

Inkshed

Newsletter of the Canadian Association
for the Study of Writing and Reading
Volume 8, number 3. May 1989

INSIDE *INKSHED*

Jim Bell	A Field Guide to Adult Education for Composition Instructors	1
Jamie MacKinnon	To Be Left Alone Sometimes	4
Michael Shields	Review: <u>The Observing Self</u>	8
Susan Drain	First-Year Writing Assignment	9
Anthony Paré	Being Social: A Response to Alan Mason	10
Barbara Roberts	Learning by Anomaly: A Response to <u>Inkshed</u> 8.2	12
Kay Stewart	Editorial Inkshedding	13
	Subscription Form	14

Thought in the essay stays close to its objects and shares their space and atmosphere. The connections between thoughts in the essay are often made through things, rather than being linked directly in a continuous argument. The term "reflection" is perhaps better than "thought," since it suggests the intellectual mirroring of an object. The truth of the essay is a *limited* truth, limited by the concrete experience, itself limited, which gave rise to it. The essay is a provisional reflection of an ephemeral experience of an event or object. If one event followed another, we would have a logical argument. But in the essay, event and reflection, object and idea, are interwoven and limit each other's development. The ideas are valid for here and now, while the sense-impressions of the object-experience are still fresh in the mind.

--Graham Good, The Observing Self: Rediscovering the Essay (London: Routledge, 1988), p. 7

3.3 March 1989

Editor

Kay L. Stewart
University of Alberta

Book Review Editor

Chris Bullock
University of Alberta

Consulting Editors

Phyllis Artiss
Memorial University

Neil Besner
University of Winnipeg

Coralie Bryant
Elmwood Resource Centre
Winnipeg, MB

Wayne Lucey
Assumption Catholic High School
Burlington, ON

Susan Drain
Mount St. Vincent University

Richard M. Coe
Simon Fraser University

Anthony Paré
McGill University

James A. Reither
St. Thomas University

Judy Segal
University of Waterloo

Graham Smart
Bank of Canada

Far-Flung Correspondent

Russell A. Hunt
St. Thomas University

Inkshed provides a forum for its subscribers to explore relationships among research, theory, and practice in language acquisition and language use. Subscribers are invited to submit informative pieces such as notices, reports, and reviews of articles, journals, books, textbooks, conferences, and workshops, as well as polemical discussions of events, issues, problems, and questions of concern to teachers in Canada interested in writing and reading theory and practice.

Inkshed is published five times during the academic year. The following is a schedule of submission deadlines and publication dates:

31 December, for 15 January	1 September, for 15 September
15 February, for 1 March	1 November, for 15 November
15 April, for 1 May	

The newsletter is supported financially by the Department of English and the University/Community Special Projects Fund, University of Alberta, and by its subscribers. Make cheques for \$7.00 payable to University of Alberta--Inkshed.

A FIELD GUIDE TO ADULT EDUCATION FOR COMPOSITION INSTRUCTORS /// Jim Bell

[Excerpt from a talk delivered as part of the Canadian Caucus co-sponsored panel on Adult Learners, Adult Learning, CCCC, Seattle, March 16, 1989]

If an adult educator were to come to your department and be assigned a composition course to teach, would you want the person to consult you and the composition literature? Similarly, if you are going to teach adults (roughly half of the students in post-secondary education are non-traditional-aged students), should you consult the field of adult education? Assuming that your answers are affirmative, I provide a field guide to adult education. Such a guide may be valuable because in the field things are not usually what they seem. Often what is presented as fact is more properly philosophy.

The most influential person in North American adult education has been Malcolm Knowles, and his seminal concept is "andragogy," the art and science of helping adults learn. "Andragogy is not pedagogy!" is how Knowles (1968) introduced the concept, and it became the slogan of many adult educators. In probably the most famous page in modern adult education literature. Knowles contrasted andragogy and pedagogy (1970), summarized thus:

REGARDING	PEDAGOGY	ANDRAGOGY
Learner	dependent	increasing self-directedness
Experience	of little worth	rich resource
Readiness to learn	society says	cope with real life tasks and problems
Orientation to learning	subject matter; delayed application	developing increased competence; immediate application

However, the child-adult dichotomy predicated does not withstand scrutiny, as the following commentary on the four assumptions indicates.

