical emphasis integrated in the text's instruction to consider everything as an argument, exists as an influential and necessary step toward breaking free of the consciousness of writing in the traditional fashion. Out of the texts held to the four-way text, the perspective described in *Everything's an Argument* lends itself best to breaking free of the traditional textbook structure and moving towards developing a writing pedagogy and curriculum that is inclusive of instruction regarding how to write and use technology effectively in the contemporary composition classroom. Even in a text as unique and modernly progressive as *Everything's an Argument,* there are still many aspects that are recognizably influenced by the traditional textbook *memoria.* A primary example of this is its neglect to directly mention the rhetorical canons, especially memory and delivery. Imagining a revised version of *Everything's an Argument* where elements such as the rational abandonment of the canons in a distinguished rhetoric were broken, would result in a very different and a much more comprehensive and effective text for contemporary composition courses.

The next two texts included in my analysis, which also show an adherence to the same disciplinarily *memoria,* were published by Pearson and Norton publishing companies. The first is the sixth edition of A *Brief Guide to Writings from Readings* (*Writings from Readings*), written by Stephen Wilhoit (Appendix E). Wilhoit's *Writings from Readings* exists as an archetype of the traditional college textbook. While an adherence to the same

memoria is evident, his text follows a somewhat different, less modernized appearance than the texts published by Bedford St. Martin. Whereas the majority of Bedford St. Martin composition textbooks feature a chart that details what elements of the text are "correlated to the WPA outcome statement," the Pearson text does not contain any explanation of its pedagogical backing. The level to which the text is pedagogically informed is then left far more to the interpretation of its content in order to deduce the pedagogical considerations of the text's authors. The "goal" of *Writings from Readings,* as stated in the preface, is "to help students master one of the most common academic genres—writings from readings" (xv). It is clear from the content and organization of the text that "writings from readings" refers to teaching students the ability to read academic texts critically, and to both responded to those readings in their own writings and use those readings as a source of research to support students own arguments.

The focus that *Writings from Readings* has on reading academic texts critically and responding to those texts in writing produces instruction that is applicable across genres and disciplines. Learning how to critically read and annotate texts and then respond to them in a scholarly manner is critical to higher education, across disciplines, and should be a focus of general education writing courses. However, as stated previously *Writings from Readings* is a very traditional text. By traditional, I mean that it follows the disciplinary *memoria* characterized by Welch as adhering to unconscious theory in writing instruction even more strictly than many of the Bedford St. Martin texts. The unconscious theory is exemplified the distinct lack of commentary on its pedagogical or theoretical backing. Furthermore, the structure of writing assignments is done according to the modes of discourse. For example, the text is divided into essay "types," ranging from response and

informative essays to argumentative and critique. So rather than using the rhetorical based chapters as a foundation on which to explain the methods of good academic writing as a whole, the text divides writing down into a few key essay genres—an organization that is rather outdated and highly representative of that disciplinarily *memoria*. Specifically, this format marks this text as relying heavily on the *memoria* that is ingrained in this textbook structure since a more modern rhetoric, designed for digital natives, uses rhetorically informed writing instruction as a base form to all writing, since rhetorical instruction centers around adapting the writing process for any rhetorical situation (including those online), rather than adapting the writing process for particular types of essays.

Overall, *Writings from Readings* is an effective text for those composition courses that are focused on research and building scholarly academic writing, as long as it is supplementary to a more modern "rhetoric" that is more aware of the needs of digital age writing students. The focus on critical reading and the ability to integrate research into students' own writing makes this text apply to a unique group of composition student. As a text published in 2012, it is surprisingly void of technological integration considering most of the writing, research, and reading done by contemporary students of composition is done in electronic spaces. These factors result in *Guides for Writing* being an excellent text for advanced composition students, but one that should not stand alone as the only text for a course, as it does not cover all writing instruction necessary in a digital age composition class.

The final text included in my analysis is the third edition of *The Norton Field Guide to Writing (Norton Field Guide),* published by Norton publishing company and is written by Richard Bullock, Maureen Daly Goggin, and Francine Weinberg (Appendix F). The first two

editions of the *Norton Field Guide* "became the best-selling college rhetoric" so expectations for the third edition were high (Bullock v). The goal of this edition is to "offer the kind of writing guides found in the best rhetoric's in a format as user-friendly as the best handbooks, and on top of that, to be as brief as could be" (Bullock v). At 235 pages, the text is not necessarily brief, but does present pedagogically informed content in a concise and manageable way. The *Norton Field Guide* is clearly a rhetoric, and therefore highly informed by rhetorical pedagogy and is complimented by a heavy emphasis on process pedagogy.

The technological focus within the content of the text, as well as the many digital components existing outside the text, also presents the *Norton Field Guide* as a text that is highly sensitive to the needs of digital age students and teachers. Throughout the text there is content that clearly acknowledges that contemporary students of composition are producing and consuming texts from electronic writing spaces. The area of the text which best acknowledges this is chapters fifty-two through fifty-six, which gives students "guidance on choosing the appropriate print, electronic, or spoken medium; designing text; using images and sound; giving spoken presentations; and writing online" (Bullock vi). While other texts devoted pages to writing in certain online genres like blogs or wikis, the *Norton Field Guide* is the only text in my analysis that devoted whole chapters to instructing students on making rhetorical choices when composing in electronic writing spaces in general. It is clear that the writers of *Norton Field Guide* understand that writing classes, which require students to only write the traditional essay, are no longer completely progressive to students' success, since the writing demands of digital age students of writing require knowledge of multimodal composition.

Despite the increased integration of digital literacy in comparison to competing textbooks, the *Norton Field Guide* still shows many areas where traditional *memoria* was a factor. While the text is rhetorically focused, there is a lack of comprehensive rhetorical instruction and the old fashioned inclusion of the modes. The heavy inclusion of digital literacy, specifically detailed content regarding writing across online genres, helps to make up for the partial theory evident in situations like the limited rhetorical instruction. Like *Everything's an Argument,* the *Norton Field Guide* does begin to break away from the traditional textbook structure in certain areas. However, in order for students to get the most out the sections breaking free of *memoria* that focus heavily on digital literacy, the instructor would need to be adamant about using those specific chapters as well as the online tools that accompany the text. The text alone provides only enough content to promote awareness of online genres and electronic writing spaces but with frequent use of the additional online tools, coupled with the instruction provided in the text, students would be able to gain introductory skills in writing electronically across genres and disciplines. If the *memoria* dictating the inclusion of only partial theory was recognized and then abandoned in the constructing of this text, it would represent a more modern and comprehensive textbook for contemporary writing courses.

CONCLUSION

Each of the textbooks included in this analysis and held to the four-way test were published within the last four years by leading publishing companies in the field of composition. The test revealed unique elements in each text as well as varying levels of digital literacy integration. However, a consistent finding in the analysis of each text is that they all display a reliance on the same traditional textbook structure and content as first described by Welch in 1987. The ideology that keeps us bound to the *memoria* perpetuating the cycle of "unconscious theory" adopted in many of the leading writing textbooks used today, is not only the personal *memoria* of those writing and selecting the textbooks to use in courses but also the ideology of what a writing textbook "should contain," as revealed through the perspective of publishing companies. What is key to this understanding is that publishing companies share in this disciplinary *memoria.* Publishing companies select texts for publication that mimic the proven "best sellers," like the St. Martins Guide to Writing, which relies heavily on the traditional content and structure of widely used texts sold previously. While it is evident by the minimal incorporation of technological instruction in modern composition textbooks that contemporary scholars are beginning to recognize the importance of digital literacy for composition students, they are less inclined to more drastically reinvent the structure of the writing textbook because the likelihood of getting that text published is lowered, consequently affecting their promotion and tenure.

