MULTI-MEDIA, MULTIMODALITY, AND MULTIMEDIA:

A STUDY OF COMPETING CONCEPTS IN COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS, 1968-1973

****

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

Of English

University of Houston

****

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

****

By

Nidhi Rajkumar

August 2019

MULTI-MEDIA, MULTIMODALITY, AND MULTIMEDIA:

A STUDY OF COMPETING CONCEPTS IN COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS, 1968-1973

Nidhi Rajkumar

Approved

Nathan Shepley, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

James L. Kastely, Ph.D.

Paul Butler, Ph.D.

Margot Backus, Ph.D.

James T. Zebroski, Ph.D.

Antonio D. Tillis, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Department of Hispanic Studies

MULTI-MEDIA, MULTIMODALITY, AND MULTIMEDIA:

A STUDY OF COMPETING CONCEPTS IN COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS, 1968-1973

****

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of English

University of Houston

****

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

****

By

Nidhi Rajkumar

August 2019

ABSTRACT

In her 2009 *Computers and Composition* article, Lauer pointed out that compositionists today have defined *multimodality* and *multimedia* more from context than from any real understanding of what these terms entail. In 2006, Daniel Anderson et al. found that in the collegiate environments within the U.S, teachers of writing understood the meaning of *multimodality* as including the use of words, images, sound, and animation. However, in practice the concept of *multimodality* focused on the use of the visual and the alphabetic, with an exclusion to all other modes (78-9). This has made *multimodality* synonymous with the use of digital technologies, rather than the impetus for something bigger. Lauer pointed out that instead of understanding *mode* and *media* as distinct, though connected, terms, *media* and *mode* have become interchangeable with the prefix *multi* (288).

This is becoming increasingly risky because, as Jason Palmeri pointed out in 2012, today's pedagogical requirements have shifted where "[i]t [is] not enough to teach students to compose alphabetic texts alone [for] that students needed to be able to compose with images, sounds, and words in order to communicate persuasively and effectively in the twenty-first century" (2). Palmeri also argued that excluding multiple modes in the composing process meant denying students *and* teachers the untapped potential of multimodality in the writing classroom. It is because of technology's influence on pedagogy, even technology's inaccessibility to some, that we must respond to this issue urgently.

In this dissertation I use textual sources to examine *multimodal* and *multimedia* in composition so as to enable instructors to articulate their multimodal pedagogical ambitions through a clear conceptual understanding of *multimodal* and *multimedia*. In order to ground

this dissertation, I locate the focus in textbooks, specifically in the multi-media textbooks from 1968-1973, the period of the emergence of the use of the multimodal approach to writing pedagogy. The goals for this study are informing writing instructors of the differences between *multimodality* and *multimedia*, while empowering them to be able to independently, and relatively quickly, assess the degree and the nature of a teaching resource's modality. Xin Liu Gale and Fredric Gale stated that we must explore the growing connections between computer technology and textbooks ([*Re*]*Visioning Composition Textbooks*), and this study is a response to their call. This dissertation allows us, as compositionists, to not only better articulate our textbooks, courses, and pedagogical resources in terms of their *multimodality*, but also to better redefine our own identities as *multimodal* compositionists of tomorrow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude to all those who have supported me during this journey is beyond words. All of them have inspired, supported, and guided me from the moment I have known them:

Dr. Nathan Shepley, the chair of my committee, for steering me through the process with expertise, clarity, commitment, patience, and encouragement.

Dr. James T. Zebroski, for your guidance and mentorship during the formative stages of this study.

Dr. Margot Backus, Dr. Paul Butler, and Dr. James L. Kastely, for your kindness and constant encouragement.

Dr. Anil Aneja, for believing in me through the hard years.

My parents, Mrs. Neerja and Mr. Falguni Rajkumar, my grandmother, Smt. Kaushilya Devi, for your blessings, and my mother-in-law, Mrs. Christine Jyoti Krishna, for your comradery.

My friends, Maurice Wilson, for looking out for me, and Sarah Fish, for your honesty.

My sons, Surya and Akshay, for being my motivation and for constantly reminding me about the important things in life.

And above all, Kiran, my husband and best friend, you have made life an amazing adventure.

Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

Dedicated to Kiran, Surya, and Akshay

Om Shri Ganeshai Namaha

May every endeavor bear auspicious fruit.

Om Namaha Shivaii

May every end be an auspicious beginning.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In her 2007 article in *Computers and Composition*, "Inventing Myself in Multimodality," Debra Journet identified herself as a "senior faculty member," that is, "someone with a long history of teaching and research in English studies" (107) who always saw writing as alphabetic. She described her work as "a life-long commitment to both reading and producing *words*" coupled with "a professional reluctance to employ communicative technologies for anything other than the production and reception of written text" (107). However, Journet soon began to recognize that *writing* was now becoming increasingly unrecognizable as students were communicating "with technologies [she] only dimly understood," and "genres [she had] never heard of" (108). In light of these shifts, Journet recalled beginning to reconsider her responsibilities as a writing teacher as she worked to integrate unfamiliar new modes with familiar traditional modes.

Journet's story ended well, but her experiences remain valuable because this struggle is as familiar as it is frequent. A general inability to define *multimodality* as distinct from *multimedia* in composition studies, including *multimodality*'s scope and possibilities, is far more common than we would like to acknowledge. Journet concluded her narrative by calling for studies that explore the ways in which new media mesh with what many of us have "traditionally (and over a lifetime) considered our responsibilities as composition teachers" (108). She asks, "[h]ow do we negotiate difficulties attendant on becoming a learner in areas where we are accustomed to being experts?" (108). Her story is also important because it shows that our use of digital technology and the concept of *multimodality* have merged. In 2006, Daniel Anderson et al. found that in the collegiate

environments within the U.S., teachers of writing understood the meaning of *multimodality* as including the use of words, images, sound, and animation. However, in practice the concept of *multimodality* focused on the use of the visual and the alphabetic, with an exclusion to all other modes (78-79), making, as Cynthia Selfe pointed out, *multimodality* synonymous with the use of digital technologies rather than the impetus for something bigger (Ryerson). Daniel Anderson et al. further discovered that most instructors seemed to realize this gap and wished to learn more about *multimodality* in composition studies, but due to various factors, learnt what they could informally and through colleagues (79).

In 2012, Jason Palmeri argued that today's pedagogical requirements had shifted as "[i]t [is] not enough to teach students to compose alphabetic texts alone for that students needed to be able to compose with images, sounds, and words in order to communicate persuasively and effectively in the twenty-first century" (2). Palmeri also argued that excluding multiple modes in the composing process meant denying students and teachers the untapped potential of multimodality in the writing classroom. The point I am making is that *everything* is at stake in understanding *multimodality* in composition today, from our relevance as a discipline (Hawisher et al.) to our identities as compositionists (*Remixing*). Given such high stakes, the question of understanding multimodality for itself and as distinct from *multimedia* is of utmost urgency today.

The question of definitions is central to our understanding of our identities as compositionists today, as well our ability to cope with the changing face of writing pedagogy. Before proceeding, I would point out that in this study I differentiate between the use of terms as concepts and as descriptions through my use of italics. I have italicized conceptual terms and have used the regular font when the word is descriptive. For example,

"understanding *multimodality* is important," and "this dissertation examines multimodal textbooks." I have maintained this pattern throughout the project for several other terms as well.

In 2009 Claire Lauer pointed out that *media* and *mode* have become interchangeable with the prefix *multi* when they should be seen as distinct, yet, connected, terms. Lauer further argued that definitions of "just about everything tend to adapt to the variety of audiences to whom they are being delivered" (228). In other words, context and reader interpretation dictate meaning. Theory, Lauer argues, is useful when we understand and apply it, but if this theoretical understanding is absent then the "real-life applicability of a term" is lost (Lauer 228). Lauer proposed,

> Both multimedia and multimodal arose in response to the technological advancement that was occurring – in the late 60's and early 90's for multimedia and the late 90's for multimodal – but while multimedia emerged out of industry, multimodal arose out of the academic scholarship of the New London Group. As a result, the use of multimedia in industry remains dominant, while the use of multimodal within composition scholarship has grown. (237)

She furthered argued,

> Multimodal and multimedia are especially interesting terms to examine together because they come from different social, technological, and historical contexts and their definitions are technically different, yet they are often understood similarly. (238)

She concluded that the reader's theoretical understanding differentiates the definitions of *multimedia* and *multimodal*. Context has shaped how most compositionists understand *multimodal* and *multimedia*.

