

# WRITING WHOLE- ISTICALLY

---

MARK EDWARD SMITH

In *The Psychology of the Unconscious* Robert Ornstein recounts a well-known fable from Eastern oral traditions: a king, his entourage, and an elephant visit a city whose inhabitants are blind. Anxious to learn about this mysterious animal, several citizens come to examine it. Each man feels only a part of the huge beast, and so, when they are asked to describe it to their fellow citizens, they give vastly different responses:

The man who had reached an ear said: "It is a large, rough thing, wide and broad, like a rug."

One who had felt the trunk said: "I have the real facts about it. It is like a straight and hollow pipe, awful and destructive."

One who had felt its feet and legs said: "It is mighty and firm, like a pillar."<sup>1</sup>

This tale illustrates a dilemma we writing teachers confront every term, for, while a completed written composition is a large and complex thing, as an elephant is, when we attempt to describe it to our students, we must eventually explain its parts, one at a time. True, for a time, we can discuss the essay as a whole, describing its general overall shape and appearance, and comparing and contrasting it to other "wholes," but eventually, to teach writing successfully, we will need to break it into parts and begin examining these components. Although I believe we composition teachers are not blind, like the men in the story, and although we have been able to "feel" the whole of a written composition,

Mark Smith is Associate Professor of English and Director of the Writing Workshop at Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan. This essay was written during and after a 1981 NEH Summer Seminar directed by Professor William Irmischer. Professor Smith wishes to acknowledge both Professor Irmischer and seminar participants for their help in the drafting of this essay.

when we explain it to our students we must, necessarily, break it into parts. So, some focus on sentences, others on paragraphs; some on beginnings, others on words.

But this approach poses two dangers. First, by concentrating on just one part at a time students often mistakenly believe that it is the only or most crucial component of the composition. For example, students sometimes say to their teachers: "Why did you give me such a low grade?" I used my *Thesaurus*, so I know all my words are good ones," as if the elephant's trunk was the only part that mattered. The other danger arises in the recomposition, the putting together of the parts after they have been explained. Students may be unsure about where to put the parts, perhaps placing a leg where the trunk belongs, or may get all the parts in the right places following mechanistic rules, but then lack any feeling for or a sense of the "whole" they have created.

For more than a decade now researchers of composing like Janet Emig and writers and teachers of writing like Donald Murray and Peter Elbow have offered a less dangerous alternate route; they have advised us to place less emphasis on writing as a product, consisting of parts like sentences and paragraphs, and more on writing as a process, consisting of stages like pre-writing, inventing and revising. Instead of describing the parts of a finished written composition to our students, we should explain and help them with the steps involved in producing it. But this seems to be only a partial solution to the dilemma of helping our students understand the whole, because as soon as we concentrate on a particular stage of the writing process, we are still examining just a part of the whole, albeit of the entire process rather than the finished product. Thus we still face the same dangers involved in the approach described above.

However, "seems to be" is the correct phrasing, because, while describing writing as a process *implies* that it consists of a series of sequential steps, that is not its true nature. Writing is not a linear process. Emig states: "Composing does not occur as a left-to-right solid, uninterrupted activity with an even pace. Rather there are recursive, as well as anticipatory features."<sup>2</sup> Elbow advises writers "to try to treat writing not exclusively linear . . . , not starting in at one end and writing till you get to the other."<sup>3</sup> And Murray describes the writing process as an "interaction, not a series of logical steps," and notes that the stages of this process "blend and overlap."<sup>4</sup>

In other words, while writing is a process, it is not, for example, similar to building a house. A home builder must first complete the foundation before constructing the walls, but a writer can certainly compose the body of a paper before writing the introduction. That many of us composition teachers are aware of this is demonstrated by the advice we often give to students who can't get started on a paper: "Plunge right into the middle somewhere," we say, "and then come back later and write your introduction."

