GROUNDING THEORY IN PRACTICE IN THE COMPOSITION CLASS

ANGUS DUNSTAN, JUDY KIRSCHT, JOHN REIFF, MARJORIE ROEMER, NICK TINGLE

The metaphor "framing" surrounds us; we hear it on all sides. It is invoked to name a current concern for "contextualizing," marking an emerging self-consciousness, a sense that what we see and what we say always constitute a particular perspective, a view grounded in our situation (where we are placed and what that position allows us to see). So, we see what we see because of the ways our interests, our status, our training, our experience allow us to see. It is a commonplace that different periods in history become saturated with underlying metaphors: sometimes it has been the organic, sometimes the technological. For us, in the late twentieth century it seems to be the relational: the frame, the figure and the ground.

Following this preoccupation, we "frame" our telling here with reference to frames of understanding and to the well-established genre of framed tales and their modern equivalence in frames of movie footage. This essay is, then, one story about both teaching composition and talking about teaching composition, one story told in different voices, framed by our individual perspectives, never identical.

In the fall of 1987 five Lecturers at the University of California, Santa Barbara, started a group to discuss our teaching. We believed that teaching freshman English is a distinct field as yet inadequately

defended and supported. We wished to share our experiences and thoughts in the hope of better understanding and representing our work. Hoping that local knowledge would lead to broader theoretical clarity, we began by videotaping our classes and coming together to discuss what we saw on the tapes.

We worked at Santa Barbara in a program that hired a large number of Lecturers, most with PhD's, some with MFA's, a program that, despite some general guidelines for English 1,2A, and 2B, essentially gave its teachers a free hand. We taught a broad spectrum of possibilities; some in the program were composition teachers who believed that student texts should be the center of the classroom experience, some were most interested in literary theory, reading strategies and cultural studies, some were committed to interdisciplinary design, others had really been trained to do literary criticism in a particular period. But the five of us felt, that despite all the surface differences in our training, commitments, and style, there were some commonalities, some things that we might all agree on as essential to the freshman English class.

Believing that abstract goals and pronouncements don't take us very far in understanding pedagogic practice, we decided to proceed in the opposite direction, to tape our actual practice and to derive from that our understandings about common goals and common beliefs. It was in the texture of classroom practice that we thought we could locate our most sacrosanct pedagogic values. Perhaps it was this belief that was our most essential area of agreement: that practice, pedagogic arrangements and dynamics, convey epistemological values, that in the way we conducted our classes day to day was to be found the center of our beliefs about what it means to shape the beginning education of college students as readers and writers.

In another place ("Working in the Classroom") we have recorded some of our experience of actually viewing those tapes, what it felt like to see ourselves in the presence of other collegial viewers. Here, we want less to capture the personal experiences of the project and more to trace the way the project allowed us to rethink what our circumstances are and what frames our own ways of seeing ourselves as the teachers of freshman English in a composition program. Although our project was about establishing commonality, understanding one another, it was necessarily also about understanding ourselves. Each person in this project had a particular way of reflecting on the experience; what we offer

here, then, are multiple frames of reflection. In a sense, we model here what we think occurs in the classrooms we inhabit: individuals enter into communal discussions in order to reflect on and to refine their particular ways of framing their own experience.

FRAME ONE
THE ENVIRONMENT FOR TEACHING

Nick, whose orientation is the most widely political in the group, gives us an establishing shot.

The first year we videotaped our classes; then we sat and watched them. At first we wondered what sort of ground rules we needed, what sort of procedures. None of us had ever done anything like this before. Should we have rules governing the feedback we would offer? Somehow, we chose not to pre-shape the experience but plunged ahead intuitively, forging a style and mode of operations as we went. We would watch a tape and begin to talk about what interested us. We'd point to a moment in the class, an exchange, a student response, and that would become the text for intricate discussions of the exercise of authority in the classroom: the role of teacher as model, or coach, or facilitator; the extent of personal disclosure that teaching calls for; texts and how they are to be used and interpreted; the relation between writing instruction and the shape of inquiry as defined by different disciplines. Each moment would open up a web of concerns, values, strategies: what we came to call the "layered intentions of the classroom."