Assumption 1: Children are not dependent learners. That children depend on adults for many things such as food and shelter does not mean that they also rely on grown-ups for learning. Similarly, it does not follow that because young people are often put in dependent positions in schools, they are dependent learners. As well as displaying independence in what they learn, youngsters "are quite innovative in the learning processes they employ: fantasy, imagination, simulation, role play, experimentation, games, and so on" (Tennant, 1986, p. 116).

Assumption 2: Making use of life experiences in educating adults but not children is simply good practice with adults and poor practice with children. Although most adults do indeed have more experience than most children, a more fundamental principle is that all education is based on experience. Interestingly, adults' greater experience may sometimes hinder their learning by reducing openness to new experiences.

Assumption 3: Young and old have developmental tasks. Does adults' having a larger proportion of social developmental tasks necessitate a unique form of education?

Assumption 4: Children are not subject-centred. School is. Neither do children naturally have a perspective of delayed application. Adults have organized most schooling this way. Interestingly, adults probably have a greater capacity to tolerate delayed application of knowledge because their greater social and mental maturity enables more postponement of gratification and more hypothetical thinking.

In his recent writing, Knowles assiduously avoids linking pedagogy with children and andragogy with adults. Andragogy, he maintains, is a set of assumptions (1979). This position does not make earlier critiques of Knowles' position irrelevant, for numerous adult educators still rally around "Andragogy not pedagogy." Nor should Knowles' redefining halt critiquing of his position. If andragogy is a set of assumptions, how sound are the assumptions? In the following answer, the critique of assumptions one, three, and four draws on Brookfield's analysis (1986).

Assumption 1: If adults have an innate need to be self-directing, why, when the opportunities present themselves, do they often escape from freedom (Fromm, 1942)? Similarly, if the need for autonomy is so great, why does release from confining social structures and normative codes often produce neuroses? Self-direction, the core concept in andragogy, does not describe or explain enough human behavior to serve as a solid foundation for good educational practice.

Assumption 2: To assert that people "accumulate an increasing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning" (Knowles, 1980, p. 44) is to oversimplify. As Jarvis (1987) points out, "what is accumulated is an increasing stock of knowledge which results from *interpreting and reflecting on experiences*" (p. 172, italics added). The potentially available reservoir of relevant experience in a learning encounter thus depends on three factors: past actions, transformation of those events, and the present educational situation. Living longer does not necessarily mean that a person has proportionally more experience, or that a person has reflected on the activities to produce meaningful experience, or that a person's experience is necessarily an asset in all learning situations.

Assumption 3: Adults learn for other reasons than coping with real-life problems. As examples, sometimes they are curious, and sometimes they simply enjoy learning.

Assumption 4: Adults do not always require that what they learn will be immediately applicable. Self-awareness and insight are oft-sought goals with nebulous time frames.

The andragogical assumptions are not particularly sound. They do not provide especially well-grounded principles for good educational practice. Far from being a tested theory of adult learning, andragogy is in essence humanist philosophy.

[In the remainder of the presentation, I made two points. First, the critique

of andragogy, as epitomized by Brookfield's Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning, also presents as effective practice what is primarily a philosophy--in this case radical--with extrapolated practices. Second, reading the adult education literature has several benefits: it broadens our perspective, emphasizing the education in what we do; it encourages us to examine and clarify our philosophies of education; it sensitizes us to the growing number of non-traditional-aged students; and it helps us make the transition from teacher-student to person-person in the educational situation.]

#46, 113 Renova Private
Ottawa, ON
K1G 4C7

REFERENCES

- Brookfield, S.D. (1986). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fromm, E. (1942). The fear of freedom. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: Towards an analysis of learning from life. Adult education quarterly, 37, 164-172.
- Knowles, M.S. (1968). Androgogy [sic], not pedagogy! Adult leadership, 16, 350-352, 386.
- (1979). Andragogy revisited part II. Adult education, 30, 52-53.
- (1970). The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy. New York: Association Press.
- (1980). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy. New York: Cambridge.
- Tennant, M. (1986). An evaluation of Knowles' theory of adult learning. International journal of lifelong education, 5, 113-122.

TO BE LEFT ALONE SOMETIMES: THE NEED FOR LONELY WRITING /// Jamie MacKinnon

Writing is a solitary activity; writing is the creative individual making personal meaning in an atomistic world. Writing is world-making. The writer is a scribe.