Nor is the writing process linear in the more abstract sense of the mental operations we go through in producing a piece. While a homebuilder would never expect to successfully build an entire house without first making blueprints or drawings, many writers, on the other hand, can compose effective, even lengthy works without making an outline. Similarly, a home contractor would never build the rooms of a house separately and then move them around experimentally until they fit together into a well built house, but some writers compose their works one section at a time, and then rearrange and fit them together into a coherent essay.

A home builder must know before starting what the finished structure will look like, a ranch style, colonial, split level, etc. In other words, the dominant impression of the structure must be determined before the construction begins. But writers sometimes begin putting words on paper before they know what their main point is, and in some instances the writing is a means for discovering the theme of the work. Elbow's free writes often lead him to a "center of gravity" for his works.<sup>5</sup>

Also, the materials a contractor needs to construct a house must be on hand, or at least ordered or listed, to successfully complete the work. But the raw materials for writing, words and ideas, do not need to always be on the desk in front of the writer or even listed mentally in order to write an effective paper. In fact, some writers have found that the writing itself generates new ideas to use in their work, but no carpenter has ever generated 2 x 4's by playing around with the ones already there.

So, while both home building and writing are processes, they are very different ones, the former much more rigid and linear than the latter. In fact, the only thing definitely, and literally, linear about the writing process is the placement of letters and words on the page, which is only a minute part of this complex activity.

The writing process is more accurately described as holistic rather than linear. Anyone who has written and thought about the process of doing it realizes this. As we write a word down on the page, an idea for a whole later section of our paper comes to mind and we jot a word or phrase in the margin or jump ahead and write that section. As we read over what we have just written, we rethink the previous paragraph. As we jot down some notes for a specific passage in the paper, the phrasing of the opening sentence pops into our mind. Murray describes the writing process as “an explosion of elements in *simultaneous* action and reaction. Meaning is made through a series of almost instantaneous interactions.”<sup>6</sup> Elbow advises writers “to treat writing . . . as wholistic.”<sup>7</sup> And William Irmscher states: “Everything impinges at once: thought, emotion, structures, modes and the transcription itself. In fairly technical discussions, the process is characterized as holistic.”<sup>8</sup>

Irmscher continues, very logically and common sensically:

And it might seem to follow that what is holistic ought to be taught in a holistic way, that is as an entity. I am not aware how that is possible. As fully as I acknowledge that we do not explain everything about writing when we talk about it in piecemeal fashion, it is the only way of talking specifically about what is right and what is faulty. We may want our students to be better writers, but if we can't get at the cause of the problem in particular terms, then we are not likely to help.<sup>9</sup>

Thus another dilemma: writing is a holistic process and should be taught that way, but this, as Irmscher points out, does not *seem* possible.

While this may not *seem* possible at first, I believe, for both theoretical and practical reasons, writing *can* be taught holistically, at least to a certain useful degree. Vygotsky's concept of inner speech and Britton's of expressive writing provide the theoretical foundation for this strategy of teaching writing, along with recent findings in left brain-right brain research; my experiences and those of other composition teachers and writers furnish the practical groundwork. To fully understand this approach to teaching writing, it is important to view writing not so much, holistically, as wholeistically.

To explain the latter distinction first: I first encountered the term “holistic” some years ago in a discussion of holistic scoring of student essays. To my knowledge I had never seen the word in print prior to that time, and upon hearing it orally I constructed, in my mind’s eye, the word “whole-istic.” This made sense to me, because the unique characteristic of holistic essay evaluation was the reader’s overall or *whole* impression of the work in relation to the scoring criteria based on reading the essay straight through once. Later, I saw the word in print as “holistic,” and I was initially confused (and still, to some degree, am) by this spelling of the word, since it made me think of “hole,” something dark, empty and foreboding. “Whole-istic,” on the other hand, made me think of whole, entire, and complete, which connected more directly and logically, in my mind at least, with the meaning of the word. However, realizing inconsistencies and illogicality are common in the spelling of English words, I have generally conformed to the more usual spelling of “holistic,” though not in this instance, and for a specific reason.