But while our discussions arose very directly from practical classroom examples, they necessarily over time angled off into areas of generality or abstraction. And while the group developed more or less its own mode of operations, the "videocell," as we came to call ourselves, like any good cell, remained sensitive to its environment. This year we have been particularly concerned about the future of our Composition Program. More exactly we have been concerned to define and defend it in the face of an External Review which might recommend a considerable restructuring of the Program, along the lines, possibly, of replacing us Lecturers—full-time teachers with advanced degrees in either literature or composition—with Teaching Assistants, a wholly other breed of cat. We have found it impossible, in other words, and still find it impossible wholly to disentangle the more abstract or

theoretical of our concerns from our immediate institutional circumstances. That we cannot imagine discussing pedagogy "theoretically" without relating that theory to immediate institutional realities—in their social, political, and economic dimensions—says something about our conception of pedagogy.

We have been defending our Program for some time now, about eight years, or from just about the moment it developed the potential for becoming something like a Program. In looking for arguments for ourselves and what we do, we have long sought to attach composition and the teaching of it, like the "rider" to some larger bill, to the quality of education issue. Facing the External Review, we turned for a better understanding of this issue to the report of the University of California's Task Force on Lower Division Education, chaired by Neil Smelser, and the report *College* of the Carnegie Committee, written by Ernest Boyer.

As employees of the University of California, we were particularly interested in the Smelser report. It points out that knowledge produced is increasingly *technical*, increasingly *specialized*, and increasingly *fragmented*. These changes in knowledge pose a special challenge for university faculty as researchers *and* teachers, who, the report acknowledges, are caught in a "tension betwen the specialized pursuit of knowledge and the search for synthesis and integration." This tension the report identifies as a "conflict between the university and the college."

> The university is a collection of highly trained specialists who work with skill, persistence, and devotion. Its success is beyond question, but it pays the price of its success. The price is specialization, and it supports two unsympathetic jibes: the individual specialized scholar may find that with Oedipus, the pursuit of knowledge leads to impairment of vision; and, the community of scholars, speaking its special tongues, has suffered the fate of Babel.
>
> [Those] who are the university are also, however, [those] who are the college. But the liberal arts college is a different enterprise. It does not assault or extend the frontiers of knowledge. It has a different mission. It cultivates human understanding. The mind of the person, not the body of knowledge, is its central concern . . . The university for multiplicity and knowledge; the college for unity and understanding (35-36).

These remarks speak directly, we feel, to our sense of the place

of composition in the University. In their focus on the making of meaning and the mind of the person, composition courses can be crucial to the liberal arts enterprise of the "college." Many of our composition courses, especially at the introductory level, are designed explicitly to address this problem of the fragmentation of knowledge—by posing a broad interdisciplinary context, by drawing on texts from a variety of disciplines to define approaches into the problem, and by pressing students to see through their writing how different disciplinary paradigms can be used to explore the issues.

While the report's diagnosis of the situation jibed in many respects with our own, we had reservations. We weren't sure, for example, that we bought the rather dramatic separation of teaching and research, of college and university. Further, we were inclined to see the impairment of vision, referred to in the report, as having much less to do with the impressive tragedy of Oedipus and much more to do with that sort of blinding by the "Atoms of Democritus" alluded to by Blake in his "Mock on Mock on Voltaire Rousseau" ("You throw the sand against the Wind/And the wind blows it back again"). Finally, we had to worry about the report's rather masculine, not to mention "macho," conception of the specialized disciplines as "assaulting" the frontiers of knowledge. Where did that put us, we wondered, with our concern for the unity of minds?

Still to the extent that we could be heartened, we were heartened by the report. We were heartened also by two remarks in the Carnegie Report:

> We conclude that American undergraduate education cannot be strengthened unless and until the academic deficiencies of entering students are candidly confronted. Top priority must be given to teaching English—essentially reading and writing—to incoming students who lack sufficient mastery of this basic academic skill (Boyer, 77).

Further and more practically:

> Just as high schools build on the early years, colleges must build on secondary education. Therefore we recommend that all college students, not just those with special problems, begin their college experience with a year-long course in English, with emphasis on writing (Boyer, 78-79).

These remarks are clear enough to anyone who reads English. The question, though, we had to ask was why did our local administration seem so intent on reducing our Program? Had they not read the Carnegie Report? That did not seem possible since the new Chancellor of our University is listed as one of the Trustees of the Carnegie Commission which sponsored the report. Were they—the members of the local administration—not inclined to draw from the Smelser Report the sort of inferences we were inclined to draw?