The original draft of this thesis contained an analysis of five composition textbooks published by Bedford St. Martin. The reason for this was mere accessibility. Between the composition courses that I have taught, across two campuses, and in working closely with

the director of writing at Colorado State University-Pueblo, the majority of first-year

writing textbooks available to study were in large part produced by Bedford St. Martin. My

intention was to produce a fair study and therefore had to include an analysis of textbooks

published by more than one company. This presented a challenge since Bedford St. Martin

existed as the only company willing to send several desk copies of newly published

rhetorics without purchase. Gaining access to the Pearson and Norton textbooks was made

possible merely by chance. *A Brief Guide to Writings from Readings,* happened to be the only

recently published Pearson text that the director of writing had access to, which gave me

no choice but to include it in my study. And the Norton text, *The Norton Field Guide to*

Writing, made its way into the study because I was lucky enough to run into the Norton

representative on the day she was visiting campus. Had I not been on campus, that day, the

chances of me gaining access to the newest version of Norton's top selling rhetoric, for free,

would have been little to none.

Normally the only people that gain access to a variety of newly published course

material are those tasked to select material for particular courses. For first-year writing,

that makes the Director of Writing one of the only individuals to ever put textbooks side by

side and assess their quality. They do this with the programmatic and disciplinarily

stipulations in mind, and usually end up subjectively choosing whatever text seems to fit

into the "effective, high quality" rating based on institution designated criteria and their

own *memoria.* The low level of accessibility of first-year writing textbooks for study, rather

than selection for a particular writing course at a particular university, is something that

may be contributing to the influence of *memoria* going unnoticed for so long.

Ultimately, there exists a cycle dictated by *memoria* that influences the way that

textbooks are created, which ones get published, and ultimately which ones are used in the classroom. The cycle then continues when students in those classrooms, using traditionally structured textbooks, become academics and start to compose texts of their own. When students become academics and produce scholarship in the form of textbooks, the only example available for recollection and safe emulation is that same traditional text they once encountered in the composition classroom. Until there is a renewed interest in *memoria* within the field of composition, specifically in regard to the influence that *memroia* has in dictating the structure and content within textbooks, the cycle will perpetuate and students will not be presented with course material that is truly proactive to their success.

One thing that is certain is that the traditional textbook no longer fits in the contemporary higher education classroom. Like everything, they must grow and evolve to the demands of the time. An acknowledgement of this can be found in the article written by Jeffrey R. Young titled, "The Object Formerly Known as the Textbook." Young's article was published by The Chronicle of Higher Education in January of 2013 and presents a modern perspective on textbooks by stating,

> Textbook publishers argue that their newest digital products shouldn't even be called "textbooks." They're really software programs built to deliver a mix of text, videos, and homework assignments . . . One publisher calls its products "personalized learning experiences," another "courseware," and one insists on using its own brand name, "MindTap." For now, this new product could be called "the object formerly known as the textbook.

Whether the textbooks in question are too digitalized or too traditional, important questions on just what these "objects" should look like and what they should contain is vital

to the evolution of any discipline in the digital age. But in order to develop answers to these questions, I argue that the influences that have dictated what course materials contain should be recognized and considered. Otherwise, those same forces of *memoria* will be at work contradicting efforts to evolve for the digital age.

The time to question the textbooks used in composition is now. Composition studies finds itself in a world composed of electronic writing spaces, where it would be hard to find a college campus not fitted with computers, just as it would be hard to find a composition course that does not require interaction with technology, even if that interaction is as limited as requiring essays to be typed rather than hand written. So "how do computers assist the recovery and the discovery of knowledge?" One key answer to this question is that computers, and their incorporation into the work force and our every day lives, render textbooks useless until they contain the instruction necessary to help students develop digital literacy. Computers, in the writing classroom, represent a challenge to our discourse *memoria* and perhaps the best place to gage the evolution and acceptance of that *memoria* is through the textbooks produced and utilized in first-year composition—the texts containing the most foundational elements to the field. The steadily increasing number of computers being embraced in the writing classroom, as well as the content making its way into textbooks that begin to discuss how to use technology, not only recover and discover knowledge, but also produce it, represents a disciplinary *memoria* that is evolving. That *memoria* has considerable influence over the direction that the discipline will take, so it is important that it continues to evolve to the demands of current society.

While there is evidence of an expanding *memoria,* analysis of key composition textbooks has shown that we still cling to the traditions of pedagogy and scholarship that

once proved effective in a print based society, even though we are well into the digital age. Even some of the most innovative textbooks being used today, continue to echo the traditional arrangement identified by Welch in 1987, both in their structure and content. The continual inclusion of unconscious theory, partial canons, and modes of discourse stand as evidence of the role that disciplinary, institutional, and program *memoria* have in the textbooks that end up being used in writing classrooms.

For some time now, *memoria* has been virtually abandoned in the field of composition, with nearly no acknowledgement of its existence in first year writing textbooks and only a small handful of scholars dedicating the time to publish on the topic. In order for the field to assess the effectiveness of the texts we use to teach our students, the fourth canon, and its influence, must be reconsidered. Only when *memoria,* as an important element to any rhetorical situation, is resurrected will we be able to objectively consider the influences working upon us in the creation and selection of the textbooks put to use in first-year writing courses. Once the *memoria* that impacts the way we consider textbooks is fully recognized, we will be able to more objectively and efficiently determine the content that should be included in these texts in order to develop a curriculum productive in an age dictated by communicating digitally. Acknowledging the effect that *memoria* has had, will then be the key to establishing new content that is designed to be more effective in aiding contemporary composition students to become more successful writers in the digital age.

WORK CITED

Allen, Virginia. "The Faculty of Memory." *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery Classical Concepts*

    for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Ed. John Fredrick Reynolds.

    Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 45-63. Print.

Axelrod, Rise B., and Charles Raymond Cooper. *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*. 9th ed.

    Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2010. Print.

Bleich, David. "In Case of Fire, throw in (What to Do with Textbooks Once you Switch to

    Sorcebooks." (*Re)visioning Composition Textbooks: Conflicts of Culture, Ideology, and*

    Pedagogy. Ed. Xiu Liu Gale; Fredric G. Gale. Albany: State University of New York

    Press. 1999. 15-42. Print.

Bolter, Jay. "Hypertext and the Rhetorical Canons." *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery Classical*

    Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Ed. John Fredrick

    Reynolds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 97-111. Print.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *College*

    English, *46*(7), 1984: 635–652. Print.

Bryant, Lizbeth. "A Textbook's Theory: Current Composition Theory in Argument

    Textbooks." (*Re)visioning Composition Textbooks: Conflicts of Culture, Ideology, and*

    Pedagogy. Ed. Xiu Liu Gale; Fredric G. Gale. Albany: State University of New York

    Press. 1999. 113-133. Print.

Bullock, Richard, Maureen D. Goggin, and Francine Weinberg. *Norton Field Guide to Writing,*

    with Readings and Handbook. 3rd ed: W. W. Norton & Company, 2013. Print.

Burns, Hugh. "Four dimensions of significance: Tradition, method, theory, originality."

    Computers and Composition, *21*(1), 2004: 5–13.

Clark, Elizabeth. "The Digital Imperative: Making the Case for a 21st-Century Pedagogy."

    Computers and Composition, *27*.1 2010: 27–35. Print.

Crowley, Sharon. "Modern Rhetoric and Memory." *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery Classical*

    Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Ed. John Fredrick

    Reynolds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 31-44. Print.

Frederick Renyolds, John. "Memory Issues in Composition Studies." *Rhetorical Memory and*

    Delivery Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Ed.

    John Frederick Renyolds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 1-15. Print.