To illustrate this contextual use of *multimodality* and *multimedia* I refer to Journet's story that demonstrates how this conceptual interchangeability plays out in real time and Palmeri's use of these terms in *Remixing* as an example of how context defines meaning. Palmeri's use of *multimedia* refers to the action of incorporating multiple modes in writing, while *multimodal* is the theory of a pedagogical approach deploying multiple modes in composition. Consider these excerpts from *Remixing Composition*:

> Whereas traditional cluster maps are limited to words and simple shapes such as lines and circles, Prezi can enable students to make a cluster map that combines words with embedded images and videos. In the process of making their cluster maps, students might search Google, YouTube, and literary databases looking for quotations, images, and videos that relate to their chosen topic. They can import all of this material into Prezi and experiment with multiple ways of arranging it. After students have created a Prezi map of their paper, they can present their multimodal maps to each other, reflecting about how their understanding of their topic has changed through the process of gathering and rearranging their multimodal materials. (45-6)

And:

> Although most compositionists of the late 1960s and early 1970s focused on visual and multimedia texts as objects of analysis, some scholars in this time period also proposed that writing teachers engage students in *producing* visual

> and multimedia texts … Furthermore, some compositionists of the early 1970s suggested that the electronic revolution necessitated a rethinking of the field's conventional privileging of linearity and originality in print texts, arguing instead that writing teachers should engage students in analyzing and/or producing participatory, associative texts that made meaning through juxtaposition, incorporated found images and words, and enabled audience interaction. (88)

In the first passage Palmeri used *multimodal* to denote the digital synthesis of materials, making *digital* synonymous with *multimodal*. In the second passage, Palmeri referred to *multimodal* as the juxtaposition of word and image that enable audience interaction. Here Palmeri specifically referred to "participatory, associative texts" as being multimodal texts. These examples illustrate how context drives meaning, and while this works well enough for Palmeri in *Remixing*, it is potentially and unintentionally confusing, misleading even, to someone incorporating *multimodality* in a composition course. The potential problems of this interchangeability of terms are:

- Instructors teaching non-multimodal courses believing they are multimodal only because of the use of multiple digital medium in the implementation of the course content;
- Instructors developing a sense of inaccessibility to a *multimodal* approach in composition pedagogy; and
- Students learning nothing new as they continue to reiterate traditional models albeit digitally.

This project defines *multimodal* and *multimedia* in composition to enable instructors to articulate their multimodal pedagogical ambitions through a clear conceptual understanding of *multimodal* and *multimedia*. This dissertation addresses two questions:

- How is *multimodal* distinct from *multimedia*, and what is their relationship?
- How can instructors evaluate these distinctions when trying to articulate their vision of a (multimodal) composition course?

The first question establishes a theoretical understanding of *multimodal* and *multimedia* where meaning is dependent on an inherent definition of *multimodality*, while the second question puts this conceptual understanding to use. Using the composition textbook as a site where the theory and the act of teaching symbolically meet, I explain and differentiate between the concepts of *multimodal* and *multimedia.* In this study I will (re)present the composition textbook as a composite of author intention, instructional content implementation, and the perception of the users and/or reviewers of the textbook. These three aspects are distinct as intention is the author's motivation to write the textbook; implementation is how this authorial intention manifests in the forms of instructional content, as well as the modes used to do this; and external perception is how the users of these textbooks have received this implementation. Each of these is distinct because even though the contents of the textbook may be influenced by intention, the actual implementation defines various aspects of a textbook's features like its level, type, usability, and relevance. The role these three aspects play is evident not just in the textbooks included in the textbook analysis chapters, but also in other textbooks I analyzed from the period 1968-1973 (Appendix 1).

The second question seeks to empower instructors by enabling them to independently evaluate and determine the multimodality of their courses and course materials. I do this through the Function & Form Framework tool (table 1). In a nutshell, the Framework is a customizable research tool that analyzes any textbook's content implementation against the textbook's function and form dimensions. It enables a composition instructor to clearly articulate their course objectives and match multimodal resources for the multimodal course they envision for their students. This Framework works not just to design *multimodal* and *multimedia* composition courses, but also to enable the analysis of textbooks. It analyzes the functions of the textbook through the instructional content implementation and the modes deployed to achieve these goals.

Table 1: Function & Form Framework

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback Assignments				
	Research Assignments				
	Reflective Assignments				
	Reading Centered Assignment				
Visual	Feedback Assignments				
	Research Assignments				
	Reflective Assignments				
	Reading Centered Assignment				
Alphabetic	Feedback Assignments				
	Research Assignments				
	Reflective Assignments				
	Reading Centered Assignment				
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

- ● Significant evidence available to validate
- ○ Partial evidence available to validate

Justifying the Scope: Writing Textbooks from 1968-1973

Choice of Writing Textbooks:

Composition scholarship has at the one end seen textbooks as an indispensable part of composition pedagogy but has at the other end considered textbooks nothing more than teaching aids. In a panel discussion in 1969, George Allen said that "a good textbook is an excellent, if not indispensable, tool for teaching" (1). However, Robin Varnum argued that textbooks substantiate a false view of history that does not reveal real classroom practices and forces like demographic, geographic, economic, social, political, gender, institutional, and departmental issues – which affect the teaching of writing (40). Nonetheless I would argue that the persistent use of textbooks as a basis of scholarship in writing studies is evidence for its legitimacy. Textbooks as the basis of research has its advocates, like Louise Phelps. In 1991 Phelps argued that the generally accepted notion of research that was defined by formal inquiry was considered the only legitimate source of scholarly knowledge. However, the Aristotelian concept of *phronesis* in which practice informs theory and theory makes room for practice. Together theory and practice articulate the knowledge making process ("Practical Wisdom" 864), giving scholarship based on textbooks academic legitimacy. This in turn creates knowledge that is global and local at the same time (864). I would argue that textbooks are the confluence of theory as well as practice. The *theory* in a textbook is often seen as the repository of the knowledge, while *practice* is the textbook as the *tool* used by instructors in the dissemination of this knowledge. A composition *textbook* then is a place where theory enlightened by practice can empower the teachers by enhancing the validity of classroom content, while simultaneously informing research in the discipline.

Textbooks, as the basis of academic scholarship, are by no means a new idea. As far back as 1932, Caverly et al. used textbooks to evaluate areas of concern for inexperienced teachers who "must rely upon (their) own judgment in the evaluation of a textbook" (281). Even as recently as 2017, Chris Mays used textbooks to discuss the complexities of the writing process at multiple levels of scale, or the interconnectedness that connects even the most dissimilar of texts and its influence on how we understand and teach the writing processes. The point I am making here is that while textbooks are seen with some suspicion in the process of knowledge making, several scholars have seen writing textbooks as valuable. For example, Ryan Horadan, Abby Knoblauch, Kathleen Welch, Robert Connors, William Woods, Donald C. Stewart, George Allen et.al, and Edward Corbett to name a few have seen textbooks as objects of constancy. I follow in this tradition and believe that textbook are subjects of legitimate and serious scholarship, and while they may not provide complete records of pedagogical practices in the classrooms, they provide important clues that lay down the path forward, brick by brick.

Choice of Time Period:

The publications between 1968-1973 indicate that these few years were a unique moment when classical rhetoric was being revisited, revised, and redefined. It was a moment before the establishment of composition as an institutionally recognized discipline, yet the formation of the Conference of College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1949 implied that the teaching of writing of the late 60s and early 70s likely benefited from the nascent recognition of a shift in pedagogical perspectives among research-inclined college writing instructors. The idea that good writing should entail more than error avoidance and

form adherence was beginning to be heard at the growing CCCC and was documented in some issues of the *CCC* from that period. James Zebroski saw 1968-1973 as an amalgamation of several events that critically defined our official histories (28). Zebroski argued that the social formation that had begun to gather both clarified and challenged how we view our discipline today. Palmeri also goes back to the late 60s and early 70s as the moment when the multimodal approach became noticeable in the teaching of writing in the colleges and universities then.