More and more we began to feel that such reports might be part of the problem by virtue, we might say, of how they defined the problem. What was the Carnegie report about really but the addition, in some areas, of classes, especially in the area of the core curriculum, and the subtraction of some classes in others? Or about the movement of personnel (good teachers should teach the large undergraduate lecture classes, the Carnegie Report says). Call this personnel movement or reallocation. Or about the movement of what we might call resource towards the cultivation of some end? Sadly we found ourselves in agreement with B.F. Skinner who, in his own book on education, argues that such reports always miss the mark by a mile because all they are about is the bureaucratic matter of resource allocation and not about what is critical to education (93-94). This critical thing Skinner calls Method; Dewey might call it a philosophy of education.

What Skinner calls Method, we want to call Pedagogy. In any case—whatever the word—Skinner's right: the Carnegie Report is not about method/pedagogy/philosophy of education. The chapter on teaching is particularly weak. That it is just a chapter among chapters and not *the* chapter in which the work's guiding principles are laid out is itself rather strange. While pedagogical considerations ought to have been the overriding principle of the book, we find instead in the chapter on teaching, as about the only reference to a truly pedagogical matter, an inspiring, but finally vacuous quotation by Mortimer Adler which says "that all genuine learning is active, not passive. It involves the use of the mind, not just the memory. It is the process of discovery in which the student is the main agent, not the teacher" (150). Most of the teachers we know would agree with this oracular remark in about the same way they would agree it is better to be alive than dead. That such a remark constitutes the primary pedagogical comment in a book purportedly about education is pathetic.

What the Carnegie Report is really about is the bureaucratic matter of resource allocation in light of the national interest, as the report understands that interest. It's an attempt to better rationalize the order. In treating knowledge and culture bureaucratically, as a matter of resource allocation, neither report sets pedagogy, or Skinner's method, at the center of the educational process. The reports, it turns out, end up one way or another contributing to the very fragmentation of knowledge which they seem to decry.

FRAME TWO
THE ENVIRONMENT FOR LEARNING

Angus, whose loyalties are to the National Writing Project and the "teacherly," gives us a shot from the middle distance.

We came to be interested in teaching and in talking about teaching in part because of our subject matter and in part because of our own marginal institutional positions. Because we teach writing, which is in a sense a content-free (though not content-empty) subject, we are perhaps more aware of the effects of different teaching methods than are other instructors more driven by content. Writing instruction, as we practice it, is student-centered rather than information centered; we are less concerned with transmitting information and more concerned with helping students use writing to create and manipulate information.

Also, because composition teachers are second-class citizens in this University, underpaid and underrepresented, we are more disposed to look closely at the political structure of the classrooms in which we work. It is not hard, therefore, for us to sympathize and even identify with the plight of undergraduate/workers who are frequently herded into large classes and seldom consulted about their wishes. Finally, because of our relatively heavy teaching load, writing instructors constitute a kind of academic subculture in a research-oriented environment. Though we come from traditional academic backgrounds and may carry with us much of the heavy baggage of that past, we have found ourselves, either by choice or from force of circumstances, more concerned with teaching than with formal research.

Our collective experiences in the classrooms of many different institutions have led us to embrace certain principles of writing

instruction that are quite familiar to readers of composition theory over the last couple of decades: an emphasis on shared authority; the knowledge-making circle; a pedagogy of respect and collaboration. But as we watched the tapes of each other's classes, we were frequently reminded of the different ways in which these principles manifest themselves in our daily practice. And we were forced to recognize that our adherence to these principles was at least as much a personal political matter as it was a rational intellectual choice.

Each of us, for example, subscribes to the principle of shared authority; we try to make our classrooms more democratic workplaces both for ourselves and for our student/workers. Our decision to shift the locus of authority is motivated by a questioning, problematizing stance and by a social constructionist view of knowledge. We want students to understand the importance of questioning, and we want them to learn to play a part in the making of knowledge—to learn, in fact, that knowledge *is* made so that they will not be duped by those who claim otherwise. But what does "sharing authority" look like in the classroom?

In Angus' class, for example, we saw groups of students pursuing answers to questions they had posed for themselves the previous week. The teacher had simply collected the questions, distributed them to the groups, and set up a procedure for them to share their ideas and insights. The teacher was not much in evidence in the classroom—in fact, a visitor could have been forgiven for asking the Fish-like question, "Is there a teacher in this class?" Nick's class looked different. The students had read "Civil Disobedience" and were invited to give their responses, but Nick's own anecdotal reflections were more thought-out and articulate and students inevitably deferred. As we watched such manifestations of "shared authority" we were forced to wonder, "Am I giving up too much control (and not talking enough)?" or "Am I taking too much control (and talking too much)?"