“Holistic,” suggesting “hole,” seems to imply the writing process consists of pouring words, sentences and paragraphs into a structure or container, which is not at all the way most writers describe their practice. “Whole-istic,” on the other hand, is consistent with the many descriptions of the writing process as one in which, at some point, the writer envisions the whole composition, and in which many things happen at the same time, and which results, when practiced effectively, in a unified, complete piece. Thus, if we can teach the writing process “whole-istically” rather than holistically or piecemeal, we will be teaching it much more realistically and effectively. Our method of instruction will reinforce the process.

Vygotsky’s concept of inner speech and Britton’s of expressive writing provide a theoretical rationale and a means of teaching the writing process in a more “whole-istic” way. Results of recent studies in left brain-right brain research support this rationale.

In *Thought and Language*, Vygotsky cites Piaget’s observations of children using language to explain the origin of inner speech. Piaget noticed, as every parent has, that preschool children often talk aloud to themselves while playing; he labeled this talking “egocentric speech.” In addition, Piaget observed that the amount of egocentric speech used

by children of about age three declined as the child grew older until, by the time (and possibly because of) the child's first enrollment in school it had almost completely disappeared. While Piaget hypothesizes that egocentric speech disappears because of increasing demands for socialized speech and the stigma attached to "talking to yourself," Vygotsky says that egocentric speech gradually becomes internalized as "inner speech." In other words, egocentric speech does not simply disappear, it is simply no longer vocalized; however, it does not simply remain unvocalized egocentric speech. It undergoes significant development as the child matures cognitively.<sup>10</sup>

Having accounted for its origin, Vygotsky then explains the crucial role of inner speech in the development of thought. He cites an intriguing example:

Our findings indicate that egocentric speech . . . soon becomes an instrument of thought in the proper sense — in seeking and planning a solution of a problem. An accident that occurred during one of our experiments provides a good illustration of one way in which egocentric speech may alter the course of an activity: A child of five and a half was drawing a streetcar when the point of his pencil broke. He tried, nevertheless, to finish the circle of a wheel, pressing down on the pencil very hard, but nothing showed on the paper except a deep colorless line. The child muttered to himself, "it's broken," put aside the pencil, took watercolors instead and began drawing a *broken* streetcar after an accident, continuing to talk to himself from time to time about the change in his picture. (pp. 16-17)

In this incident, an accident, the pencil breaking, prompted egocentric speech, "it's broken," which in turn enabled the child to alter his perception, to discover a new idea or thought. If this had happened to an older child or an adult, Vygotsky would probably say the only difference is that "it's broken" would not have been uttered aloud, a manifestation of egocentric speech, but instead have simply flashed through the drawer's mind, an example of inner speech. For Vygotsky, the development of 'inner speech' marks a crucial step in the child's cognitive development. "Inner speech," he writes, "is a function in itself . . . [and] is to a large extent thinking in pure meanings." (p. 149) Inner speech plays a

significant, intermediate role in the process of thought, which begins from a motive and then proceeds through inner speech, and finally manifests itself in words meaningful to others. (p. 152)

Vygotsky also describes the general characteristics of inner speech. It is "condensed, abbreviated speech," and "almost entirely predicative, because the situation, the subject of thought, is always known to the thinker." (p. 100) He also refers to inner speech as a "mental draft" of written speech. (p. 144) Vygotsky explains at length the unique nature of the words of inner speech; they "have a 'sense' not a strictly defined 'meaning,' which means that they are not narrowly defined, but have fairly broad limits" (p. 147), and "in inner speech . . . a single word is so saturated with sense that many words would be required to explain it in external speech." (p. 148)

Many of the terms Vygotsky uses to describe "inner speech" are the same or very similar to Britton's description of "expressive writing." Britton explicitly acknowledges his debt to the Russian psychologist:

The best description of the dialectical interrelationship of thought and language is still probably that provided by Vygotsky. . . . The way Vygotsky defines inner speech is of crucial importance, not only to an explanation of the process of writing, but also to understanding what will make writing easier.<sup>11</sup>

Drawing from the work of Edward Sapir as well as Vygotsky, Britton identifies and describes a mode of language and writing which he calls "expressive." Expressive writing "stays close to the speaker" and hence is fully comprehensible only to one who knows the speaker and shares his context"; expressive writing "is a verbalization of the speaker's immediate preoccupations and his mood of the moment"; expressive writing is "relaxed and intimate, as free as possible from outside demands, whether those of a task or of an audience"; expressive writing is "the mode in which, generally speaking, we frame the tentative first drafts of new ideas"; and expressive writing "is a kind of matrix from which differentiated forms of mature writing are developed."<sup>12</sup>

Inner speech and expressive writing, then, share some significant characteristics: each is context bound, meaning that the thinker's or writer's situation must be fully known

for the meaning of the utterance to be understandable to someone else; the audience for each is primarily the self; and each is crucial to further development of thought and writing. But there is a significant difference between them: Vygotsky says that inner speech is “condensed,” “abbreviated,” “almost entirely predicative,” and consists of words that are “saturated with sense.” Britton does not use these same terms to describe expressive writing. As a writer who has reread some of my own expressive writing, and as a teacher who has looked at a file cabinet full of spiral notebook journals written by my students (journals are one kind of expressive writing), I am absolutely convinced that expressive writing is not “condensed and abbreviated.” In fact, like much oral language, it is vague, wordy and redundant.

But, having examined my own expressive writing closely as well as that of my students, I am now convinced that expressive writing *contains some* inner speech. In other words, I have found that some of those special words and phrases from inner speech, those which are “saturated with sense,” find their way from the thinker’s mind onto the writer’s page. Vygotsky recognizes this phenomenon: “a word that keeps recurring in a book or a poem sometimes absorbs *all* the variety of sense contained in it and becomes, in a way, equivalent to the work itself . . . the *whole* sense of a work is contained in one name.” (p. 147)

A reader response exercise recommended by Peter Elbow that I have used successfully in my classes supports this observation by Vygotsky. In *Writing Without Teachers* Elbow advises the readers of a paper to “choose *one word* from the writing which best summarizes it.”<sup>13</sup> When I have used this exercise in small groups in class, I have been amazed at the consistency of the choices. In responding to a particular essay, often as many as 4 or 5 students, and sometimes more, out of a group of 7 will choose the same word or synonymous ones. This demonstrates that certain key words or phrases in a piece of writing assimilate a broader, deeper meaning than their denotation; they take on a concentrated “sense,” to use Vygotsky’s term, which encompasses the whole of what the author is trying to convey.

This word or phrase, which embodies all or the “whole” of the writer’s thoughts on a specific subject, is the key to a whole-istic approach to the writing process. Writing whole-istically consists, in an abbreviated description, of: (1) being consciously aware of one’s inner speech; (2) doing some ex-

pressive writing in which these words “saturated with sense” will be used automatically; (3) examining one’s expressive writing and finding these key words, expanding, developing, and defining them, so the writing will be meaningful to an audience broader than just the self. This explains the way in which the writing process can be practiced whole-istically, but it is, of course, a gross oversimplification of the entire activity, especially of its beginning and ending. Vygotsky and other cognitive psychologists explain the development and interaction of thought and inner speech in more detail and with stronger support; likewise, many authorities on writing explain more precisely how key words can be expanded and developed into works that are meaningful to others. But the process described above clearly indicates the crucial intermediate step that inner speech and expressive writing play in the whole-istic writing process. Also, as noted earlier and indicated in the above description, this process is not absolutely whole-istic; that is, it is not one in which the entire text suddenly appears on the page all at once. However, it is whole-istic in the sense that it is based on a key word or phrase which embodies the writer’s complete thought.