Juxtaposing Zebroski's analysis of 1968-1973 with Palmeri's claim indicates that those years are an appropriate starting point in trying to understand *multimodality* in composition and in writing textbooks. It is important to specify here that mine is not a history project despite the historical context that defines the project. This dissertation is a forward-looking project that looks back at the multi-media moment of 1968-1973 to inform our current understanding of *multimodality* and *multimedia* in composition studies.

Defining Key Terms:

Here I define key terms that are important and that repeatedly appear in this study. Each definition includes how the term has been used in scholarship as well how the term has been used in this project, particularly if I have given it a unique interpretation that makes it better serve the aims of this project.

Mode:

In this project *mode* is the deployment of any medium towards pedagogical value-addition. This term, in the context of the Framework, is the unit of a textbook's deployment

of forms of multiple media used towards fulfilling the textbook's functions. In scholarship, *mode* has a range of meanings like Lorena Marchetti and Peter Cullen's definition of the term as "visual, audio, text, or speech, and movement channels used in a classical classroom situation" (40). Kress and Leeuwen in 2001, on the other hand, saw *modes* as semiotic resources which allow the simultaneous realization of discourses and types of (inter) action and can be realized through many ways of production (media) (*Rhetorics of the Science Classroom* 22).

Media/Medium:

In this study *medium* or *media* is the technology that fulfills a mechanical function. This function does not result in the production of a new original text. In 2001, Kress and Leeuwen defined *medium* as follows:

> Media are the material resources used in the production of semiotic products and events, including both the tools and the materials used (e.g. the musical instrument and air; the chisel and the block of wood). They usually are specially produced for this purpose, not only in culture (ink, paint, cameras, computers), but also in nature (our vocal apparatus). (*Multimodal Discourse* 22)

This is the definition I use in this project as well. Here *medium* is the use of technology as a mechanical function and one that is geared towards the simplification of a process without intellectual value addition.

Multimodal:

In this study *multimodality* is defined as the deployment of multiple modes to teach and learn writing. Here *multimodality* is not an absolute "yes" or "no," but appears in degrees of a textbook's modality and the Framework maps this degree of modality. *Multimodality* must also be seen as a contrast to *monomodality*, which Kress and Leeuwen defined as a representation that is "discrete, bounded, autonomous, with its own practices, traditions, professions, habits" (*Multimodal Discourse* 45). I borrow from Kress and Leeuwen to define *monomodality* as one function fulfilled using one mode and instructional form. For example, a grammar handbook is monomodal because it fulfills one function (knowledge of convention) using one mode (the alphabetic) and through one instructional content form (reading-based). *Multimodality* is, on the other hand, unbounded by any one discipline; it is interdisciplinary and not an absolute. It extends indefinitely to degrees based on the varieties of modes deployed and the various functions those modes fulfill. A multimodal textbook will prompt the students to reflect, research, and collaborate on topics in ways other than the alphabetic and will have students look outside of the assigned readings for much of their materials.

Today in composition studies defining *multimodality* is challenging because of the unconscious and nondeliberate interchangeability of *multimodal* with *multimedia* (Lauer; Anderson et al.). In scholarship *multimodal* and *multimodality* mean combining modes to make meaning (Marchetti and Cullen; Lutkewitte; Selfe; Bateman; Kress; New London Group; Cope and Kalantzis). Within this general understanding various sub-meanings have emerged depending upon the context. For example, Kress and Leeuwen write:

> We have defined multimodality as the use of several semiotic modes in the design of a semiotic product or event, together with the particular way in which these modes are combined – they may for instance reinforce each other ("say the same thing in different ways"), fulfill complementary roles …or be hierarchically ordered. (*Multimodal Discourse* 20)

Palmeri used *multimodality* to mean layered images, words, and sounds together (*Remixing*), and John Bateman described multimodal artifacts as those that combine "a variety of visually-based modes deployed simultaneously in order to fulfill an orchestrated collection of interwoven communicative goals" (1).

Multimedia:

In this study, *multimedia* is defined as the use of multiple types of medium to achieve mechanical functions that do not result in any pedagogical value addition. When pedagogical value addition is a consequence of the use of multiple media then *multimedia* becomes *multimodal*.

In 1993 J.L. Lemke defined *multimedia* as the means through which the transfer of linguistic signs was done through a non-linguistic, material reality. Lauer considered Fred Hofstetter's definition of *multimedia* as the most comprehensive. Hofstetter defined *multimedia* as "the use of a computer to present and combine text, graphics, audio, and video with links and tools that let the user navigate, interact, create, and communicate" (qtd. in Lauer 228). Kress saw *multimedia* as a semiotic channel that relies on a unique code for the representation of all information (*Literacy* 4) and elaborates with the example of "[m]usic … analyzed into this digital code just as much as image is, or graphic word, or other modes"

(*Literacy* 4). Kress and Leeuwen defined *media* as the "material resources used in the production of semiotic products and events" to produce and disseminate texts (*Multimodal Discourse* 22). Kress added that *multimedia* was the integration of multiple skills that is expressed through the means provided within the contemporary culture (*Literacy*). According to Claire Lauer, *multimedia* is "a term that described texts composed by using a computer to integrate words and visuals as well as sound and video" (228). Of these definitions of *multimedia*, I prefer Kress's and Kress and Leeuwen's definitions that include the physical reality of technologies accessible, as dictated by the culturally available means through which texts are produced and shared.

(Author) Intention/Purpose:

In 2012 Sigrid Norris examined whether the texts "actually [did] provide the meaning to students and others that they set out to provide." Norris asserted, "We need many more investigations into such multifaceted texts" (225). Meaning is, according to Norris, the guiding motivation in the writing of a textbook. What Norris termed "the meaning" that textbooks "set out to provide" is what I refer to as *author intention* in this study. Here, *author* includes even the editors of the textbooks. This stated intention, or the meaning that an author sets out to provide in a textbook, stands apart from what we actually see in the instructional content of a textbook. In the textbook analysis sections I sought author intention in the front matter of the textbooks: the preface, introduction, foreword, and the teachers' manual, if there was one.

It is important to establish that I acknowledge the long-standing debate around the term *author intention*, or *authorial intent*, in literary criticism. However, here I use *author*

intention in its rhetorical sense to indicate the purpose of the author (including editors) as they claim, in their own words, and as seen in the front matter of the textbooks. This includes the stated ideas and philosophies that defined the textbook in the words of the author and editors themselves. Even though our awareness of the authorial intention, or purpose, remains throughout our analysis of instructional content implementation, this intention is not considered in the way in which the instructional content actually manifests.

(Instructional Content) Implementation:

The instructional content comprises everything that is included in the main instructional section of the textbook excluding the author's intentions as well as the external perceptions of the textbook. The instructional content implementation is the way assignments, including discussion questions, exercise prompts, the language and the tone of the instructional matter, the clarity of tasks assigned, types of modes used, and their importance to the instructional content and the like are presented in the textbook. It is *only* this content implementation that is mapped on to the Framework.

(External) Perception:

In 2012 Carey Jewitt argued that the multimodal text is one that has within it the "relationship of text and reader as the reader designs the text through his or her engagement with it" (qtd. in Norris 101). This, she further argues, "impacts on reception as it changes the work of interpreting resources in the classroom" (Jewitt qtd. in Norris 101). I define *external perception* as this redesigning of a text by a reader through use. In this study *perception* is the effect of the textbook's implementation as the readers and/or the users interact with it. This

reader must be someone who is outside the process of creating the textbook, so the intentions do not impact the perception of the textbook on an intimate level. The perception must be of someone who used or reviewed the textbook so as to inform other potential users of the textbook as a writing classroom resource. I gathered the external perceptions primarily from the February textbook review editions of *CCC* from 1968-1973 (Appendix 2, 3a, and 3b) to ascertain what scholars and teachers of writing noticed when reviewing textbooks in the late 60s and early 70s. It is from the common terms distilled from these reviews that I developed a starting point from where I created lists of functional terms (Appendix 3a) and form terms (Appendix 3b) for the Framework.