Gale, Xin Liu. "The 'Full Toolbox' and Critical Thinking: Conflicts and Contradictions in *The*

    St. Martin's Guide to Writing." (*Re)visioning Composition Textbooks: Conflicts of*

    Culture, Ideology, and Pedagogy. Ed. Xiu Liu Gale; Fredric G. Gale. Albany: State

    University of New York Press. 1999. 185-213. Print.

Hacker, Diana, and Nancy Sommers. *The Bedford Handbook*. 8th ed. N.p.: Bedford/st

    Martins, 2011. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea A., John J. Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters. *Everything's an Argument With*

    Readings. 6th ed. N.p.: Bedford/st Martins, 2012. Print.

Lunsford, K. J., Rohan, L., Roozen, K., Mary, P., Shipka, J., Ittersum, D. V., & Walker, J. "Re-

    situating and re-mediating the canons: A cultural-historical remapping of rhetorical

    activity." 2005. Web.

Marc, David. "Mass Memory: The Past in the Age of Television." *Rhetorical Memory and*

    Delivery Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Ed.

    John Fredrick Reynolds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 125-138.

    Print.

Olick, Jeffery. Robbins, Joyce. "Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the

    Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology*, *24*(1),

    1998: 105–140. Print

Palmquist, Mike. *Joining the Conversation: Writing in College and beyond*. Boston, MA:

    Bedford/St. Martins, 2010. Print.

Phillips, Kendell. "The Failure of Memory: Reflections on Rhetoric and Public

    Remembrance." *Western Journal of Communication*, *74*(2), 2010: 208–223. Print.

Porter, James. "Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric." *Computers and Composition*,

    26(4), 2009:207–224.

Rice, Jeff. *The Rhetoric of Cool: Composition Studies and New Media*. Carbondale: Southern

    Illinois UP, 2007. Print.

Rice, Jeff. "The 1963 Composition Revolution Will Not Be Televised, Computed, or

    Demonstrated By Any Other Means of Technology." *Composition Studies*, *33*.1 2005.

    Print.

Ruszkiewicz, John J., and Jay Dolmage. *How to Write Anything: A Guide and Reference*. 2nd

    ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2009. Print.

Ryan, Kathleen. "Memory, Literacy, and Invention: Reimagining the Cannon of Memory for

    the Writing Classroom." *Composition Studies. 32*(1). 2004:35-47. Print.

Selfe, Cynthia L. *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-first Century: The Importance of

    Paying Attention*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.

Swadley, Charles R. *Remembering Memory: Reconfiguring the Fourth Canon of Classical

    Rhetoric*. Dissertation. University of Oklahoma Graduate College, 2008. Ann Arbor:

    ProQuest, 2008. Print.

Van Ittersum, Derek. "Augmenting Literacy: The Role of Expertise in Digital Writing."
Composition Studies, *2*, 2011. 61–77.

Van Ittersum, Derek. "Distributing Memory: Rhetorical Work in Digital Environments."
Technical Communication Quarterly, *18*.3 2009. 259–280.

Welch, Kathleen E. "Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production: The Place of Theory in
Writing Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication* 38.3 (1987): 269-82.
Web.

Welch, Kathleen E. "Reconfiguring Writing and Delivery in Secondary Orality." *Rhetorical
Memory and Delivery Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and
Communication*. Ed. John Fredrick Reynolds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates, 1993. 17-30. Print.

Wright, Elizabethanda. "A History of the Arts of Memory and Rhetoric." *Rivier Academic
Journal* 5.2 (2009): 1-11. Web.

Wilhoit, Stephen. *A Brief Guide to Writing from Readings*. 6th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2012.
Print.

Young, Jeffery R. "The Object Formerly Known as the Textbook." *The Chronicle of Higher
Education*. 2013. Web.

APPENDIX A

The Four-Way Test: Providing Objective Analysis of First-Year Writing Textbooks

1. To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

☐ The text represents and includes several modern theories on the teaching of composition in a way that produces well-rounded and complete writing instruction.

☐ The text represents and includes a few modern pedagogical theories on the teaching of composition.

☐ The text does not clearly represent or include modern pedagogical theories on the teaching of composition.

2. To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

☐ The text incorporates comprehensive instruction on 21st century technology in a way that is progressive to student's apprehension of digital literacy in regard to consuming and producing writing in electronic spaces.

☐ The text incorporates some instruction on 21st century technology and how it can be used in the writing process.

☐ The text does not acknowledge or incorporate instruction on the impact that 21st century technology has on the writing process.

3. To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

☐ The text is organized and composed of content that is comprehensible and applicable for its audience.

☐ The text includes content that is written with appropriate style and diction for its audience but does not include enough explanation and detail for required writing concepts to be mastered.

☐ The text is not written or organized in a logical or comprehensible fashion for its audience.

4. To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

☐ The text contains comprehensive instructional material that is pedagogically diverse enough to enhance students' writing ability across genres and disciplines in the digital age.

☐ The text contains pedagogically informed instructional material but does not extend writing instruction to genres other than the essay.

☐ The text does not contain instruction comprehensive enough to produce rhetorically based writing skills applicable across genres and disciplines.

APENDIX B

ANALYSIS: *THE ST. MARTINS GUIDE TO WRITING*

-Rise B. Axelrod and Charles R. Cooper

To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

Throughout *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* (*Guide to Writing*), there is obvious effort to include a variety of pedagogical perspectives. The text is organized into six distinct parts followed by a handbook offering a "complete reference guide to grammar, word choice, punctuation, mechanics, common ESL problems, sentence structure, and usage" (Axelrod vii). While there is no pedagogical explanation or justification provided in the text, in each of the sections there is evidence that communicates an obvious consideration of a variety of pedagogical philosophies. Although pedagogical influence exists throughout the text, the amount varies significantly by section. Those with the most obvious inclusion of pedagogical consideration include sections one, two, and six. Section one is broken down into nine different writing activities and each of those activities include a collaborative activity intended to "help students start working in the genre" (Axelrod vi). Part six, titled "Writing and Speaking to Wider Audiences" also draws heavily from collaborative learning and service learning in order to help students learn how to cater their writing to a particular audience. This constant inclusion of collaborative activities clearly shows value for collaborative pedagogy and a belief in the notion that having students work together "provides a social context in which students can experience and practice the kinds of conversation value by college teachers" (Bruffee 642).

In turning from the emphasis on collaboration, After the emphasis on collaboration is established, part two and three are most heavily influenced by process pedagogy. Part

34

two, titled "Critical Thinking Strategies" provides students with "practical heuristics for invention and reading" and is thus focused on the first step of the writing process. A whole chapter dedicated to invention is clearly in line with the opinion of Peter Elbow, who suggested that writers should "free write" during the invention stage, which involved writing "non-stop without worrying about correctness, form, logic; play with words and ideas; form writing groups; and rely less at first on doubting and more on believing, less on criticism, more on imagination" (Tobin 2-3). This "play with words" is reflected in the chapter's suggestion to try various invention methods ranging from clustering, outlining, cubing, dramatizing, etc.

To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

A deeper analysis of these sections not only continues to prove pedagogical influence but also an acknowledgement of the next criteria in the four-way test—digital literacy. Part two of *Guides to Writing* not only serves as an excellent example of a textbook that includes what Welch describes as "unconscious theory," as it follows the structure of including "partial canons," but also presents a clear acknowledgement of students being placed in writing classrooms fitted with computers. For example, the eleventh chapter deals with the process of invention, stating that "chunking, a type of scratch outline commonly used by professional writers in business and industry and especially well suited to writing in the electronic age, consists of a set of headings describing the major points to be covered" (Axelrod 566). Furthermore, in the portion discussing the clustering method, there is a side panel reminding students that "software vendors have created a variety of

electronic tools to help people visualize complex projects," yet the text never goes into detail about how to use these digital tools most effectively or provides any recommendations of top software examples.