Writing is a social, institutional, communitarian phenomenon; the "individual" is the locus of complex external influences and, subliminally or implicitly, responds to them by "writing". Writing is world-sharing. The writer is a script.

Our growing appreciation of the social dimensions of writing is quickly reshaping how we teach writing. And more effective pedagogy is the probable result.

But I have a concern. I am afraid that excitement about the social dimensions of writing may lead some teachers to overdo the social stuff: too many conferences, too many forced revisions, too much peer feedback and collaboration.

In the November '88 *Inkshed*, Lynn Holmes said: "I am more concerned with individual rather than social knowledge. Sharing has its limits." Sharing does have its limits. Perhaps we need to start thinking about what those limits might be and about the cost of transgressing them.

I have no intention of discussing here either the relative merits, or the complex relationship, of what I'll term lonely writing and fraternal or communitarian writing. And it goes without saying, I believe, that the two terms are only notions, different positions on a notional spectrum. The loneliest writing, a diary say, is written in socially determined language (as Vygotsky reminds us) and has social phantoms (both repressed and acknowledged) peering in the windows. Highly communitarian writing, say an academic article collaboratively written, has its eremitic elements, its lonely voices as well. Like nature-nurture, often presented as an "opposition" (false in my view), the two notions of writing are likely "true" to the extent that they acknowledge and accommodate each other.

Rather, I'd like to remember, and make a plea for remembrance. Je me souviens as we say in French, with the reflexive pronoun.

I remember writing in and out of class in primary and high school. I remember my first written thesis, or proposition: that the early medical practitioners in the pioneer days of my hometown were weird, eccentric, perhaps loony. Hardly an earth-shaking proposition, but mine.

I remember too the thrill of discovering meanings and the words to find and express them, in poems and short stories and prose fragments. I remember wrestling with ideas and metaphors, with rhythm and diction and handwriting, with titles and spelling and occasionally grammar. By the end of high school I understood that words had power.

In university, I was struck by the fact that one could reasonably, pleasurably, invent a thesis on any given topic. This was quite a revelation

for me: the notion had never been explicitly discussed in my previous schooling. It occurred to me then that contrary to the notion that "coming up with ideas" (original ideas or propositions) was hard ("How do you get all those ideas?") or at least harder than in "merely" reporting researched data, writing was made easier by having something personal to say. This struck me as true not only in literature, but in economic geography, physics, and linguistics.

But in all my recollections of writing (and reading) in school, there is a dominant composite memory of pleasurable aloneness, of slightly anxious, mildly neurotic excitement in being completely, intellectually alone. Writing for me was one of the few intellectual activities in which I was free from the burden of being in society.

For a student, intellectual "being in society" meant raising your hand neither too much nor too little, speaking intelligibly but not too intelligently (one had to have friends), learning, knowing and expressing in ways which maximized gains perhaps least in the intellectual economy, and perhaps most in the social economy. Think of the simple act of speaking in class: threads of accommodation and acknowledgement attaching the speaker to thirty or thirty-five souls.

All school life was socially bound. Little room was left for the private person and the individual psyche. Indeed, school's major purpose is often thought to be the socializing of the young individual. Sometimes this socialization process seemed overarching, all-encompassing, suffocating. Individual differences were not generally nourished, but rather starved through the various forms of peer pressure, institutional power, and societal expectations.

And of course there was an infinite number of ways to induce conformity in dress, in comportment, in thought. When we weren't socialized directly by peers and teachers, we were socialized indirectly by the syllabus, by the valence table, by gym class and the school dance, by Latin and geometry (old things) and by evolution and astronomy (new things), by ringing bells and by the menu in the cafeteria, in short, by almost everything "out there".

Writing was the glorious exception.

In writing I found a retreat from what I perceived as the awfulness of high school. This "awfulness" can be re-phrased in a high-falutin' way as the absolute institutionalization and socialization of the individual. The process is aggravated by the fact that it occurs at a time when body and soul are going through a natural phase of growing autonomy and individuation.