Form and Function; and the Dimensions:

In this project I define *function* as the desired goals that textbooks aim to fulfill and *form* as the material reality that realize these desired goals. I use *function* and *form* in the context of the Framework, and the two axes along which they appear are the f*unction* and *form dimensions*. The X-axis is the *function dimension* that marks the goals of a(ny) writing course or resource, while the *form dimension* comprises *Forms of Media* and *Forms of Content dimensions* (table 1).

The original *function* and *form* concepts as a means to understand an object was originally used in Architecture. Louis Sullivan (1856-1924), a Chicago-based architect famous for the first skyscrapers, first presented the idea that form follows function. Kress and Theo Leeuwen used form-follows-function to explain how form was defined by an underlying discourse (function) (*Multimodal Discourse*). I argue that as with any other articulation (form) of a discourse (function), the composition textbook is also defined by a

similar relationship between function and form. Therefore, I use Sullivan's form-follows-function in the same way as Kress and Leeuwen; however, I invert *function* and *form* when naming the application of this concept to Composition studies. This inversion differentiates between the Architectural use of form-follows-function idea from how I use it in here. It is also because unlike in Architecture, where form (of a building) is visually more dominant than function, I believe in Composition the function of a pedagogical resource like a textbook is more dominant when the textbook is perceived. That is why here Sullivan's form-follows-function idea has been readapted as the Function & Form Framework.

Spread:

Spread is the measure of the number of intersections between the Function and Form dimensions on the Framework. The greater the spread, the greater the modality of that particular composition textbook, and, inversely, a restricted spread indicates a lower degree of the textbook's modality. How instructors wish to denote the spread of the Framework is up to them. For example, in my Framework analysis I used types of circles to mark my spread – full circles ("●"), hollow circles ("○") and in one instance (table 14), I have used an additional symbol ("✓"). An instructor could fill the Framework using information like chapter or page numbers, symbols like "✓" and "X" to mark the presence or absence of something, or titles of alternate texts and resources that instructors would need during the course.

I believe that the choice of *how* the mapping should be done must be left to the instructor and have therefore deliberately left the ways to map the *spread* to the instructor. To enable and empower an instructor, freedom is the first step, and in this way instructors are

free to map course materials as they see fit so that the materials align with different visions of their course. This will leave room for instructors to customize and *own* the Framework in their own unique ways. I see this customizable aspect as one of the strengths of the Framework.

Historicize:

Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes defined *historicize* as acknowledging history but "not ignore[ing] the present; [their] move to historicize is to invite a more robust consideration of the multiple contexts – including sociocultural, political, pedagogical, and affective -- that inform, structure, and condition how we compose [multimodally]" (21). In this project, I use *historicize* in the same way where I refer to the past through various textual sources to understand multimodality as it manifests in the "multi-media" textbooks then. Yet, I do this with an aim to define *multimodality* and *multimedia* in the context of today and tomorrow.

Research Autobiography

Previously I was a teacher of design, and the pedagogical environment that I was used to was by its very nature highly multimodal. Later, in my role as a writing studio facilitator, I found the singularity of mode that dominated composition pedagogy was easy in some ways and challenging in others. I found that it was easier because I had to focus on the conventions of just one form and therefore had more "control" over the process of teaching writing convention. However, as control and the mechanics of language were not my primary teaching goals, this *monomodality* proved extremely challenging. My pedagogical approach

focuses on critical thinking and reflective writing, which is why I sought more from my former experience as a design teacher as opposed to my present role as a (monomodal) writing instructor. However, I was still unable to find the connections that linked the multimodal approach I preferred to the *monomodality* that my writing students seemed to be more accustomed to.

Palmeri's *Remixing* gave me my first inroads into looking at interdisciplinary approaches to composition. Not only did Palmeri's advocating the interdisciplinary approach to composition not only gave me the confidence to pursue my own multimodal line of inquiry, but it also helped me realize that my identity as a compositionist valued the *multimodal* part of my pedagogical approach. From my own experiences and observations of my colleagues who were similarly motivated writing teachers, I outlined some assumptions that inform this project:

- Instructors are guided by an impulse (even a sense of responsibility) to connect with their students through modes and media that students are familiar and comfortable with.
- Instructors can design multimodal courses that align with their own unique visions given the proper understanding and the tools to do so.
- Instructors should be encouraged to (re)design and create their own multimodal courses if, as a discipline, we are to truly harness the potential of multimodal pedagogy.

Literature Survey:

Two main aims guide this dissertation: understanding multimodality as a concept as distinct from the use of multimedia in composition textbooks of 1968-1973 and empowering instructors of composition to identify degrees of multimodality in the textbook so they may independently create multimodal courses that realize their unique visions for their courses. The scholarship that is the foundation to my study was enormous in scope, and giving coherence, while remaining comprehensive, was complicated. That is why I present the literature that informs this study under four main headings:

- Importance of multimodality in composition studies today,
- The problem of defining *multimodality* and *multimedia* and the role of technology therein,
- The textbook as a manifestation of *multimodality* and *multimedia* in the writing course, and
- The Framework as an enabling and empowering tool that serves the instructor at multiple levels.

Importance of Multimodality in Composition Studies:

Since the late 1990s there has been a growing awareness and recognition of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in composition classrooms (Lauer; Bowen and Whithaus; Palmeri). Most agree that *multimodality* has a growing presence in the composition classrooms of today, and it is an effective way to engage students (Lauer; Selfe; Alexander and Rhodes; Bowen; Palmeri; Etlinger; Dunn). Selfe calls for an acknowledgement of non-alphabetic composition across digital and print formats if

composition hopes to stay relevant; Lunsford sees writing today as having moved from "black marks on white paper, left to right and top to bottom" to writing "in full Technicolor"; and Yancey holds the writing teacher responsible for fulfilling the students' need for multiple literacies. Palmeri sums up the common "refrain," stating, "alphabetic literacy is our past; multimodal composing is our future" (*Remixing* 5). In short, *multimodality* has been seen as a way to not only excite the student into meaningful participation, but also ensure relevant pedagogical practice going forward.

From as early as the 1970s, scholars like Elbow repeatedly pointed to the promise of the use of multiple modes in teaching writing, including the visual and the aural. The point is that *multimodality* in writing pedagogy is not a new concept, but it has become more noticeable because it has come to include multiple ways to consume and produce texts with growing affordances that technological innovations have given us. The New London Group (NLG) coined the term *multiliteracy* and *multimodality* in the context of composition studies in 1996 and 2000. The NLG consolidated the modes, namely alphabetic, visual, aural, gestural, and spatial, that would in combination create a pedagogy based in *multiliteracy*. Soon after in 2001 and 2003, Kress and Leeuwen pointed to *multimodality* as a structured and deliberately designed semiotic entity that aimed to facilitate the imbibing, and sharing of meaning. The complexity of *multimodality* made itself increasingly evident in the introduction of new vocabulary terms and with this complexity came the moment when our imaginations were (re)vitalized from a pedagogical perspective.

Through *multimodality* not only were pedagogical approaches getting reinvented, but surrounding pedagogical practices were also being looked at anew. For example, in 2008 Daniel Anderson saw *multimodality* as redefining the notion of the *classroom* to mean an(y)

experimental space. Daniel Anderson saw *multimodality* as simultaneously redefining imagination, reflection, and intellectual engagement in the process of composing for the student. Even contradictions within the discipline like conflicts and agreements, successes and failures, were laid bare through *multimodality* (Bowen and Whithaus). Our collective inability to articulate a single definition of *multimodality* that is distinct from *multimedia* is, according to Lauer, a symptom of such a push and pull (229).

The Problem of Defining Multimodality and The Place of Technology:

While *multimodality* in composition courses is becoming more noticeable, the most common reference point for *multimodality* is through the use of technology in the production and consumption of texts. In 2010 Brian Bailie interviewed Selfe, where she stated that the persistent, almost universal interchangeability of *multimodality* and *multimedia* has complicated our understanding of *multimodality* as distinct from the use of digital technologies that enact traditional pedagogical functions. Today *multimodality* is used to refer to everything and consequently has ended up meaning nothing in the context of the composition course. This I would argue is largely because the intentions of the teacher to use a medium as a mode are getting lost in the role technology plays in this implementation process.