Out of our discussions and disagreements it seemed that better questions would be, "Does the student experience the classroom as a place where she exercises some authority?" and "How, in such a classroom, can a teacher feel secure about fulfilling the real obligations she has to guide instruction?" Watching a type of a group of students slowly, hesitantly, and inarticulately struggling to answer the questions they had themselves raised challenges

our commitment to student authority. We agonized over the appropriate moments for intervention.

In keeping with the principle of sharing authority, we also try to do something about the physical arrangement of the classroom. The traditional classroom space is theatre-like with a student-audience watching a teacher-actor perform. While it would be naive to suggest that simply by arranging the chairs in groups or in a circle one could automatically democratize the classroom, such arrangements do announce an intention, put us all face to face, prepare us for dialogue. Discussion in the theatre-classroom is often an exercise in free-market intellectual economics. In principle, everyone is free to speak, but in practice isolated student-thinkers compete for a share of the available discursive space with the teacher's virtual monopoly.

As we watched each other's tapes, it became clear how much our personal and political histories determine the classroom spaces we create. The distance we experience or the distance we wish to place between ourselves and our students affects the physical arrangements we are comfortable with. It seems fairly obvious now, but emerged as something of a revelation in our discussion, that one may hold radical positions relative to composition theory but still take up a fairly traditional position vis-a-vis one's students. Marjorie's generally Freirean views, for example, seemed possibly at variance with the image of her on the tape summarizing at the blackboard the points she wanted her class to remember. In fact, the more we proceeded with the self-reflective exercise of our video project, the more we saw the complexities of the play of authority in classroom interactions. The more we watched, the more we found conflicts between our professed intentions and our daily activities and even in our own self-perceptions. This attempt to implement a reflective pedagogy necessarily produces uneasiness.

The best way we have found to cope with this uneasiness is not to return to the tyranny of the one right answer, but to create a climate of generosity and a pedagogy of respect—respect for the interpretations of others, respect for the author and/or the text, and respect for the tradition in which discussion and interpretation take place. What we ask of readers is an ability to shift perspectives, to see many positions; we want a mixture of empathy and criticism. Watching John's students discuss competing hypotheses, we could see their impulse to criticize, to demolish

the others' argument in order that their own might flourish. But John simply listened carefully, restated each position, avoided the rush to judgment in favor of continued attention to the process and thereby created a space in which it was possible to respect what the other person had said without feeling one had to concede.

In a class where students have had the experience of being listened to, of having their interpretations heard, we can ask them to overcome their resistance to difficult ideas. We can say, "try it this way," or "walk in the author's shoe for a moment," if we ourselves have shown them how one can do that without losing one's own perspective. Instead of playing the role of the expert delivering knowledge to the ignorant, we are beginning to define a role as an expert producing knowledge, modeling in the classroom what a professional actually does rather than simply repeating what the professional already knows. Our role in the classroom becomes that of the researcher researching with apprentice researchers, a thinker thinking with thinkers, a writer writing with writers.

FRAME THREE
A CLOSE-UP OF CLASSROOM PROCESS

John, committed to the interdisciplinary, offers a close-up on one kind of classroom.

How might this pedagogy look in a specific classroom when we try to build our own practice around these ideas and values? One example that we viewed together, back in the early days of the group when we were first videotaping our classes and discussing what we saw, was a segment of John's class, where he was working on how scientists build knowledge. He asked the class to consider the question "Why do trees lose their leaves in the fall?," to form groups, to brainstorm hypotheses, and to come up with a plan for testing the hypothesis the group thought was most likely. When the groups reported what they had come up with, he pushed each group to determine if their research design would do what they intended it to—if it could actually work to test the hypothesis they had chosen.

In the segment of the class we viewed, one student, Ichiro, had just explained his group's hypothesis—that the lower angle of the sun in the autumn sky decreases the intensity of sunlight and thereby causes the leaves to fall off. Another student, Jamie,

then reports a much more general hypothesis from his group—simply that sunlight "changes" in the fall, providing less light and heat, and these changes cause the leaves to fall off. He describes a research design for testing the hypothesis.

Ichiro breaks in: "But you wouldn't know what you've got? You'd have to, like, test each one separately. You can't just test everything at once. You wouldn't know that it is."

Holly, from Jamie's group, challenges Ichiro: "What if you were wrong to start with?"

Ichiro: "Then you'd have to do each one anyway."

John comments: "If you want to know precisely what makes it happen, change in sunlight is an answer which you could push further to get more precise."

Jamie adds: "And you can *keep* getting more precise."