Recent findings in left brain-right brain research support this description of writing as a whole-istic process. For most people the left brain is the primary seat of language functions, including writing; this hemisphere has been described as rational, linear, sequential and analytic. The right brain, on the other hand, usually functions in an intuitive, synthetic and holistic manner. These two hemispheres, or as Ornstein calls them, “modes of consciousness,” are, in relation to the anecdote at the beginning of this article, analogous to “first . . . the process of viewing in sequence the individual parts of the elephant,” and “second . . . viewing at once the whole animal.”<sup>14</sup> In general, at least in the past, Western education, including instruction in writing, has been primarily left brain oriented; it has emphasized the sequential, the causal, the analytic aspects of our experience. Yet the other “mode is a daily part of the experience of each person . . . . It is a mode associated with the intuitive, holistic side of ourselves.”<sup>15</sup> In fact, “our highest creative achievements are the products of the complementary functioning of the two modes.”<sup>16</sup> Certainly a well written composition is a “creative achievement”; thus, as Emig states: “The process of writing requires integration of

the functions of both spheres of the brain. In the process of writing, experiences that come to our right sphere as wholes must be rendered by our left sphere into linear sequences of verbal symbols with explicit logical and psychological connections.”<sup>17</sup>

I used this whole-istic writing process in composing this article. First, I did extensive pre-writing, deciding on a topic, reading works related to it, talking to others about it, all the while thinking verbally about it. I carried on an internal dialogue with myself on this topic and listened carefully to it. In other words, I used inner speech and was consciously aware of this. I also did expressive writing on this topic, jotting down notes from time to time, and doing freewrites and journal entries. Later I examined this expressive writing and gradually focused my attention on the phrase “writing whole-istically.” As I continued thinking about this topic, this phrase absorbed more and more meaning, or in Vygotsky’s term, assimilated a “sense,” until I felt it embodied for me my complete or whole thought on this topic. I knew then I had a handle on my composition, but realized I still had much work to do in expanding, developing, and defining this phrase so others could understand its full, concentrated meaning the way I do. Jotting down that phrase and then gradually realizing it contained *all* of my thought on this topic was a focal point in my composing of this article. Interestingly, when I first wrote this phrase, I didn’t feel it represented for me the whole of my thoughts on this subject; I wasn’t satisfied and kept searching fruitlessly for other ideas and words. If, shortly after writing that, a knowledgeable and caring reader had looked at my notes, told me this phrase looked promising, and suggested that I explore it further, then I would have been spared some unnecessary work and frustration. This, of course, is one practical way composition instructors can teach the writing process whole-istically.

In writing a work very different from this one, I had a similar whole-istic experience. I had assigned one of my classes a character description, and planned on writing one along with them. To help them choose a strong topic and focus their attention on details, I conducted a one-word exercise taken from the Story Workshop method of teaching composition.<sup>18</sup> I asked my students to think about an intriguing person that they might want to describe, to concentrate intensely on seeing that person in their mind’s eye,

and to focus on just one specific part of that person's physical appearance. Then, going around the room in turn, I had the students name in a single word or phrase the part of the person they were looking at. At this point, I had, like most of my students, not even decided on a character I wanted to describe in my paper. I listened intently as the students pronounced their words and when a student said "chest," an image immediately popped into my mind. (No, it wasn't of a buxom woman as my students initially expected, when I later related this incident to them.) I saw my father-in-law, who had a huge barrel chest. From this single word, and the image it generated in my mind, I was able to construct an entire composition. Though the word came very early, actually as the first step of my writing process, it was the crucial step in my completing this work, and encompassed for me the "whole" of the description. Upon re-examination of my writing processes in composing all my works, I have discovered a key word or phrase that functions in this whole-istic manner, though this experience has more often been a gradual realization, as it was in writing this article, than a sudden, immediate recognition, as it was in composing the character description of my father-in-law.