In *Defining Reality,* Edward Schiappa argued that "definitions are the result of a shared understanding of the world and are both the product of past persuasion and a resource for future persuasion" (167). Here Schiappa was not just referring to the importance of definitions, but to definitions as articulations of what becomes aspirational. Scholars have underscored the importance of defining terms because definitions "constitute

a form of rhetorically induced social knowledge" (Schiappa qtd. in Lauer 225). Tracey Bowen and Carl Whithaus argued that the "act of naming a genre" at an important moment when a "text form is still emerging" will often see the genre getting mixed up with the text-tool or medium (3). When it comes to defining technology as a mechanical means (*multimedia*) and defining the modes for a pedagogical end (*multimodality*) in writing studies, scholars are aware of this nuanced distinction. According to Rachael Ryerson's web text "Multimodal Composition in *Kairos,"* Selfe made a distinction between medium and modality where "medium is the delivery mechanism" and "[m]odality is the semiotic channel that we use to communicate." (qtd. in Ryerson 2). Such a nuanced definition demonstrates "the unspoken values attached to words and phrases that many scholars often use interchangeably" (Selfe qtd. Ryerson 2). Kress believed that "new media provide the means through which composers can (more easily) achieve multimodal expression and communication" (qtd. in Ryerson 2). This relationship is reiterated by others like Lauer and Palmeri, but in everyday use this distinction is almost entirely lost. *Media* is the collective word for all the "tools and material resources" needed to produce and disseminate texts (Lauer 227), while *multi* refers to the fact that modes never occur by themselves, but always with others in ensembles. Yet, in practice, this nuanced understanding is lost. This loss of understanding complicates the notion of *multimodality* and the use of multimedia, particularly for those who are trying to select multimodal materials for multimodal courses.

Lauer and Selfe located a distinction between these terms in the place of their emergence. They proposed that "multimedia emerged out of the industry, [while] multimodal arose out of the academic scholarship of the New London Group" (Lauer 237). Selfe located the beginning of the *multimodal-multimedia* interchangeability in composition studies when

departments of English began to focus on preparing students for their professional lives after college ("The Movement of Air" 621). Selfe argued that the interchangeability was a response to the growing demand for professionally relevant skills (*multimedia*) and a scholastic quest for making a paradigmatic shift in composition pedagogy (*multimodal*) ("The Movement of Air" 622).

In short, the interchangeability "arose in response to the technological advancement that was occurring – in the late 60's and early 70s's for multimedia and late 90s for multimodal" (Lauer 237). As m*ultimedia* appeared in the context of writing instruction in 1970 and *multimodality* appeared in composition studies in the late 90s, the fusing together of these terms happened within the 30 years between 1970 and 2000. This is also evident in the way in which these terms have been used in scholarship, where the concept of using multiple modes is *multimodal*, while descriptions of the actual application of *multimodality* used the term *multimedia*.

Understanding the emergence of *multimodality* in writing in 1968-1973 requires Selfe and Lauer's insight on the role of technology in writing pedagogy along with Kress's notion of *multimodality* as the culturally shaped resources that make meaning. M.J. Heal, a sociologist and historian, acknowledged the role of technology in the 60s and 70s that created a legacy no other period had previously seen. It was then that the individual voice became one with the form through which it was being conveyed.

Textbooks as Manifestations of Multimodality in the Writing Classroom:

As objects of scholarship that contributed to the creation of knowledge, textbooks have been viewed and used with guarded suspicion (Varnum; North). Nonetheless, their

prevalence in scholarship has remained. For example, Kitzhaber's 1953 dissertation used textbooks to plot a history of rhetorical theory; Robert Zoellner saw textbooks as markers of progress; Richard Ohmann used textbooks as supporting evidence to critique Language and Literature departments from a Marxist perspective; and Xin Liu Gale and Frederic G. Gale, and Connors repeatedly used textbooks for various studies. More recently, in 2004, Julia Jasken used *Worlds in the Making: Probes for Students of the Future* by Mary Jane Dustan & Patricia Garland; *Mixed Bag: Artifacts from Contemporary Culture* by Helen Hutchinson; *The Writer's Mind* by Wallace Kaufman and William Powers; and *Montage: Investigations in Language* by William Sparke and Clarke McKowen, "to consider the impact of how we teach visual production" (Jasken 6). In 2012 Sarah Etlinger examined the problem of using traditional textbooks in writing classes "particularly at a time when our notions of what it means to write have been challenged by digital media" (17). Palmeri used textbooks like *Montage* and *The Comp Box: Composition as Assemblage* as "classic texts" that exemplified multimodality in composition textbooks (*Remixing*). It is true that textbooks are not complete images of what transpires in a composition classroom, but they do offer a stable, unchanging point of reference that does measure prevailing assumptions about writing pedagogy (Hawhee; Ohmann).

All of these studies, though distinct, were located in textbooks from 1968-1973 and used the multimodal textbook from the late 60s and early 70s as objects of study despite some scholarly reservations. Also, the studies examined the challenges that the shift from the paper to the screen and the shift from the alphabetic to the visual have presented to writing pedagogy. They all argued for a connection between the nature of the course and the textbook's role within the course. I would extend this textbook-course relationship to argue

that the implemented goals of a course can be influenced by the form of the textbooks and that the role of the textbook in the course is determined by the instructor's perception of the functionality of the textbook's implemented instructional content. In terms of ground realities, this means that if a textbook is not identified correctly by the instructor then the expectations from the textbook will be flawed. This in turn will cause create unrealistic course expectations from the students and the teachers, and that is only the start of the problems.

The Framework as a Tool that Enables and Empowers:

The theoretical understanding of *multimodality* and *multimedia* is the first step. The second step is applying this theory to the textbooks and other resources, using the Framework. The Function and Form Framework is based heavily on Kress and Leeuwen's 2001 interpretation of form and function as it applies to semiotics. They pointed out that several semiotic modes can combine in the design of a semiotic product (the textbook) or semiotic event (the course), so they may at times reinforce each other by "say[ing] the same thing in different ways," "fulfill[ing] complementary roles," or creating a hierarchy (*Multimodal Discourse* 20). In essence, the way the parts of the product (textbook) combine (the elements along the form and function dimension) defines the product (textbook), and this is what the Framework analyzes. In my study the "product" is the *textbook* and the "parts" are the elements along the function and form dimensions that come together to give the textbook (product) semiotic meaning.

My decision to examine textbooks as a composite of parts and their patterns is along a similar tradition of such studies. Some studies not only examined the textbooks, but also

analyzed the parts that these textbooks are made up of. Ernest Caverly et al. in 1932 and Ohmann in 1976 analyzed writing/composition textbooks according to the aims of those textbooks, focusing on the mechanics of writing, as opposed to the powers of thought and expression. Connors, in 1981 and 1997, examined composition textbooks by form, namely rhetorics, readers, and handbooks that matched particular functions based on the level of the student. Mohammad Mohammadi and Heidar Abdi, in 2014, measured a textbook's suitability against student needs based on textbook layout and design, skills taught, language type and vocabulary level, and subject and content. And the list goes on.

Yet, despite similar a similar approach to analyzing textbooks, none of these studies examined *multimodality* in textbooks, let alone sought to distinguish between *multimodality* and *multimedia* in a textbook. As Claire Lauer pointed out, the problem of clearly differentiating *multimodality* from *multimedia* has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. By revisiting *multimodality* as function and form defined by intention, implementation, and perception, I believe such a resolution is both possible and imminent.