In writing I found a way to link my growing need for control with my natural desire to learn. In writing I could say (or find) what I meant, what I thought. The meanings and thoughts came not only from the technics of writing, but from its solitude. The socializing and harmonizing forces of society, while not totally removed, were in abeyance. When I was lucky, the forces were out of sight, over some psychic horizon. This was most true in writing I took on myself, unassigned: poetry, marginalia, prose. But it was also much the case when I was writing for the teacher, writing for a grade, because, I now believe, they left me pretty much alone. No threads attaching

me to the thirty-five others.

In writing I found a space to explore and cultivate what I found to be the wonder and excitement of university. As reading was the main vehicle for absorbing the knowledge and wisdom of others, so writing was the dominant vehicle for wrestling with this knowledge, for finding what it meant to me, for making some of it my own, and often for finding that I had a personal space in a busy and crowded intellectual terrain.

In the latest volume of A History of Private Life, Passions of the Renaissance, Roger Chartier reminds us of the psychic consequences wrought by literacy in the Enlightenment: "it liberated the individual from the old mediators, freed him from the control of the group, and made it possible to cultivate an inner life."

God knows how I would have reacted in high school or university if I had been forced to collaborate or confer for much of my writing time. Likely I would have been driven even crazier than I already was.

So maybe sharing does have its limits.

But Holmes' phrase "rather than social knowledge" strikes me as odd. Personal knowledge and social knowledge are not, in my mind, contrasting notions to choose from. Personal knowledge is always and everywhere imbricated with social knowledge. Writing probably has a special productive capacity for personal knowledge. Our concern as teachers should be with disseminating social knowledge and encouraging, cultivating and engaging personal knowledge (that is to say, knowledge which has taken root, or been inseminated) in our students.

Disseminate, inseminate, cultivate. If disseminating knowledge is a social act and inseminating knowledge is an intensely personal act, cultivating should probably be both social and personal.

Sharing resources and time is essential. Sharing knowledge is our duty: our survival depends on it.

But surely one of the few areas in which we must guard against too much sharing is in exploring and articulating the self. We can only be fruitful members of a valued community when we know who we are--alone. And this knowledge can only come from time alone with the individual spirit, the individual psyche.

So what am I saying here? I am not rejecting the notion of writing to a reader (though we should free ourselves from this tyranny occasionally). I am not suggesting that we should encourage in our students the notion that writing is best accomplished by geniuses who must live apart from society. And I am not rejecting the pedagogy of conferences, feedback and multiple drafting.

I'm trying to say two things.

On a practical, pedagogical level, I'm suggesting the need for plenty of lonely, personal space in the writing practices of your students. This may

imply the need to give students a choice for teacher-imposed writing: writing alone or writing with peers. I think it worthwhile to examine the "limits" of sharing. Teachers who think that the only lonely writing a student need do is in a teacher-sanctioned journal or in-class freewriting may be robbing their students of blithe writing solitude. They may be diminishing their students' chances to cultivate an inner life.

On a rhetorical and psychological level, I'm pleading for some thought about writing's role in finding and shaping the self. Lonely writing may represent one risky path to personal freedom, a course between the Scylla of absolute socialization and the Charybdis of absolute solecism. Writing alone keeps the tyranny of society at bay; writing alone, because it exteriorizes and reifies symbolically a person's thought, allows us to escape the prison of self-absorption.

While communitarian writing acknowledges and reinforces the individual's movement from egocentrism to awareness of the other, we must also encourage and acknowledge the individual's movement from social dependency and boundedness to independence, autonomy and self-awareness. The rhetorical notion we are chasing here is "voice". The psychological notion we are chasing is self-discovery and self-awareness.

"Off-stage voices", "intertextuality", "social context": to the extent that writing is presented as just the extension or reflection of other texts, writers are cheated. The focus on other voices, other texts inveigles the eye and seduces the gaze. Transfixed by the voices outside, writers forget to look inside, to find, articulate and cultivate the self. To cultivate an inner life.

We find ourselves too, of course, in the words and minds and feelings of others. But if it were only in others and outsides, we would never progress. There truly would be nothing new under the sun.

49 Victoria Street
Ottawa, ON
K1M 1S9

* * * * *

Selected papers from the 1988 *Inkshed* Conference on Values and Evaluation are being published by Memorial University. If you want more information or to order a copy, write to Phyllis Artiss, Department of English, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland, A1C 5S7.