John: "So there's a judgment call to make here: which is a more . . ."

Ichiro: "Systematic!"

John: "I think they both could be systematic—but which is a more efficient way to go? Do you start with a big thing and try to narrow it down—and some of you say yes—or do you start with one narrow hypothesis, rule it out or confirm it, and then move on? If it's ruled out, go on to another narrow hypothesis? We've got two different ways of intellectually proceeding being argued for here. . ."

Holly: "I just want to say that the probability of their hypothesis being correct is less than ours, because we started in a more general area."

Ichiro: "But . . ."

Holly: "But we're probably going to be right on our first hypothesis and then from there go down. [Turning to Ichiro] If you're wrong, you really don't know which way to go. I'm just saying *if* you're wrong, you really don't know which way to go. I'm just saying *if* you're wrong. If you're right, you know, great! wonderful! . . ."

Ichiro: "We don't really mind if it's wrong. Because we're really sure, if it's right or if it's wrong, we know for sure what is wrong. Being wrong is better. Or if it's right, we know *exactly* what is right—and if we're wrong, we know *exactly* what is right—and if we're wrong, we know *exactly* what is wrong."

John: "This is an odd feature of scientific inquiry, and it's worth noting: wrong answers can be good. We're used to think-

ing that we've got to get the right answer, but in scientific inquiry, wrong answers are helpful too. They close off pathways of investigation—you know you don't have to go down the pathway—and that narrows down the possibilities you still have to consider. So a wrong answer can be good."

Several things struck us as we reflected on this exchange. For starters, we commented on how *slow* this exchange was. The three students who talked got quite animated, and the rest of the class was obviously interested in their argument, but there were several long pauses while John searched for the right words to describe what he'd just heard from them. We decided that a class in which there is real dialogue going on may sometimes be slow, that it may not be dramatic to watch, because it takes time to listen, to absorb, and to make a thoughtful response. When the instructor is not driven by the goal of "covering" a defined body of content, slowness can be good: time can be used to build the climate of generosity that supports the knowledge-making circle, that supports a learning community struggling together to build a new understanding of an issue or phenomenon.

And this *was* a class where students were grappling with a real problem. Botanists, biochemists and ecologists may have answered this question to their satisfaction already, but no one in *this* group of learners had an answer in his or her hip pocket; all they had was some ability to design ways of answering the question, just as scientists must have done when they first worked on it. And once John had set the task in motion, the locus of authority shifted in large part to the students, who had figured out their own responses to the assignment and were now weighing alternatives against each other. Whereas traditionally the teacher, with his or her fund of knowledge, is the center of the classroom, where the students occupy the center—filling it not with what they know but with a debate about *how to learn*.

Why was John doing this exercise? He set it up to explore with his students how scientists think, how they approach problems in their fields. Because all the scientific apparatus, the lab or field work is driven by a way of conceptualizing issues and problems, he was trying to get the class to think about a problem this way. This unit on scientific thinking was part of a larger design including ways of thinking of social science and the humanities; his general goal was to help his students use these ways of think-

ing, of generating and organizing knowledge, that underlie different kinds of intellectual work.

As we explored the goals underlying this exercise—introducing students to academic discourse and the ways of thinking that it expresses, exploring how thought is shaped in these different areas—at least some of us saw these purposes as the central business of the introductory writing course. We teach control of the writing process, with drafts and revisions, journals and group work as a vehicle for inquiry. The purpose is not merely self-expression, but problem-solving that leads to a particular kind of self-creation: the creation of a self who *knows more* than she did. Who knows more about how to learn. Who understands more about how the knowledge that matters to her is generated. Who knows how she can find it, interpret it, and if need be, create it herself.

From this point of view, we work to shift the locus of authority to students because we want students to see authority coming from what you know and how you know it, not from a position or social role, and we want them to see how they can develop their own authority through questioning and through writing. We believe that how you find answers is more important than having the right answer. We think this is the proper function of the introductory writing course, to serve as a gateway to a reconceived academic community, to help students develop their own authority in that community and actually to join in constructing the community. This is both similar to and more than getting them to write "in their own voice." It's helping them learn to use their voices in new ways.

FRAME FOUR
SEEING THROUGH TEXTS

Judy, who is interested, too, in modes of inquiry, steps back and pans her camera to survey the epistemological territory that we have covered.