There are similar mentions of technological resources throughout the writing activities provided in part one as well. For example, in the first activity, titled "Remembering an Event" it suggests that students turn to "a private diary, a Facebook page . . . or a public blog" in order to help remember and gather information about an event that they may want to write about. The Handbook to the text also includes a small amount of recognition toward the digital tools available to students. In the preface to the handbook it states that, "below the heading of each numbered Handbook section is a URL that you can use to access interactive online exercises for practice in the topics covered in each section" (Axelrod H-1). Providing students with online exercises is innovative, but this inclusion is limited since it does not provide an online environment through which students can enhance their digital literacy. Even mention of other free, and quite helpful online tools or URL's, such as the OWL at Purdue or easybib.com, are left out. Even a detailed explanation on how to best use Google and Google Scholar would be more beneficial to students once they have moved beyond their freshmen composition class than only the curriculum contained in the text or its online platform, which students will only have access to while enrolled in a particular course. While the recognition of the technology available to students is positive and clearly useful, it is highly limited considering the digital literacy required in the work force; therefore, it would be more beneficial to students if this inclusion of digital tools were expanded on rather than existing only as a side note.

The portion of the *Guide to Writing* that best incorporates instruction relevant to the

digital native is in part four, chapter twenty-three, which focuses on "Library and Internet Research" (Axelrod 728). This chapter provides detailed information regarding how to find articles and other research using databases, search engines, interlibrary networks, online websites, and social networking sites. The text also provides detailed information on how to organize and take notes while doing research. What is particularly insightful about this section, is that the writers took care to consider their audience, that is mostly comprised of digital natives, by considering things such as Wikipedia "often [being] the first stop for students who are accustomed to consulting the open Internet first for information" and goes on to warn students on the "user-generated, rather than traditionally published" information available on the site (Axelrod 730). Another area where special attention was given to the needs of contemporary students is in the explanation of "Orienting Yourself to the Library," which covers how to do a self-guided tour, look for the availability of a virtual tour, and the possibilities of consulting with a librarian through "email, phone, or internet chat or messaging options" (Axelrod 729). Chapter twenty-three, with its rhetorically sound awareness of its digital age audience could serve as a great example of how to construct other chapters to more fully integrate the technological focus and instruction needed to become an effective writer in the digital age.

To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

The "Library and Internet Research" section of the *Guide to Writing* is clearly written in a way that is conscious of the needs of its audience, which brings us to the third stipulation in the four-way test, which focuses on an awareness of audience. For chapter

twenty-three, the answer to whether or not the writers of this text were clearly conscious of the needs of its first-year writing audience is, yes. For the most part, the rest of the text uses a style and diction appropriate for its audience, yet issues exist with the content base on which the structure of the book is founded. With this I am referring back to Welch's discussion of textbooks following and ideology that rests on "unconscious theory." The *Guide to Writing,* like many other texts, includes partial canons, and theory that is minimally included but with no recognition or explanation. Along with the emphasis on collaborative and process pedagogy, this text is clearly grounded in rhetorical theory, drawing from both the canons and the elements of the rhetorical triangle. Part two, chapter eleven, which focused on "Critical Thinking Strategies," serves as an example of partial canons. This chapter focuses only on invention and suggests arrangement, not by name but in concept, by explaining the organization of an outline, and ignores the other canons entirely. The process of *memoria* is only slightly alluded to in part one and is found in the very first writing activity titled, "Remembering an Event," but is never mentioned or discussed in content again throughout the rest of the text. Style is only indicated in part one, where in each of the writing activities there is an "explanation" of the genre section and a student-writing excerpt. Delivery, one could gather, was discussed by concept in part six, which revolves around how to present ones writing orally. Thus, invention was the only canons discussed both by name and by concept while the content of other canons were merely alluded to throughout various parts of the text. Presenting students with an incomplete set of rhetorical canons and never referring the ones included as "rhetorical canons" does not provide students with the information necessary to become effective writers, because they lack the terminology necessary to critically discuss and reflect on

their own writing and writing process.

The same type of buried inclusion exists throughout the text in regard to the elements of the rhetorical triangle. From the beginning of the text, in the preface, there is a section that provides a detailed chart aiming to explain "Features of *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing,* Ninth Edition, Correlated to the WPA Outcomes Statement" (Axelrod xvi). Half of this chart breaks down the "rhetorical knowledge" that is supposed to be translated by the text. These range from students needing instruction on how to "focus on a purpose," "respond to the needs of different audiences," and "respond appropriately to the different kinds of rhetorical situations" (Axelrod xvi). Each of these stipulations is correlated with an explanation of where in the text it is covered. For example, "focus on a purpose" is supposed to be detailed in part one as it "offers extensive discussion of the purpose(s) for the genre of writing" (Axelrod xvi). However, nowhere in the text is there an explanation, purpose, or audience, in rhetorical terms. The buried definition given for purpose in part one reads, "as you read remembered event essays, ask yourself what seems to be the writer's *purpose* in writing about this particular experience" (Axelrod 18). Never in the text does it explain how a purpose changes depending on a given occasion or on the audience designated by that particular occasion. Essentially, the third element of the rhetorical triangle is completely eliminated. Furthermore, the outcomes dictate that students should be able to "respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations" but nowhere in the text is rhetoric used or defined, nor is "rhetorical situation." How are we supposed to ask students to respond to a rhetorical situation, when they are not provided with the terminology in which to discuss and reflect on what they have been asked to do? This lack of introduction to the proper terminology not underestimated the students ability to

comprehend such concepts and harms their overall comprehension and reflection of the act, but also puts much more pressure on the instructor, then tasked with making sure students understand the concept without the term, or with introducing students to the term and explaining how it connects to the content provided in the textbook.

To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

So considering the lack of rhetorical terminology, and the continued ideologically informed structure characterized by partial canons and unconscious theory, does *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* fulfill the requirement of the final part of the four-way test—comprehensive instruction? The nine writing activities provided in part one include: "Remembering an Event," "Writing Profiles," "Explaining a Concept," "Finding Common Ground," "Arguing a Position," "Proposing a Solution," "Justifying an Evaluation," "Speculating about Causes," and "Analyzing Stories." Many of these writing projects, heavily reflect and are based on the traditional modes, in particular those focusing on "evaluation" and "explaining." I venture to claim that a large part of the reasoning behind the writing projects in the most recent version of this text is the neglect of a distinct rhetorical focus. Because the text does not explain the key elements to writing persuasively—the rhetorical canons and the elements of the rhetorical triangle—the text must regress to lower order writing processes like "explaining" something. Had the text devoted a section to exploring rhetorical concepts, a student may better understand not only the theoretical concept behind what they are being asked to do, but that any writing, even one that requires the explanation and evaluation of something, is inherently persuasive and has rhetoric at its

core. The deviation from rhetorical instruction results in lower order instruction, which is counterproductive in developing writing instruction appropriate to the digital age. In regard to this elimination of key concepts, Welch states,

> The problem with partial canons and the modes is that they do not have any aim. They are cut off from meaning because they are cut off from pointing forward to any life outside the test. They point back only to themselves and so implode meaninglessly. In most textbooks no connection is made to exist between a canon or a modal category and a desire to know where it came from and what will follow from it (Welch 275).

What is key to the success of this, and any textbook intended for use in a contemporary writing course, is that rhetorical and pedagogical theory must be fully incorporated into the curriculum in a way that both includes and evolves their classical concepts for writing in electronic spaces. In order for students to truly learn how to respond to a verity of rhetorical situations, the content in textbooks and the writing assignments presented in them should reflect the types of rhetorical situations that they will be presented with in academic, professional, and social environments.