Other writers have reported the whole-istic nature and central role of a key word or phrase in their composing processes. In his presentation at the 1981 Conference on College Composition and Communication, Donald Murray explained that Charles Dickens had reported he was able to compose the entire opening scene of one of his novels from just a few key words and phrases, and that Joan Didion was prompted to write an entire play by a single image from a dream.

Thus, based on my writing experiences, my observation of the writing processes of my students, and reports from successful writers about their composing, I am convinced the writing process has a significant whole-istic component. This conclusion is supported in theory by the work of Vygotsky and Britton, as well as recent findings in left brain-right brain research. This whole-istic component of the process originates in the writer's inner speech. It then appears in the author's expressive writing. This key word or phrase may appear at any time, early or late, in the writing process, and may show up in any type of expressive writing: a journal or diary entry, some notes jotted down after a conversation with friends, a paragraph scribbled on a scratch

paper on a nightstand in the middle of the night, a few phrases roughly etched on a napkin after dinner, a topic in a rough outline, a note in the margin of a book or article, or a group of words in an early rough draft of a composition. In re-examining this expressive writing, the author focuses on this key word or phrase and then expands, develops and defines it through successive drafts so that this "whole" will be meaningful to others.

But what does all of this mean in practical terms? How, exactly, can we composition teachers teach the process of writing whole-istically? I can think of a few strategies for doing this.

First, we should simply tell students about inner speech, describe its characteristics to them, give examples of it from our own experiences and those of other writers. We should not only define it and describe its characteristics, but explain how it works in the processes of developing our thought and writing. Citing the example of the boy who drew a picture of a broken streetcar after his pencil had broken is a clear, simple way of conveying this. To a certain degree we can put students into more intimate touch with their own inner speech by simply telling them that it exists, has a name, and that they should listen for it more carefully. But this approach is limited; it is one thing to be told about the whole-istic nature of the writing process, and quite another to actually experience it. More specific and involving methods must be used to help students practice this whole-istic part of their writing processes.

We can have students do extensive expressive writing. I prefer to have students keep journals, but there are other methods of encouraging expressive writing, such as free writing exercises, note taking, brainstorming, diary writing, accounts of dialogues with others or with themselves, filling in slots in heuristic systems like the tagmemic grid or Burke's pentad, and so on. However, we must remind students that while inner speech reveals itself graphically in certain words and phrases of expressive writing, not all expressive writing is, by any means, inner speech. Most of what my students write in their journals and free writes is not "saturated with sense," but instead consists of filler words, what Elbow describes as "garbage."<sup>19</sup> But intermingled with that garbage are a few invaluable diamonds that sparkle brilliantly, because they come from inner speech.

Thus, in addition to having students do extensive ex-

pressive writing, we must ask them to carefully re-examine it. Having them reread their expressive writing and mark the words or phrases which sound strong is one way to do this. This method will probably work best with experienced writers. Ideally, all writers should be able to find their own wholistic words or phrases by themselves. Less experienced writers, however, will initially need help at this stage, which we can provide in two ways. First, we can read their expressive writing and quickly and simply underline or circle the words or phrases which appear to have come from inner speech. While we will not be able to spot all of these key words and phrases with total accuracy, we can discover them with great frequency. After all, we have for years recognized these terms in the finished compositions of our best students. All we need do now is mark them earlier in the writing process for less experienced writers. Another method is to have students exchange their expressive pieces and read each other's, marking the words and phrases that seem to come from inner speech. My successful use of the Elbow one-word exercise cited above convinces me that students are able to identify significant terms in each other's writings.

Next, after students have identified their key words and phrases, either by themselves, with our assistance or with the help of other students, we can draw their attention to these terms. We can have them concentrate on these words, play around with them, work with them, develop, expand and define them so they will be meaningful to others. Many recent composition textbooks offer specific strategies for this expansion and refinement.