The Framework plays a big part in explaining the concepts for themselves, as well as illustrating the relationship between *multimodality* and *multimedia.* The Framework rests on a foundation of terms that I sourced from textbooks from 1968-1973 (Appendices 1, 4, and 5) and the textbook reviews from the 1968-1973 issues of the *CCC* (Appendix 2, 3a, and 3b). The process was long, but the logic was simple. I went through all the reviews to find terms that defined the textbooks from the perspective of the reviewer (Appendix 2). The first extraction of terms resulted in a list of terms that I then re-grouped into categories for the functional dimension (Appendix 3a) as well as the forms of content and medium dimensions (Appendix 3b). It was easier to differentiate the functions because they were articulated more

clearly in the reviews, but it was harder to differentiate the forms of implementation. That is why the functional dimension terms are organized under sub-categories (Appendix 3a) while the form terms are in a single list (Appendix 3b). I then matched these groups of terms with the various studies that also examined composition textbooks through a parts-and-patterns approach. Of all the studies I consulted, the New London Group's report, the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition," and Douglas Down and Elizabeth Wardle's paper on re-imagining composition as a "Introduction to Writing Studies" course gave me groupings that incorporated the most frequently referenced terms. In the event of multiple, updated versions of studies, I used the version that incorporated the terms from the past. For example, the Writing Program Administrators' "Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" has an updated 2014 version that does include the knowledge of convention category. This category is important because knowledge of convention was a crucial marker that distinguished the multi-media textbooks from the traditional textbooks. Knowledge of convention also marked the extent to which traditional textbooks encroached on the multi-media approach of late 60s and early 70s. That is why I retained the 2008 version instead.

Function-Dimension:

This dimension is based on the format of the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" published in April 2000, which was amended in July 2008. This statement "describes the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes sought by first-year composition programs in American postsecondary education." The Outcomes were a compilation of what had at that time taken place and

articulated what composition teachers nationwide had learned from practice, research, and theory. The Writing Program Administrators' statement believed that the goals were necessary information that all students of writing were expected to know by the end of their first-year writing course. This functional orientation aligns with William Howard Smith's 1981 definition of a textbook as a "book or books which are assigned as the primary source of necessary information required to be known by the student at the end of a particular course" (5).

I acknowledge the resistance that the WPA document has met with throughout on the grounds that the outcomes listed in the Outcomes' Statement are arguably narrow in their scope, depicting a writing student whom some instructors would find unrepresentative of actual students. To that end I state that I use the WPA document not as any kind of final truth, but as a summary of the main functions that textbooks from 1968-1973 included in their content implementation. The Outcomes document is, in this study, a marker against which textbook functionality in 1968-1973 can be mapped. It provides:

- A scheme that organizes the terms that I found in the process of textbook and textbook review analysis on their terms, located in a perspective closest to their own time.
- A point from where the concepts of *multi-media*, *multimodality* and *multimedia* as defined by function and form as well as by intention, implementation, and perception connect to today's context.
- A place from where an instructor can make decisions for or even against the scheme provided.

Further explaining my use of the WPA Outcomes here, I go back to how the WPA statement was originally intended. In 2001, as the Chair of the College section of the NCTE, Kathleen Blake Yancey defended the Outcomes document arguing that it listed common assumptions in the discipline and was a historical artifact that captured a key moment in the timeline of the discipline's evolution (qtd. in Harrington 322). Yancey said that this was a reminder, a "to-do" list of what instructors at the time could add onto their curriculums to make their courses more contemporarily relevant. The Outcomes document, according to Yancey, could work well as a skeletal framework used to create and refine composition courses and initiate dialogue among different faculty (qtd. in Harrington 322-3). Finally, Yancey saw it as a powerful political tool that enables us to "*argue for*" everything that pertains to composition studies and resist everything that is a hurdle in the path of student education (qtd. in Harrington 323). In 2014 Alexander and Rhodes argued that the Outcomes document provided a point of reference from where more complex issues of the discipline can be examined. By the content of their analysis, it becomes clear that Alexander and Rhodes are talking about the 2000 – 2008 Outcomes document as they refer to the "knowledge of conventions" category. Alexander and Rhodes saw the value of the WPA Outcomes in the document's early acknowledgement of the electronic environment. Alexander and Rhodes argue that this acknowledgement of the electronic environment of the writing classroom, along with knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, writing process, and critical thinking, reading and writing, was a "move in the right direction" (53). It is with a similar perspective that I used the WPA Outcomes Statement as the basis for the functional dimension of the Function & Form Framework.

Form-Dimension

I combined the terms that defined the form dimension, which included all the instructional apparatus like assignments, prompts, discussion topics, and exercises, as well as the forms of content delivery, or the medium used. As previously noted in the textual sources examined by me, the forms of instructional apparatus were almost inseparable from the forms of media used. Previous studies that considered the forms through which *multimodality* was expressed in composition textbooks focused largely on the use of visual mode alongside the alphabetic mode (Jasken; Foss; Phillips; Flood et al.). Variations of the visual mode included considering color as distinct but a part of the visual mode (Kress; Pett and Wilson; Horadan); visuals and technology through photography and the camera (Murray; Palmeri); the visual and gestural, as in film making (Williamson); and even the visual through spatial location (Kress and Leeuwen, *Multimodal Discourse*). Outside of the visual, the aural was also recognized though not as much (Palmeri; Selfe; Freire and Shor; Smitherman; Elbow; Winchester; Emig). The aural mode, which is the use of sound as a mode of instruction in the context of a textbook, is tricky. In the case of this study I define *aural mode* as the specifically articulated deployment of the medium of sound as a mode in the pedagogical process, where the deployment of the aural is specifically articulated in the prompt. An example of such an exercise is in the 1967 and 1972 editions of *Writing with a Purpose* where James McCrimmon asks the students to learn the pronunciation of words by sounding them aloud from a dictionary. This would be an example of what I would consider an aural exercise. The other aural reference in the previous and later editions of *Writing* hint at the use of sound but do not require it explicitly. For this study, particularly the Framework analysis of the textbooks, this is not counted as an aural exercise.

Just as WPA's Outcomes Statement document gave the function dimension a foundation, The NLG's report on *multiliteracies* and *multimodality* and Downs & Wardle's 2007 study constitute the two parallel dimensions of form dimensions of the Framework.

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms in Composition Textbooks:

The NLG comprised ten scholars: Courtney Cazden, Bill Cope, Norman Fairclough, James Gee, Mary Kalantzis, Gunther Kress, Allen Luke, Carmen Luke, Sarah Michaels, and Martin Nakata. Their specializations ranged from cultural and social diversity, language theory, and semiotics, to critical theory and citizenship education. The NLG spent a year studying, in exhaustive detail, the connections between the shifts in the world at large and how these changes affected pedagogy. In 1996, the NLG presented a "programmatic manifesto" that provided

> [A] theoretical overview of the current social context of learning and the consequences of social changes for the content (the "what") and the form (the "how") of literacy pedagogy. (Cazden et al. 63)

Collectively they coined the term *multiliteracies* that encapsulated what the NLG saw as emerging "multiplicity of communications channels and media, and the increasing saliency of cultural and linguistic diversity" (Cazden et al. 63). According to the NLG the term *multiliteracies* included:

- Modes of representation that were much broader than language and incorporated the increasing multiplicity and integration of significant modes of meaning-making;
- The interrelationship between these various modes where the textual was connected to the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioral; and

- An acknowledgment of the realities of global connectedness coupled with local diversities.

The NLG proposed that multiliteracies "overcomes the limitations of traditional approaches," and

> *[E]nable[s] students to achieve the authors' twin goals for literacy learning: creating access to evolving language of work, power, and community, and fostering the critical engagement necessary for them to design their social features and achieve success through fulfilling employment*. (Cazden et al. 60)

The NLG used the concept of *multiliteracy* to explain how these new and emerging literacies worked in

> [U]nderstanding and [teaching/learning] competent control of representational forms that are becoming increasingly significant in the overall communications environment, such as visual images and their relationship to the written word – for instance, visual design …and linguistic meaning in multimedia. (Cazden et al. 61; original emphasis)

The NLG surmised that design has defined workplace (classroom) innovations, and that teachers and managers are the designers of the learning processes and environments, not bosses dictating what those in their charge should so (Cazden et al. 73). This echoes the question of identity that Journet and Palmeri referred to.

The NLG acknowledged the complexity and inter-relationship of different forms of meaning. To this end they outlined six interrelated patterns of meaning, or ways in which meaning is made: Linguistic Design, Visual Design, Audio Design, Gestural Design, Spatial Design, and Multimodal Design (Cazden et al. 78). These patterns of meaning have begun to

define how content is delivered in a composition course, and if we consider the linguistic and visual meanings, we largely articulate how textbooks make meaning. To be sure, the gestural and spatial meaning define the overall multimodality of a composition course, collectively with the multimodal textbook. However, as this project focuses on textbooks, the gestural and spatial patterns have been set aside.