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS: *JOINING THE CONVERSATION WRITING IN COLLEGE AND BEYOND*

-Mike Palmquist

To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

While there is no specific discussion of pedagogy in Palmquist's *Joining the Conversation,* the text is clearly designed to fulfill all the desired outcomes set by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), which are pedagogically informed. The detailed explanation of how the text fulfills the desired outcomes for first-year composition, given primarily in the chart appearing on pages xii-xv but also throughout the text illustrates a distinct effort to base content on what is pedagogically relevant to contemporary students of composition. Palmquist's text fulfills the requirements of the first element in the four-way test in that it is an "inquiry-based rhetoric focusing on purpose and genre" that combines rhetorical, collaborative, and process pedagogy with the importance of digital literacy and technology in the writing classroom (13).

What is especially unique about Palmquist's rhetoric is that it is inspired by and based off of Kenneth Burke's parlor metaphor, which is made evident by the title as well as the explanation given throughout the text. As a self proclaimed "rhetoric" *Joining the Conversation* is especially vigilant to incorporate "rhetorical knowledge," which is listed as the first WPA desired outcome, and does so by explaining purpose, audience, and the overall rhetorical situation in terms of "entering a conversation." The emphasis given on the writing situation, not as simply an opportunity to write about what one knows, but as something that is,

shaped by several factors, among them the purposes, needs, interests, and

backgrounds of the writers and readers of a document; the contexts—

physical, social, and cultural—in which a document is written and read;

related documents that have already been written by other writers; and the

type of document that is written (Palmquist 13).

This explanation clearly works to incorporate and show a value for rhetorical elements

being implemented into writing instruction. However, it is interesting that, for a rhetoric,

there is no discussion of the term "rhetoric" provided, nor is there any discussion of the

rhetorical appeals or purpose and audience being explained as part of the rhetorical

triangle. Again, it is as if rhetorical elements are valued but are taught only by concept

while the terms and the "larger picture" that these elements fit into is left out.

While *Joining the Conversation,* like many first-year composition texts that value

rhetorical pedagogy, explain only some of the rhetorical tools available to students of

writing, and some only by concept, it does go farther than most in connecting rhetorical

elements to context through the use of Burke's parlor metaphor. The conversation

metaphor also integrates collaborative and process pedagogy in a comprehensible way

through peer review, revision, and collaborative activities. Since the writing process is

treated like a conversation, there are activities and writing assignments in each chapter

that require students to work together in groups in order to talk and gain an idea of what

people talk about when they talk about a particular topic. For example, in chapter one an

activity is described that instructs students to "work together with your classmates to

explore roles during a conversation. In a group of five, ask three people to talk about a topic

that has recently been in the news . . . As the conversation unfolds, the other two members

of the group should listen and write down the different roles that are adopted" (Palmquist

12). This type of collaborative activity is then praxis combining Burke's metaphor and the invention stage to the writing process.

To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

Using the parlor metaphor also proves to be an especially innovative way to express a value for technology and to connect to students that are digital natives. For example, in chapter one where students are introduced to the idea that the writing process works like a conversation, it is explained not only in terms of an oral conversation but online as well, when it states, "you already know how conversations work—online and off" (Palmquist 6). It goes on to explain,

> Many of us are as likely to engage in conversations through writing as through speaking. Some of us prefer a text message to a phone call. Some of us spend more time using e-mail than talking with friends. Some of us spend entire evenings on Web discussion forums . . . some of us post, read, and reply to blogs on a regular basis. And some of us spend more time keeping up with friends on Facebook or MySpace than we do hanging out together (Palmquist 6).

This explanation brings theory and the writing process together in a way that is recognizable and understandable to contemporary students. This type of focus is not only progressive and supportive of students' digital literacy but is clearly appealing to an audience comprised of digital natives, thus emulating the type of audience specific writing that is asked of students. It is evident throughout the text that Palmquist understands that

"technology has also changed what writing looks like" (vii). The text features discussions of how to use "chat sessions, e-mail discussion lists, Web discussion forums, wikis, and blogs to generate and refine ideas, file-sharing Websites to share documents; and word processing programs" (Palmquist xv). And if these explanations are not enough, the text also provides a list of "more digital choices" ranging from an e-book to the bedfordstmartins.com/conversation site that includes open resources ranging from how-to guides to research and peer review" options. *Joining the Conversation* therefore passes the second component of the four-way test, since there are many elements "throughout the book [that] reflect the range of online and visual genres that writers draw on for both sources of ideas and examples of design conventions to inspire and adapt" (vii).

To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

Joining the Conversation also does a better job at satisfying the third element of the four-way test than most texts of its kind. While several areas of the text are particularly well adapted for its digital native audience base as discussed earlier, there are areas that could be improved in terms of comprehension. Overall, the diction, style, and organization of the text is quite suitable; however, this text, like many other's, follows the structure described by Welch characterized by partial inclusion of the rhetorical canons and unconscious theory.

Similar to the way that the text provides no definition or reference to "rhetoric" or the appeals, there is also no reference to the rhetorical canons. The parlor metaphor and beginning the writing process collaboratively through group conversations is clearly

invention, although there is never any reference to it being part of the "invention" stage. Likewise, part four "Crafting and Polishing Your Contribution" focusing on drafting and revising is the area that is most clearly informed by the canons of arrangement, style, and delivery and the project in part two, instructing students about "writing to reflect," is the only area that memory is discussed. Again, these concepts are included by concept only, with no reference or explanation to their greater context.

To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

Overall, the content of *Joining the Conversation* fulfills the fourth element of the four-way test better that the texts analyzed previously, as it "contains instruction comprehensive enough to enhance students' writing ability across genres and disciplines." The incorporation of Burke's metaphor throughout the text works to make Welch's "unconscious theory" more conscious and while more context and definitions could be provided, rhetorical elements are explained in a more comprehensive way than similar texts. Perhaps the most progressive element of *Joining the Conversation* is its keen acceptance and integration of how technology has changed writing, which is shown through Palmquist's writing instruction that is adapted to integrate the digital tools available to and understood by students who are predominantly digital natives.

APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS: *EVERYTHING'S AN ARGUMENT*

-Andrea A. Lundsford, John J. Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters

To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

Everything's an Argument, in its sixth edition has shown considerable evolution

through which it has grown in response to the cultural and academic needs of students as

well as the progression of modern theories of writing pedagogy. While this text does not

distinctly include or focus on any other pedagogical stance outside of rhetorical, the text

still exists as one that is pedagogically sound in that its rhetorically driven content is

extremely comprehensive and therefore encompasses and lends itself to be adapted to any

writing pedagogy.

The evidence of the text's rhetorically based origins exists throughout the text from

its proactive title to its content, and even the organization of that content. Everything in the

text was designed with clear rhetorical intent, from cover to cover. As discussed in the

preface, the text's title is designed to be "purposefully controversial" in order to represent

the "core tenants of the book," which include:

> First, language provides the most powerful means of understanding to help
>
> shape lives. Second, argument seldom if ever only have two sides; rather,
>
> they present a dizzying array of perspectives, often with as many "takes" on a
>
> subject as they are arguers . . . Finally, and most important, all language and
>
> symbols are in some way argumentative, pointing in a direction and asking
>
> for yet another response, whether it be understanding, identification, or
>
> persuasion (Lunsford vii).

These tenants are continually represented throughout the text, from its cover that features

images that range from the protests of Arab Spring of 2011, to the "99%" sign from an

Occupy movement, through content that asks students not only to analyze academic essays

and editorials, but smartphone apps, website designs, ads, and clothes. The most significant

aspect reflecting rhetorical pedagogy is the Aristotelian rhetorical instruction that is used

throughout the text. As a text that is both a rhetoric and reader its focus and organization

centers around rhetorical instruction that does not focus only on concept but also

terminology. In discussing how "everything's an argument" the text gives expansive detail,

key rhetorical concepts including but not limited to, the rhetorical appeals, the fallacies of

argument, the elements of a rhetorical situation, and the organization of classical oration.