REVIEW OF GRAHAM GOOD, *THE OBSERVING SELF: REDISCOVERING THE ESSAY* (London & New York: Routledge, 1988; 208 pp., \$17.95 paperback) /// Michael Shields

Graham Good's *The Observing Self*--an attempt to rediscover the essay, as its subtitle states, and to situate the essay as a form historically and philosophically--is a book at odds with itself. *The Observing Self* is a very academic work, and as such embodies the strengths and weaknesses of that genre; it is driven by the compulsion to be systematic and complete, and the result is a glut of enlightening but often unfocussed information tethered by the demands of literary critical methodology. The rub here is that Good is striving to resurrect the essay, a genre which he describes as "a focus of individual resistance to 'systems' of various kinds." He seems oblivious, however, to his own systematizing or unaware of the inherent contradiction between those characteristics of the essay that he is valorizing--its individual-to-individual communication, its freedom from authority, its openness to individual experience, its reciprocity of self and that which is explored by the self, and its spontaneity--and the critical method he himself chooses to perform that valorizing with. *The Observing Self* curiously lacks self--or else it reveals a self that is tweedy, pipe-smoking, and deferential to system as opposed to brash, punky, and innovative.

Tweed and pipe tobacco have their uses, however, and Good's text is useful and maybe even necessary. If there is much to say for a man's grasp exceeding his reach, *The Observing Self* should be lauded. Good has done a tremendous amount of necessary work. He is right in saying that contemporary criticism has reduced the essay to some form of "adjunct" to more serious study, one which is not considered as something worthy of study in itself; we study Eliot's essays to understand Eliot and his poetry but not to understand his essays in and of themselves. Good takes the essay seriously and argues persuasively that it is a serious genre.

There is much valuable work in *The Observing Self*. Good attempts to account for prevalent attitudes towards the essay; he provides a definition of the essay; he traces the historico-philosophical contexts which gave rise to it; he explores the kind of knowledge inherent in the essay; he provides minute criticism of eight essayists ranging historically from Montaigne to Orwell; and he places attitudes towards and criticism of the essay within twentieth-century literary criticism (all in the space of some 200 pages). The result is at once dizzying, informative, frustrating if one is trying to read the book at one swat, and admirable because of the Casaubon-like rigor involved.

The Observing Self is dense, not a quick read to plumb for some *bons mots* by which to launch one's students into the wonders of discovering themselves in the process of their own essay writing. It would best serve those who are interested in the history and development of the essay or in its epistemology. The chapters on individual essayists (Montaigne, Bacon, Johnson, Hazlitt, Henry James, Woolf, Eliot, and Orwell) are excellent sources of critical material for anyone working on these authors or other prominent essayists. His annotated bibliographies on each of the essayists discussed are also extremely useful. *The Observing Self* could, I think, be profitably used as a basic reference text in an upper-level or graduate course devoted to the study of the essay.

In the end, *The Observing Self* performs the function of all competent academic glosses. It provides context--historical, philosophical, psychological--for discussing what is truly important: the literature at hand, the essays themselves.

Department of English
University of Alberta

FIRST-YEAR WRITING ASSIGNMENT

/// Susan Drain

My first-year composition classes tackle a library assignment as a third of six writing tasks in thirteen weeks. It is their first big task, and they work at it in small groups of three or four. The purpose of the assignment is to write a library guide for first-year students. They brainstorm likely questions before they visit the library under my auspices. Once there they discover the library services: sometimes, the reference librarian takes them on a tour; sometimes, he and I are available to help them find the answers to their brainstormed questions. (They prefer the structured tour; I prefer the problem-solving approach.) Class time is used generously for work on the guide; questions of general interest arise such as how best to organize the guide, what format would be useful given the guide's purpose, and how much detail real first-year students need about, say, inter-library loans or course readings on reserve.

The assignment serves several ends: first, it ensures that the students learn about the library in a quite thorough way; second, they get some experience in the joys and frustrations of collaborative writing; third, they practice writing using at least two "rhetorical patterns" -- analysis and process analysis. (It's very interesting to watch the group analysis at work; many of the small groups immediately divide the library up physically -- you take the top floor, I'll take the ground floor, etc. Often, they come to reject this plan spontaneously; sometimes it takes a little prompting to get them to see that such a division does not relate very usefully to how people use the library.) Finally, they begin to see the real constraints that audience and purpose exercise in a realistic writing situation.