The NLG considered the Multimodal mode of meaning as the most significant because it was in *multimodality* that multiple modes came together in dynamic relationships (Cazden et al. 80). This description highlights the "dynamic relationship" that the Function & Form Framework maps in the *spread* of a multimodal textbook. The greater the *spread* the more dynamic these modalities would be, and this would mean that the textbook is highly multimodal. This in turn implies a textbook well suited to a highly multimodal course. The greater the *spread* the higher is the modal *visibility* of the textbook in terms of degree of *multimodality* and the nature of the textbook's *multimodality*.

The Forms of Instructional Content in Composition Textbooks*:*

The parallel path that runs alongside the forms of media dimension is the forms of instructional content dimension. The forms of instructional content dimension in the Function & Form Framework outlines the instructional content in textbooks. The 2007 Downs and Wardle reimagined the first-year composition course as an "Introduction to Writing Studies" course, along the lines of the introductory courses of other disciplines. The Downs & Wardle study outlined the curriculum of this reimagined course as "Grounding Principles and Goals," "Readings," "Reflective Assignments," "Research Assignments," and "Presentation Assignments" (559-64). The "Grounding Principles and Goals" are similar to the functions

dimension of the Function & Form Framework, and that is a nod to the functional aspect of the Downs & Wardle scheme. This is why I have excluded "Grounding Principles and Goals" from the forms of content dimension in the Framework.

The form of content dimension moves upwards from reading-based assignments that require students to stay within the text provided and move into reflection-based assignments that require students to add to the text through their own experiences. Then comes the research-based assignments that require the students to look outside of text to their own experiences and finally to produce an original text through collaboration-based assignments akin to peer-review processes. Both the forms of content and forms of media dimensions are the means through which the instructional content is delivered to fulfill a desired function.

Function & Form Framework: How Does it Work?

The primary aim of the Function & Form Framework is to enable instructors to ascertain the *spread* of *modality* of a course or course resource, here a textbook. This *spread* is the result of the process of mapping the content implementation of the textbook onto the Framework by the instructor. I designed the Framework so that using it is a simple and straightforward process, as well as customizable so that every instructor can articulate their assessments in ways that are most relevant to them. Quite simply, each instructor can fill out the function and form dimensions using their own criteria of what they consider the main goals of their courses and course materials. The point I am stressing is that as long as an instructor can see *multimodality* as a result of form addressing function, the Framework will make sense, as well as be beneficial to them. The instructor can fill out their own functional

elements and outline forms of content and medium that *they* would like to use to those functional ends.

The Framework mapping that I have done for detailed analysis of textbooks from 1950-1980 is outside of my theoretical analysis; it is my perceptions as an external reviewer of the instructional content of those textbooks. The mapping that I did for these textbooks is largely based on:

- The clear articulation of printed instructional content that includes assignments, prompts, discussion topics and other apparatus. Here intended meanings, perceived meanings, and interpretations do *not* count. For example, the aural exercise in the 1967 and 1973 editions of *Writing with a Purpose* is an aural, reader-based knowledge of convention exercise. However, just considering the phonetics of words, without asking the students *specifically* to sound these words out aloud, is an exercise that I consider reader-based that aims at developing the knowledge of convention function.
- The value and/or the visibility of the elements along the dimensions of the Framework. The presumption here is that if this *multimodal* presence is negligible, there is a higher chance that the textbook will support a more traditional, non-*multimodal* class. If, on the other hand, a textbook is more visibly *multimodally* oriented, then the chances of the course becoming multimodal is somewhat higher.

Upon finding these criteria, I marked the coordinates where function and form intersect. An instructor may use a mapping method that works for them. I am more visually than alphabetically and numerically oriented, so I chose symbols "●","○", and "✓". If a function

or form element was absent, I left that coordinate blank. I explain the significance of each of these in the legend that accompanies each Framework analysis:

●	Significant evidence available to validate
○	Partial evidence available to validate
✓	Evidence of anomalies

Overall, meaning in the Framework is through the *spread*. In the case of my Framework analyses, the *spread* was indicative of the degree and nature of a textbook's modality. A wider *spread* meant a more multimodal textbook and a more limited or sparse *spread* indicated a less multimodal textbook. There could also be situations where *spread* is greater along either the function or the form dimensions only. This would mean that either a textbook fulfills a wide range of functions, but through limited modes, or it could mean that a textbook deploys a wide range of modes and instructional content forms to fulfill limited functions. In all scenarios the Framework enables a clearer understanding of the *multimodality* of a textbook, or any other teaching resource for that matter.

Three Questions:

At the conclusion of the literature survey, some questions emerged that further guided the study:

- ***Question #1:*** *If the use of multiple (digital) modes to teach composition happened before the introduction of the term* multimodal *in writing in the 60s and 70s, then how was the intentionality of this use of multiple modes to fulfill a pedagogical purpose*

articulated in the late 60s and early 70s writing classroom? Also, how did this intention manifest in writing textbooks from 1968-1973?

- **Question #2**: *If the use of multiple modes was seen in the writing textbooks of 1968-1973 (Palmeri; Jasken), then what role did the period of the late 60s and early 70s play in defining how multiple modes were used in textbooks? Also, how did the very concept of the writing textbook as a set of conventions for a writing class get challenged?*
- **Question #3** *If the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973 were perceived as motivating and engaging to the students then how did this perception influence the successful yet traditional textbooks of the 60s and 70s?*

Method and Methodology:

Primary Method: Teacher-Research:

The implications of this study are of value to anyone who wishes to refer to them; however, the writing teacher looking to teach writing through innovative, multimodal methods will benefit the most from this study. Given that this research is *for* teachers of writing, is *by* a teacher of writing, and is on a subject that informs writing pedagogy, I define this as a teacher-research project. I further qualify the type of teacher-research here as located in the concept of *phronesis*, an Aristotelian concept of practical wisdom that combined epistemic knowledge with human experience (Phelps). As a teacher-researcher-scholar, I see myself as both the "theorist-practitioner" (Goswami and Stillman) and as the "teacher-practitioner" (Ray).

Teacher research has not always been seen in a positive light and therefore has had to establish its academic legitimacy as being rigorous and universal enough to be of scholarly value. However, there are those who have argued for the legitimacy of teacher research in the making of disciplinary knowledge, even though of a different kind. In 2012 Jeannie Beard argued that knowledge making through teacher research involves novel approaches and perspectives that work to realize meaningful change in composition studies. Beard further pointed out that it is now accepted that a clear distinction between the role of the teacher and researcher is not a prerequisite for valuable research. Teacher research is also valuable because it "addressing inaccuracies" that becomes "redemptive and revisionary in nature and purpose," (Ray). This dissertation aims to address these inaccuracies, or at the very least examine and clarify the definitions of *multimodality* and *multimedia* as mega-concepts. By contextualizing the composition textbook as a means to understanding *multimodality*, this dissertation aims to invest the practitioner with more authority in the classroom and, by extension, in academia in general.

Methodology: Textual Analysis

Chris Mays re-examined the complexities of writing and located a significant measure of that complexity in the "influence of the complex systems theory" (559). This concept argues that an interconnectedness defines all acts of writing that on the one side dissolved "the limits of texts and of writing," but one that also made "writing potentially irreducible, unpredictable, and perhaps, unteachable" (560). The question of *multimodality* and its relationship with *multimedia* in the context of writing textbooks is not a straightforward one. The problems of dissolving limits of text and the unpredictability of

writing in the changing realities of the writing classroom, then and now, makes finding concepts that define (or create boundaries for) writing as a deliberate, predictable, and multimodal act, complicated.

Composition is a field that is not homogenous in terms of the teachers and their approach to teaching writing, or their students. Each class is as unique as a fingerprint and this is complicated by the varieties of medium and modalities adopted. To that end I looked for stability in the textual sources that I selected for this teacher-research project and focused on:

- Textbook reviews in academic journals, particularly the *CCC* from 1968-1973;
- Composition textbooks from 1950 to 1980; and
- Scholarship and research based in composition/writing textbooks, including dissertations.

I examined these various textual sources for definitive concepts that distinguished, identified, and/or marked *mode* and *medium* in writing textbooks. From there, as I previously outlined, I regrouped and organized the terms to isolate the functions, the forms, and the intentions implementation and perceptions of these writing textbooks.