To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components

of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

In reaction to the need for technological instruction to be merged with that of

writing and rhetoric, the authors of *Everything's an Argument* have added chapters on

"Academic Arguments" and "Research and Arguments" to this sixth edition. These chapters

provide and "explanation of what academic writing actually looks like . . . [and]what

successful writers do when they build arguments from source materials"—materials that

are, more often that not, digital (Lundsford vii). In addition to the new chapters,

Everything's an Argument comes with a wide array of electronic resources. These tools

range from a student site that includes free resources like video tutorials from

VideoCentral, multimedia tutorials from iseries and an e-Book version of the text. The

digital resources available with this text not only benefit the students but also the

instructor. The text includes instructor resources including TeachingCentral, an online

collection of reference works and sourcebooks among other things, Bedford Bits, a

collection and blog of creative ideas for teaching, and Bedford Coursepacks, which allows

instructors to integrate course content from Bedford St Martin into their own course

management system. Due to the rhetorical nature of the text, *Everything's and Argument*

exists as one of the more comprehensible texts for students of first year composition

courses. Not only is the content comprehensive, but the entire organization of the book was

designed with clear rhetorical intent. The purpose of the text, as detailed by the authors in

the preface states,

> . . . our purpose in *Everything's and Argument with Readings* is to present
>
> argument as something we do almost from the moment we are born . . . In
>
> pursuing this goal, we try to keep specialized terminology to a minimum. Bur
>
> we also see argument, and want students to regard it, as a craft both
>
> powerful and professional. So we have designed *Everything's and Argument*
>
> *with Readings* to be in itself a case for civil persuasion, with a voice that aims
>
> to appeal to readers cordially but that doesn't hesitate to make demands on
>
> them when appropriate (Lundsford ix).

The purpose of the text, and its overall goal are achieved by the comprehensive content and

the arrangement of that content. Most competing texts are ruled by what Welch calls

"unconscious theory." I have noted in earlier analysis that one characteristic of this

unconscious theory is a pattern of presenting concept without the accompanying

terminology to discuss that content. This is a pattern broken in *Everything's an Argument.*

To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

In the attempt to achieve the goals listed above, the authors of the text note that they "try to keep specialized terminology to a minimum" (Lundsford ix). What is especially interesting about this is the acknowledgment of terminology included throughout the text, used to explain the rhetorical concepts presented. Other composition texts analyzed here do not have any acknowledgment or disclaimer regarding the terminology used, which is then followed by a distinct lack of terminology. However, in *Everything's an Argument,* there exists an expansive use of terminology to explain rhetorical concepts. In fact, this is the only self-proclaimed "rhetoric" that actually includes the following rhetorical terms throughout the text: rhetoric, ethos, pathos, logos, kairos, stasis, rhetorical situation, etc. Most other rhetorics do include a small selection of these rhetorical tools to explain, as important to the writing process, but never do so by using the actual term. It is clear that the creators of this text recognize that knowing the language to discuss a concept is vital to understanding, discussing, and employing that concept in writing. The inclusion of rhetorical terminology does require students to rise to the challenge and learn an array of new vocabulary, but in the end, knowing how to intelligently and effectively use that terminology and employ the concept that the term represents leads, to an overall better understanding of the curriculum presented.

The readings selected for this text, and the way that they are categorized also contribute to students developing world schema and overall writing, critical thinking, and analysis capability. The writers of the text note that they "sought readings that will challenge students to consider new perspectives on topics they may feel they already

understand and, in particular, to contextualize themselves in a world characterized by increasing globalization and divisive political rhetoric" (Lundsford ix-x). Readings are organized into chapters focusing on key cultural questions such as "How Does Popular Culture Stereotype you?" and "How Do We Define 'Inequality' in American Society?" Each of the readings designated under these chapter titles then make a different argument answering that question. This pattern illustrates Burke's parlor metaphor by presenting students with the "conversations" going on about each argument. Not only does this pattern help achieve their goal of showing students that "arguments seldom if ever have only two sides" but it also gives students a clear example of what a conversation about a topic looks like and how to enter it. Furthermore, the reading selections and organization also make Mike Palmquist's *Joining the Conversation* an excellent companion text to *Everything's an Argument.*

To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

Overall, *Everything's an Argument* is the most comprehensive first-year composition textbook analyzed in this work and, based on the result of the four-way test, I believe that it does include the content necessary to provide students will the skill to write effectively across a variety of genres and disciplines. The most obvious reason for this adaptability of skill is the texts expansive view of "argument." Not only do students analyze academic essays, editorials, and literary works, as many other rhetoric and reader combination texts direct, but the overtly rhetorical focus of this text provides students with a change of perspective. Rhetorical analysis is not only applicable to the printed word, but "texts" of all

kinds, including digital compositions like websites and smartphone applications. This

expanded and inherently modern application of classical rhetoric gives students the ability

to look at their world differently, not merely the writing encountered in the classroom.

ANALYSIS: *A BRIEF GUDIE TO WRITINGS FROM READINGS*

-Stephen Wilhoit

To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

Due to the heavy emphasis on critical reading, summarizing, and proper use of quotations in writing, A *Brief Guide to Writings from Readings* (*Writings from Readings*) seems particularly well suited for a higher-level composition class, such as English 102, that focuses on research and distantly "academic" essay writing. At first, *Writings from Readings* does not appear to have any one, overriding pedagogical alliance. Upon detailed investigation, the two pedagogical philosophies that appear to have been considered most in the construction of *Writings from Readings* is process and rhetorical. The two elements that appear at the end of each chapter, which exist as strong evidence to process pedagogy, are the "summary charts" and "revision checklists." The summary chart is essentially a flow chart that details the steps to the writing process most appropriate for whatever type of writing that particular essay focuses on. Likewise, the revision checklist focuses on the revision strategies most important for the genre of writing that the chapter explained. For example, chapter seven centers on how to compose rhetorical analysis essays. Each of these genre focused essays are particularly effective because they begin with a "definition and purpose" section and steadily progress through an explanation of the type of writing, as well as details on how the writing process adapts for that particular genre. The concluding summary chart and revision checklist then exist as a final, condensed reminder of each step of the writing process that should be followed when writing an essay in that particular genre. It is the adaption of the writing process for each genre, from response

essays to rhetorical analysis, and the inclusion of critical reading (of the assignment and/or research) as the first step to the writing process, that makes the process pedagogy in this textbook unique.

Writings from Readings is also highly informed by rhetorical pedagogy. The most obvious example of this is the two chapters devoted to rhetorical instruction titled "Rhetorical Analysis of Written Texts" and "Rhetorical Analysis of Visual Texts." While there are only two chapters specifically focused on rhetoric, those two chapters present students with more necessary information and terminology than what is contained throughout entire texts that specifically claim to be "rhetorics." Furthermore, since the text's preliminary focus is on writing from readings, the sections of the book that instruct students on critical reading draw from rhetorical ideals by explaining that they should "engage in a dialogue with the text, posing and working our answers to tough questions concerning the material's purpose, audience, language, and content" (Wilhoit 3). Although students do not get a detailed explanation of how to compose a rhetorical analysis of written texts until chapter seven, from the first few pages of the book they are asked to consider rhetorical elements, like the purpose and target audience of a text.