My difficulty has been authenticity. When I first introduced the assignment, I announced that the guides would be submitted to the chief librarian for consideration as a replacement for the current, not-very-good student guide. They liked the idea. But has anyone any suggestions for continuing to make the assignment authentic -- as opposed to imaginary-authentic -- short of asking the librarian to change the student guide every year?

English Department
Mount St. Vincent University
Halifax, N.S. B3M 2J6

In the last issue of Inkshed, Alan Mason (1989) challenged my credentials as a member in good standing of the social-ists (i.e., those who espouse a social view of writing). I would like to rush to my own defence, since it appears Mason has misunderstood my position. Consider his opening sentence:

In a recent issue of Inkshed, two how-they-teach-writing papers advance the proposition that social writing is better than solitary writing.

The two papers Mason refers to are by Thom Parkhill (1988) and me (1988); neither paper is about how either of us teaches writing. Parkhill's is about his use of inkshedding in a Religious Studies course, and mine describes a single assignment in my writing course. I've looked carefully through Parkhill's paper and cannot find where he advances the proposition that social writing is better than solitary writing, although it is clear that he values contexts within which writing is read and responded to. And I'm sure I didn't advance that proposition, since I believe all writing, even solitary writing, is social.

What I do advance in my paper is an argument in favour of group authoring as one way of exploiting the rich dynamics of social interaction. And, although I am most excited by the process of dialogue and debate that group work promotes, I do state in my description of the assignment that the group authored paper "is better...than it would be for the majority of individual students." To this, Mason responds:

...the perceived improvement in the writing of the group-author over that of individuals may just as likely be due to the effect of putting two (or more) heads to the same task. Thus, the better writing that Paré perceives may be nothing more than the writing of better students. There is nothing remarkably social about that.

This comment is bewildering. How could anything be more social than "putting two (or more) heads to the same task"? Although the better students surely influence the quality of the finished product (and isn't influence a social act?), there is also no doubt, at least in my experience of group writing, that the activity is profoundly social; it is a collective effort. As a bonus (at least in a course dedicated to improvement in writing), the better writers inevitably share with the group much of their knowledge about and experience with texts.

Group authoring creates the same reciprocal dynamic that Alan Mason and I are now engaged in: "Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you" (Burke, 1973). Through talk, through disagreement, through a mutual effort after meaning, the writing group imitates the conversation of discourse communities. As a result of our exchange, I expect that Mason and I have sharpened our thinking; we have reconceptualized, reconsidered, revised. Group authoring replicates Inkshed's dialogue-at-a-distance.

All writing is social and always has been, even though we just noticed (or

re-noticed) it recently. Even personal diaries are dialogues between writer-then and reader-later. Most school writing, the "old solitary writing" that Mason refers to, is really just contextless writing: saying nothing to no one for no reason. But even that writing is social: other voices speak through our students' pens (and we write "cliché" in the margin). It's not writing that we have to change, but our students' experience of writing. Most of the world's writing is done by a solitary writer, but a solitary writer in a social context. If we can help our students find or create contexts in which they say something to someone for some reason, then they will be experiencing writing as a social act. If, in addition, we can take advantage of the tremendous potential for learning offered by group interaction, then so much the better.

There is no one way of making the composition classroom, or any classroom, more vital, more social; there are many ways. The school context within which we work is already highly artificial, so imitation of "real" social conditions may not always be possible (or desirable; after all, if those conditions provided such rich learning experiences, we'd all be geniuses). But the lack of context for most school writing is obviously unacceptable. Group writing is one way of generating the dialogue--the exchange and interaction--that makes writing a social act.

Works Cited

- Burke, Kenneth. The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action, 3rd ed. Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1973, 110-111.
- Mason, Alan. "Writing in the Social Context." Inkshed 8.2 (1989): 18-19.
- Paré, Anthony. "How it Works: A Group-Authored Assignment." Inkshed 7.4 (1988): 5-7.
- Parkhill, Thom. "Inkshedding in Religious Studies: Underwriting Collaboration." Inkshed 7.4 (1988): 1-4.