Another technique which puts students in contact with their inner speech is concentration on possible titles during the composing process. As I stated above, the title of this article came from my inner speech on this topic; I believe the same can happen for students. Another possible means of making students more aware of their inner speech comes from some basic writing teachers I have talked to. They sometimes advise students who are completely blocked from writing to talk their thoughts on a paper into a tape recorder and then to transcribe it later. These are only a few, briefly described strategies for teaching writing as a wholistic process. I am sure many teachers have successfully used other methods which focus on key terms from inner speech, and I hope this article will encourage them to explain these to others.

These strategies and others will help students write whole-istically; they will help them to see the “whole elephant” not just its ear or trunk or leg. A better metaphor is suggested by another familiar tale from Eastern culture which Ornstein relates:

A man saw Nasrudin searching for something on the ground. “What have you lost Mulla?” he asked.

“My key,” said the Mulla.

So the man went down on his knees, too, and they both looked for it. After a time the other man asked: “Where exactly did you drop it?”

“In my own house.”

“Then why are you looking out here?”

“There is more light here than inside my house.”<sup>20</sup>

Like the man in the story we have, for too long, been trying to help students find the keys to their written compositions in the light, that is, in the analytic, rational, intellectual side of their experiences. But the keys are not there. They are, instead, lost in the dark, in the synthetic, intuitive, holistic part of their minds. We can help our students write stronger, more insightful, and better unified compositions by telling them to look for the keys in the dark where they are lost. Then we can help them more systematically and carefully search this dark place, through increased awareness of their inner speech and extensive practice of expressive writing, and find their keys. They can then bring them into the light for a rational, analytical examination and elucidation. Emig summarizes it best: “Writing is,” and I would add, ought to be practiced as, “a whole-brained activity.”<sup>21</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Idries Shah, quoted in Robert E. Ornstein, *The Psychology of Consciousness*, 2d ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), p. 122.

<sup>2</sup>*The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders* (Urbana: NCTE, 1971), p. 84.

<sup>3</sup>*Writing Without Teachers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 29.

<sup>4</sup>“Writing as Process: How Writing Finds Its Own Meaning,” in *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*, ed. Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland (Urbana: NCTE, 1980), p. 4.

<sup>5</sup>Elbow, p. 35.

<sup>6</sup>Murray, pp. 3-4.

<sup>7</sup>Elbow, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup>*Teaching Expository Writing* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), p. 62.

<sup>9</sup>Irmscher, p. 63.

<sup>10</sup>*Thought and Language*, ed. and trans. Eugenia Hanfmann and Gertrude Vakar (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1962), pp. 44-51. Future references to this work will be indicated by page numbers in the text.

<sup>11</sup>*The Development of Writing Abilities* (London: MacMillan Education, 1975), p. 39.

<sup>12</sup>Britton, pp. 82-83.

<sup>13</sup>Elbow, p. 86. The *italics* are Elbow's.

<sup>14</sup>Ornstein, p. 12.

<sup>15</sup>Ornstein, p. 112.

<sup>16</sup>Ornstein, p. 14.

<sup>17</sup>*Four Worlds of Writing* (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), p. 7.

<sup>18</sup>See John Schultz, "Story Workshop: Writing From Start to Finish," in *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*, ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell (Urbana: NCTE, 1978), pp. 151-189 for a full explanation of this. A colleague of John Schultz at Columbia College, Betty Shiftlet, first introduced this methodology to me at a pre-convention workshop of the 1975 NCTE Convention in San Diego. I am still convinced it is a strategy that must first be experienced before it can be used; simply reading about it is inadequate.

<sup>19</sup>Elbow, p. 7.

<sup>20</sup>Idries Shah, quoted in Ornstein, p. 196.

<sup>21</sup>Emig, *Four Worlds*, p. 7.