To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

The traditional nature of Writings from Readings works well in presenting content that is pedagogically informed. However, the portion of the four-way test where this text is lacking the most is in how well it "acknowledges, incorporates, and encourages components of 21st century technology." There are only two areas in the text where

technology is acknowledged. One area is in the last chapter titled "References Lists and

Work Cited Entries," where MLA and APA format are explained. In both the MLA and APA

section, the text dedicates two pages to citing "electronic sources of information" that cover

how to write a citation line for research found on CD-ROM's, Information Databases, Email,

and Online Publications (Wilhoit 294). The other, and most prominent incorporation of

technology appears both in the preface and on the back cover of the book. These areas

feature explanation of "Pearson's MyCompLab," which is a website that "integrates the

market-leading instruction, multimedia tutorials, and exercises for writing, grammar, and

research" (Wilhoit xvi). The online space accessible with the purchase of this text has the

potential to be highly useful in helping students to develop digital literacy by using

electronic writing spaces and e–portfolios—if instructors require students to do so. Since

there is no other digital component anywhere in the text, students would not recognize

that writing in the 21st century is highly digitalized unless instructors take the time to set

up this online component to the text and require students to use it.

To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious

of its first-year composition student audience?

Unlike many of the Bedford St. Martin's texts analyzed here, *Writings from Readings,*

published by Pearson, does not follow the pattern of explaining concept without the

necessary terminology required to fully understand the concept. Much of this text focuses

on critical reading, responding to those readings in writing, and overall rhetorical analysis

stills. In the chapter that explains how to write a rhetorical analysis, the definition and

purpose of writing such a work is provided, which is similar to other textbooks; however,

what sets *Writings from Readings* apart is that key terminology, such as ethos, pathos, and logos, are also provided, defined, and explained in context. It is this inclusion of concept explanation as well as instruction on how to use terms that need to be understood in order to successfully write in the genre, that makes the material more comprehensive. In this way, *Writings from Readings* presents material that is comprehensible for its first-year composition student audience and passes the third element of the four-way test.

Another element that contributes to the *Writings from Readings* high rating on the third element of the four-way test is its emphasis on critical reading. Focusing a text on helping students to master the ability to read, comprehend, and responded to academic readings through writing is not only unique but shows an acknowledgement of a specific audience. The unique content included in this first year composition text narrows the audience down to advanced or second semester composition students. This narrowed audience base makes the text appropriate only for those institutions that have composition classes broken down into introductory academic writing, followed by a second class that asks students to expand their writing skills and respond to research. In this way, the programmatic *memoria* involved in the development and selection of this text is clear. Since Wilhoit wrote a book that would be best suited for composition classes that include a reading and research component, he most likely came from a program with a similar structure. Likewise, those who select this textbook for a class most likely do so for an institution that builds off of the memoria characterized by a series of general education writing courses where responding to research is a key learning outcome of the *program*.

To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

Another element that marks this text as being especially traditional is its appearance. Throughout the other texts analyzed in this work, pictures, graphs, note boxes, screen shots, and color adorned every page. With the exception of the front and back cover, the entire book is black and white. Even in chapter eight, which focuses on analyzing visual texts, there is only one image and it is still void of color and comprised mostly of text. On one hand, the lack of color, pictures, and other eye-catching details makes the text look serious and traditionally academic in nature. This can be a good thing for institutions, students, and professors that are focused on a high level of academic imaging. However, this design can also be seen as rhetorically ineffective for students who have low levels of attention to textbooks and the study of writing in general. For them, the color and images might make the text appear less intimidating and more accessible. This usability factor is especially prominent when considering that the lack of images included in this text may directly correlate to the lack of technology. Most of the textbooks that are riddled with images are those that have a high level of technological integration and emphasis. Images most often take the form of screenshots of webpages that can be subject to rhetorical analysis. The lack of images, let alone digital images, in this text only illustrates the way in which failing the second element of the four way test—technology integration— contributes to falling short in the last element of the test, which assesses the overall effectiveness of the text. In other words, the lack of technology awareness contributed to the style of the text, may be viewed by many students as intimidating and not applicable to writing in electronic formats.

ANALYSIS: *THE NORTON FIELD GUIDE TO WRITING*

-Richard Bullock, Maureen Daly Goggin, Francine Weinberg

To what extent is the text pedagogically informed?

Even in the first few chapters of the text, it is clear that *The Norton Field Guide to Writing* (*Norton Field Guide*) is grounded in rhetorical pedagogy. The first six chapters are categorized as focusing on the "rhetorical situation." These chapters are then designated to "focus on purpose, audience, genre, stance, media and design, and writing in academic contexts" (Bullock vi). In addition to the beginning chapters focusing on select elements of the rhetorical situation, "almost every" one of the subsequent chapters "includes a short list of tips to help students focus on their particular rhetorical situation" (Bullock vi). The focus on the first few chapters of the text being rhetorical is clearly strategic and sets readers up to approach writing assignments with key rhetorical tools in mind. Among these rhetorical elements discussed, there is an explanation of how all writing contains a purpose and likewise all writing has an audience to which writing must be directed. The explanation of audience in the *Norton Field Guide* is especially unique and is "defined as *known, multiple, or unknown*" (Bullock 6). The way audience is broken down into categories is an interesting way to help students begin to identify or classify the audience of their writing before they are instructed to ask themselves specific questions about their audience's demographic information.

Purpose and audience, which cover chapters one and two respectively, are then tied into chapters three through six which focus on genre, stance, media/design, and academic contexts. In each of these chapters, there is an explanation on how the purpose and

audience for writing influence the other factors of the rhetorical situation listed previously. At first glance this approach seems sufficient and tactful in getting students to approach writing from a rhetorical perspective, if they are instructed to read the book in chronological order, from the beginning. However, these first few chapters also emulate the attempt at including information "as brief as could be" (Bullock v). The *Norton Field Guide* defines the "rhetorical situation" as "the context in which writing or other communication takes place, including purpose, audience, genre, stance, and media/design" (Bullock G/I-40). This definition is clearly narrowed down from a longer and more complex idea of Aristotelian rhetoric. The attempt at giving students only the most necessary information is clear, but neglecting to include any mention or definition of the term "rhetoric" or the rhetorical appeals, makes the rhetorical focus of this text seem incomplete considering it is the foundation to the entire text. Furthermore, since the elements of the rhetorical triangle are key to the explanation and definition of "rhetorical situation" given, it is curious that "occasion" and any discussion of kairos, an important rhetorical tool, is left out. The discussion of stance is also very one sided, focusing on the writer's "attitude toward your topic" and how to best "identify your stance" (Bullock 12-13). There are a few lines considering how a writer's stance influences the purpose of the writing and the audience, in that "the way you express that stance affects the way you come across to your audience as a writer and as a person" (Bullock 12). However, there is no real emphasis on the writer needed to consider his stance dialogically in order to assess how best to appeal to that audience. These elements, including how to identify the appropriate time and place to make an argument, as well as how to act dialogically about a topic, are key rhetorical tools that are neglected in a text that is supposed to exist as an improved version of the "best-

selling college rhetoric" (Bullock v).

Throughout the rest of the text there are several explanations or reminders to consider the rhetorical situation among various genres of writing. For example, in chapter thirteen, which focuses on writing an evaluation essay, there are two pages explaining how to consider the rhetorical situation in evaluative writing, including such advice as "think about which criteria will likely be important to your audience" (Bullock 170). A similar connection back to rhetoric is found throughout each chapter that focuses on a particular type of writing. *Norton Field Guide's* structure, which starts with a rhetorical focus that is then referenced throughout the rest of the book, is well intended and stands as a representation of thoughtful organization. However, the abandonment of key rhetorical tools is evident throughout the rest of the text as well. For example, the rhetorical appeals, *ethos, pathos,* and *logos* are not referenced in the first six chapters, nor are they ever mentioned, by name, throughout the rest of the text. There are chapters, such as thirty-three where the appeals are discussed, but in concept only. In chapter thirty-three, which focuses on arguing, there are sections that cover "arguing logically" and "appealing to readers emotions;" however, there is no mention of these tactics actually being an employment of *logos* or *pathos.* What is perhaps more concerning is that there is no "building credibility" section in the text. So while *logos* and *pathos* are discussed in the text, by concept only, *ethos* is completely absent. Ignoring one of the rhetorical appeals presents an unbalanced rhetorical framework for students since all effective writing includes application of *all* of the rhetorical appeals. After all, students can learn to present a logical argument and appeal to an audience's emotions, but the writing will not be as rhetorically sound as it could be if they do not build their credibility as a writer simultaneously.