McGill University
Centre for the Study and
Teaching of Writing
Montreal, PQ
H3A 1Y2

Inkshed 8.2 is one of the best things I've read in a long while. Whether by chance or intent, most of the contributors suggest that we are in the midst of a shift from conventional transfer of knowledge to collaborative transactional learning (in the Dewey and Rosenblatt sense, not Britton's transactional writing). While each writer has a different perspective, shedding ink is a very collaborative means to become part of this paradigm.

Our learning, as our students' learning, expands not on the basis of belief, but on the suspicion of belief. Confronting anomalies is an important part of this in a community of learners, such as Inkshed readers and writers. For example, I feel sure that Paré must be confronted with an anomaly which makes him uncomfortable when he reads Mason's "Writing in the Social Context". He cannot help but rethink his current perspective on collaborative learning.

I agree with Carlman on the lack of communication among people of different disciplines and levels of education. Coming from an elementary education background, it is only within the past few years that I've read such journals as those which Coe in "Write a Letter to Deanne" appears to be trying to save. Through reading and talking to people from different levels of education, past anomalies led me to my current perspective on collaborative learning. For example, before reading Reither, I was convinced that collaborative learning has become a generic term which covers such practices as peer response groups, peer tutoring and evaluation, and group and co-authoring. Reither makes me very comfortable with what I think I currently know. I don't like feeling that comfortable because I believe learners operate best when confronted with anomalies.

That's why I like it when Coe mentions the need to work out the implications of the current paradigm shift. However, I am not comfortable when he suggests to work this out just in terms of writing. The implications of this shift need to be worked out for learning in general. Learning is multi-modal; writing is but one way of knowing. Reading, listening, speaking, art, drama, music, etc. can each enhance writing; just as writing can enhance transacting with other communication systems to negotiate one's knowing.

While I agree with Dias that there is a need for surrendering teacher control, I am uncomfortable when he writes "Eventually, what matters as learning and teaching is what university teachers do. Schools and colleges exist primarily to serve the needs of universities" (p. 6). Such statements create an anomaly for me, for they do not make sense in a collaborative learning paradigm. They fit more within the transfer of knowledge paradigm. For me, learning is a means of exploring and expanding our world. If we expect schools and colleges to serve the needs of universities, we cannot expect learners to take control of their own learning. Nor can we expect writing and reading to have "authentic social consequences" (Hunt, p. 17) as suggested by Hunt and others in this issue of Inkshed.

The fact that all knowledge is socially constituted constantly confronts us with anomalies which disrupt our current thinking. It is many such anomalies which have caused me not to be satisfied with a Ph.D. proposal which I've been trying to write for the past two years. Whether I ever get my Ph.D.

is not important. What is important is that I am constantly learning, and I hope, influencing other learners as they influence me. Because of this, I've been brave enough to send off this first draft reaction to Inkshed 8.2.

Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
McGill University
Montreal, PQ
H3A 1Y2

Editorial Inkshedding

/// Kay Stewart

Thanks to everyone who has contributed to *Inkshed* this year--you've made it a great year. Position papers in the March issue were hotly debated at the Canadian Caucus session at CCCC. What emerged from the discussion was a sense that while Americans talk about empowerment, some pedagogical practices in Canada are more radical than anything going on in the States. And so next year's panel will focus on these practices.

Many participants expressed frustration over the lack of jobs in composition and rhetoric and the provisional status of many writing programs. One participant suggested that a special issue of the newsletter would be a good forum for these concerns. If you would like to share your experiences or air your views, please send a piece (maximum 5 pages double-spaced) by January 15, 1990.

* * * * *

While we're on the topic of future issues, here is what lies ahead. After the last *Inkshed* conference, I kicked myself for not ensuring conference reports for those of you who couldn't be there. This year's conference organizers have helped me solve this problem. So in the fall you can look forward to entering into dialogue with what conference participants thought about "Power, Politics, and Pedagogy" in May.

"Writing in the World of Work" will be the topic of the following issue. Since I have been banished to Southern California for the fall term, I would appreciate having as many submissions as possible by mid-July. Sandra Mallett, a friend, colleague, and long-time *Inkshed* supporter, will be minding the store while I'm away, however, so feel free to send material up to November 1. That includes reviews, conference notices, and responses to previous contributors.

* * * * *

A reminder--subscriptions are for the academic year. Please renew now, even if it seems you have just mailed your cheque for the current year.