What becomes more and more evident in the preceding is that in concentrating on pedagogy, the shifiting of authority, and thinking about thinking, we have focused more and more on the development of our students' selves as knowers. The reason for the shift away from knowledge toward the thinker is not to devalue the knowledge but to change our relationship to it. We want our

students to come to college not simply to learn what others have "found out" so they can follow unquestioningly in the footsteps of their betters, but to study how others have given order to the world, how others have seen it, so that their narrow subjective views may be broadened and deepened by the views of others. The question in our classrooms, therefore, is not only what texts we should use. The question is what relationship to texts we should foster.

For us writing becomes the shape of ideas on the page, the way we fix them long enough to examine them, modify, revise, change them, all with the substantive end of changing the way we look at and think about the world. Thus the authors' writing and the students' writing becomes one and the same activity, and that activity is a dialogue. A dialogue between greater and lesser minds, perhaps, between expert and novice, between mature thinker and young thinker, but the relationship is that of a conversation. Angus stresses the students taking the authority not so that their interpretations will prevail or so that the class will degenerate into relativism, but because they must learn the role of adult conversant if they are to become active problem solvers in any domain. Though John stresses "self-creation," Marjorie "refashioning of the self," and Judy calls it "transforming the self," all agree that the active listening to other views, openness to changing one's meaning is necessary if the self is to be carried to places it has not yet experienced.

In this view, learning is always personal and participatory, and perhaps is best exemplified by our own group's interaction, the dialogues from which this view itself is emerging. No theme runs through our conversations and our classes as strongly as the continuous effort to establish or reestablish the connections between texts and life. In fact, our deep personal sense of these connections, of the transformational power of texts may well be what drew us together as a group in the first place. For each of us, reading allowed us to escape, or move beyond, our initial conceptions of the world, and our current preferences for and attitudes toward texts are traceable to those experiences. For Nick, *The 101 Greatest Books of the Western World* that transported him from a working class home gave him a strong preference for the classics. For Judy, fiction allowed escape from a rigorously intellectual family where subjectivity was denounced, and has left her with a strong preference for imaginative participation in

literature. For John, reading, particularly in natural science, and the religious grounding of home life created paradoxes, and critical thinking became the means of thrashing these out; his class tussling with experimental plans certainly shows traces of that history. Marjorie's years as a high school teacher gave her a strong sense of the alienation of "school reading" from all other acts of interpretation and meaning making; now, in her college classrooms she takes "reading" into the visual realm of the photograph first in order to reunite it with life beyond the classroom walls. Angus' concern that students learn to take authority for themselves arises from teaching the non-college bound and a wish to make intellectual texts accessible to them. This list greatly oversimplifies the complex influences that have led to our current theories and practices, and is only intended to demonstrate the kinds of experience that generate such change and the kinds of connections that are important.

Cut to Final Shot

In introducting Erving Goofman's book, Bennett M. Berger wrote, "The 'frame' in *Frame Analysis* refers to this inevitably relational dimension of meaning. A frame, in this sense, is only a particularly tangible metaphor for what other sociologists have tried to invoke by words like 'background', 'setting,' 'context,' or a phrase like 'in terms of' " (xiii). In our use of frames we have tried to establish the ways in which each of use has viewed our experience together from a perspective, and each of us has been able to render a particular sort of picture. The perspectives are not exactly the same, the pictures could not be identical, but the enterprise has been shared and the ideas are part of what has been a communal experience. We offer this experience in this way because we thinking it is the most accurate representation of our work and because we think it mirrors what is the experience of our students. We are looking for forms of instruction that might allow us to be respectful and attentive to the edges where our stories meet and never quite merge. We wish here to preserve the particularity of the grounds on which we raise our theories.

Judy Kirscht, John Reiff, and Nick Tingle are all Lecturers in both the Program in Composition and the Interdisciplinary Writing Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Angus Dunstan is now an Assistant Professor in the English Department of California State University at Sacramento; Marjorie

Roemer is now an Assistant Professor in the English Department at the University of Cincinnati.

WORKS CITED

Boyer, Ernest L. *College*. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Dunstan, Angus, Judy Kirscht, John Reiff, Marjorie Roemer, and Nick Tingle. "Working in the Classroom: Teachers Talk About What They Do." *English Education* 21.1 (February, 1989); 39-52.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis*. 1974. Foreword by Bennett M. Berger. Boston: Northeastern U Press, 1986.

Skinner, B.F. *The Technology of Teaching*. New York: Appleton-Century-Cross, 1968.

Smelser Neil J., et al. *Lower Division Education in the University of California: A Report from the Task Force on Lower Division Education*. University of California, June 1986.