Considering that the text does include a section discussing all nine of the rhetorical fallacies, it is surprising that including an explanation of the three rhetorical appeals was left out.

While the rhetorical emphasis was watered down, the other pedagogical influence was clearly adhered to throughout the text, process pedagogy, was strongly incorporated. Chapters twenty-two through twenty-nine "offer advice for generating ideas and text, drafting, revising and rewriting, editing, proof reading, compiling a portfolio, collaborating with others, and writing as inquiry" (Bullock vi). Devoting chapters to explaining the steps of the writing process, from invention to revising, is evidence of a text clearly informed by process pedagogy. Furthermore, throughout the subsequent chapters of the text, especially those focusing on various genres, there are explanations of how to adapt the writing process according to the genre, and overall rhetorical situation that the student would be dealing with. The thorough incorporation of process pedagogy helps to present *Norton Field Guide* as a text that is pedagogically informed, even when its rhetorical focus is not as comprehensive as it could be.

To what extent does the text acknowledge, incorporate, and encourage components of 21st century technology and their influence on the writing process?

The next step of the four-way test, the acknowledgement and incorporation of technological components, is the area in which the *Norton Field Guide* excels. The most impressive chapter in *Norton Field Guide,* in regard to technological incorporation, is chapter fifty-five titled "Writing Online." The first line of this chapter reads, "Email. *Facebook.* Texts. Tweets." (Bullock 600). These things may seem simple, or lower order

when compared to the elements of "academic writing" but the acknowledgement of these online platforms for writing is huge. This acknowledgement is unique and vital because the majority of the writing that our students produce, as well as the writing that our students read, is not done in the classroom and is not published in textbooks or academic journals, but online. Composition courses, and all college courses for that matter, are intended to give students the skills necessary to be successful, confident, and capable individuals in the work force, and in society in general. In today's digital age, the locations where students represent themselves and use writing the most is not in the classroom but online. The things that students write on social networking cites and the way that they construct an email drastically affect their ethos and the success, or lack thereof, that they will find in the "real world" that we are supposed to be preparing them to enter. The content of this chapter, ranging from writing across online genres, to using different systems available to manage online coursework, should be incorporated into every contemporary composition textbook.

In addition to the content discussing the technological tools available to digital age writers in the print version of *Norton Field Guide,* there are also many tools available to students outside the text including *The Norton Field Guide to Go,* an Ebook, a companion website, and norton/write. *The Norton Field Guide to Go* is a "quick-reference version [of the text] available in digital format for smartphones and other handheld device's" (Bullock vii). This is especially helpful for digital age students since the most important elements of their textbook are available on their cell phone—a piece of technology that is *always* within reach. Another element that proves how well the writers of this text consider their digital age audience is that the *Guide to Go* is not only accessible to those who buy a new version of

the text, but also accessible to students who purchase the text used, for an additional $10.00. The Ebook version of the text is also innovative since it is offered to students at half the price of the print version and "allows readers to highlight and attach sticky notes" through the text (Bullock vii). The companion website and norton/write are great for students to use in addition to the print or digital version of the text, since it gives them additional access to model papers and an area that includes plagiarism tutorials and various exercises in a platform that will help them build their digital literacy.

In addition to the online tools accessible to students, the *Norton Field Guide* also has an array of online tools for instructors including *A Guide to Teaching with* The Norton Field Guides, Coursepacks, and FRED. *A Guide to Teaching with* The Norton Field Guides is a great resources for new instructors, who are often paid very little, since it is a free online guide that helps with "developing a syllabus to facilitating group work, teaching multimodal writing to assessing student writing" (Bullock vii). The Coursepacks are a free extension of the *Guide to Teaching* that includes model papers, video tutorials, and other teaching aids presented in a variety of formats that are compatible with online portals such as Blackboard and Desire 2 Learn. Finally, FRED is an "online commenting system" that provides instructors the ability to respond to student drafts using either audio or video. FRED is then an especially great option for classes that are highly process based. Due to the content included in the *Norton Field Guide* and the accompanying online tools for both students and instructors, this text ranks highest on its acknowledgement, incorporation, and encouragement of the technology that contemporary composition students need to use the most.

To what extent is the text written in a way that is comprehensible for and conscious of its first-year composition student audience?

The *Norton Field Guide* also does well in the third element of the four-way test, which considers how comprehensible and conscious it is for its first-year composition student audience. The two things that are most helpful to students using this text are the organization, specifically the color coding, and the Glossary/Index. From the front cover to the back cover, the text is organized and categorized by color, shape, and category of information. The inside cover breaks down the eight part thematic guide that the text follows. The eight parts to the book include "rhetorical situations," "genres," "processes," "strategies," "research/documentation," "media/design," "readings," and "handbook." Each of these eight parts have several chapters that discuss the larger categories, and each of these eight categories have their own color and shape associated with them. For example, "rhetorical situations," the first section of the book, is red and is associated with a square. Likewise, "genres," the second section of the book, is green and is associated with a triangle. The same pattern applies to the rest of the eight parts with each having their own color and shape. The authors of the text note in the preface that the inclusion of "menus, directories, a glossary/index, and color-coded links make it simple for students to find what they're looking for and navigate the sections. The links are also the key to keeping the book brief" (Bullock v). These identifying factors are then used throughout the text to make sure that the reader knows what content of the book falls under what category, even if it is not in a chapter that discusses the larger topic. For example, each chapter has some rhetorical explanation to it, so the pages with that content are marked with the red square. For easy reference, the guide to the category and the color and shape that represents it is

located at the bottom of every other page. This coding system is a helpful type of organization since it allows students to find the information then need quickly, without having to necessarily analyze the table of contents until they find a specific page number to where the content they need resides.

The other part of the text that helps with student comprehension is the glossary. The glossary seems like a very simple thing to consider, but it is the only composition textbook analyzed here that thought to add one. This is especially helpful to students since they can quickly find the definition of a term without having to read through several pages, or a chapter to find it. Furthermore, the terms included in the glossary are also highlighted throughout the text. This not only shows students that the terms that are highlighted are important to remember, but that just the definition of those terms can be found in the glossary. Both the color system and the glossary make the *Norton Field Guide* very easy for students to use.

To what extent does the text contain comprehensive instruction applicable for success in writing with clear rhetorical intent across genres and disciplines?

The last element to the four-way test considers how comprehensive the instruction is, and whether or not it is capable of enhancing students' writing ability across genres and disciplines. Like the other texts analyzed here, the *Norton Field Guide* adheres to the *memoria* integrated into the traditional elements of the composition textbook as identified and described by Welch. *Norton Field Guide,* while including many elements that are reflective of the digital age and modern composition pedagogy, still holds onto the *memoria* characterized by partial theory and an adherence to the modes of discourse. The narrowing

of the rhetorical situation and the abandonment of the rhetorical appeals, that was discussed at length earlier, is a primary example of partial theory. Despite the rhetorical center of this text, the authors do not completely embrace modern pedagogy, often characterized by presenting rhetoric, persuasion, and argument as a key element to all writing, since the modes are still clearly included and emphasized. In fact, in the preface there is a note to instructors reading, "if you focus on modes, you'll find chapters on narration, description, and so on" (Bullock ix). It is progressive that each of the mode chapters include a section on how the rhetorical situation changes per mode, but rhetorical techniques set in addition to the modes made rhetoric appear as a type of writing, like a genre within itself, rather than a strategy to make all writing effective, even beyond the modes designated in the text.