Textual Source #1: Writing Textbooks from 1950-1980:

The writing textbooks selected for more detailed analysis in this study met specific criteria:

- The textbook was publication between 1968-1973;
- The textbook was recognized as exemplary of the genre it belonged to; and/or

- The textbook's success was recognized.

Criteria #1: Year of Publication

Each of these textbooks that I selected for this detailed textual analysis was published between 1968-1973. Going back to the significance of this moment (Zebroski) along with the emergence of the *multimodally* oriented approach to writing pedagogy, this moment marked beginning of the notion of *multimodality* in writing pedagogy for several scholars including Palmeri and Jasken. The new genre of "multi-media" textbooks, as they were referred to then, marked this moment as it was documented in their authors' intentions, in the way the instructional content was implemented and in how these textbooks were perceived.

Criteria #2: A Textbook Being Representative of a Type

Each of the textbook analyses examines a specific question. To do this, I needed textbooks that were at the very least reviewed in an academic source even if they were not well-known textbooks. This is why I used textbooks that had previously been used in scholarship, like *Montage* and *Mixed Bag* (Palmeri; Jasken) and the seven editions of *Writing with a Purpose* from 1950 to 1980 by James McCrimmon (Connors).

Criteria #3: "Popularity" of the Textbook

Here *popularity* is defined by how well known, as evidenced in textual sources, the textbook was during its time. Here p*opularity* also includes the textbook's longevity as seen in the number of years the textbook stayed in print and its multiple editions. Textbooks like *Montage* and *Mixed Bag* are examples of widely discussed textbooks at least in textbook

reviews and scholarship. *Writing with a Purpose* is an example of a textbook series that remained in print though multiple editions and that survived the shifts by absorbing and reflecting these changes that it witnessed.

Textual Source #2: Textbook Reviews from *CCC* -1968-1973

College Composition and Communication (*CCC*) published by the National Council of the Teachers of English (NCTE) has been in print since 1950. It is regarded as one of the flagship journals that has captured crucial moments, including "the excitement and struggles of integrating visually-oriented media in the classroom" (Jasken 59). *CCC* has recorded the past in different ways: scholarly articles, textbook reviews, advertisements, and announcements, and "Staffroom Interchanges" that documented thoughts and opinions of scholars in a more informal manner.

I refer extensively to issues of the *CCC* from 1968-1973 for several reasons. First, these issues contain sections in the February issues in particular devoted entirely to textbook reviews that were written when the textbooks were first published. These reviews are, in a sense, time machines that take us back to the *multimodal* moment that Palmeri and Jasken, among others, repeatedly refer to. Second, I believe that these issues are a way to gather accurate and in-the-moment reflections of writing teachers, untouched by either a retrospective view or the issue of inaccurate memories. I consider these reviews as a truly reliable source because they combine the intellectual credibility of scholarly voices from the past and the permanence of print.

Typically, *CCC* textbook reviews gave factual information about a textbook followed by opinions of the reviewer (Appendix 2). The factual information included the title, name(s)

of the author(s) or editor(s), the publishing house, and in some instances the price and the number of pages. As these reviews are dense, I formulated some questions that guided the process of sifting through these reviews to ensure that my search stayed on point. These questions were:

- Which textbooks from 1968-1973 were included in the review? Were there any textbooks featured elsewhere (scholarship and advertisements) that were excluded?
- What were the terms used by the reviewers as they reviewed a textbook or a group of textbooks?
- Which textbooks were included in a set when reviewers reviewed a textbook through a compare-and-contrast method?
- How did the reviewers intentionally or unintentionally consider the textbook's author intention, content implementation, and external (including their own) perceptions?

Textual Source #3: Scholarship on or Using Composition Textbooks, Including Dissertations

These sources include studies that also delved into the concepts of *multimodality* and *multimedia* in composition studies today. This source fell into two distinct groups: the first group focused on *multimodality* in composition studies; the second group focused on textbooks and their place in the evolution of the discipline. The value of scholarly papers needs no explanation, but I believe it is important to briefly state the value of dissertations in the context of my study. I found dissertations particularly useful because they included the few studies that specifically looked at *multimodality* and *multimedia* in writing textbooks (Etlinger; Jasken) perhaps with a different focus. Also, the literature review sections of the

dissertations worked as an updated record of scholarship, a record functioning like a virtual peer group of scholars similarly engaged which helped me as I proceeded through my own research. And finally, the greatest value of these dissertations to me was that they articulated new directions that such inquiries could and should take going forward.

Outline of the Chapters:

Chapter One specifically articulated the focus of the study, the literature that has informed the study, as well as the methods and methodologies I will employ to get to that end. In Chapter Two, I present the voices that experienced this original moment of the multiple modes approach to writing in the late 60s and early 70s first-hand. By bringing these reflections into conversation with the textual sources of this study, I reflect on the questions that I asked in Chapter One.

Chapters Three, Four, and Five are individual textbook analyses that examine a unique aspect of *multimodality* in textbooks that in turn lead back to a larger pattern. These chapters are based on the three questions in Chapter One and that I repeat in Chapter Two. Chapter Three examines the degree and nature of some *multimodal* textbooks from 1968 to 1973; Chapter Four looks at variations in the concept of a writing textbook as influenced by the impetus of the *multimodal* moment of the 60s and 70s; and Chapter Five examines the influence of these multi-media textbooks on the successful and traditional textbooks of the time. In Chapter Six, I conclude this study by responding to the three questions.

CHAPTER TWO: REFLECTIONS FROM 1960S AND 70S

Edward Corbett's observation from 1969 characterized the late 60s as one dominated by electronic media where the younger people understood and were making most of the potential of the newer composing styles. He wrote:

> Our world is changing at a faster rate than any of us realize. It is notable that the newer style of rhetoric has been adopted mainly by young people. Perhaps the generation under thirty realizes more than the rest of us just how much the world has changed, senses, if it does not realize, that we exist in a world dominated by electronic media. (295)

This characterization of the late 60s is similar to contemporary descriptions (Selfe; Bowen; Palmeri; Etlinger; Lauer; Lauer; Dunn), and this marks the 60s and the 70s, particularly 1968-1973, as important years. The importance of the 60s and 70s in the context of this study is that this period

- Offers a perspective that enables understanding why the *multi-media* approach to writing happened and why it happened then;
- Explains, or at very least retraces, how *multi-media* manifested in writing textbooks; and
- Presents the general perspective on the writing instructor community's reaction to this new genre of *multi-media* textbooks.

I believe the shifts that were (re)shaping American culture influenced some textbook authors in a way that is similar to how innovations today are influencing the function and form of composition pedagogy resources. In both these moments, intention manifested through the

use of (digital) innovations and these have in turn redefined how scholars reexamine the act of teaching and writing.

The similarities between the 60s-70s and our present moment are important and, I believe, easy to see. In our enthusiasm to look for answers in a period now past, it is not enough to focus only on the similarities between then and now, significant as they are. It is important to also focus on the crucial nuances that give the past its uniqueness. I believe that the repercussions of not doing so will, among other things, continue to merge the definitions of *multimedia* and *multimodal,* which in turn will continue to put our implementation of these concepts in real time at risk. The late 60s and early 70s were defined by a uniqueness that makes examining textbooks from their time in the context of today a complicated task. To get a more accurate sense of the reality of *multimodal* writing between 1968-1973, I historicize the late 60s and early 70s so that the claims that I make retain the essence of the past reviewed in the context of the present. I acknowledge the uniqueness of the late 60s and early 70s on their own terms, and I do this largely on the accepted idea that 1968-1973 was a key moment when the initial use of multiple modes towards enhanced writing pedagogy first emerged. Without historicizing there is a danger that we will misinterpret the textbooks of the past in our haste to find the meaning of *multimodality* and its relationship to *multimedia*.

Historicizing was neither an easy nor straightforward process as there is always something lost in translation. This process was more complex because of a still under-developed vocabulary that could not incorporate the modal shifts as they occurred then, as well as the fact that the process of translation by its very nature is an imperfect process. However, I believe that the conceptual understanding that we stand to gain as a discipline

today will make the effort of a retrospective examination well worth it. To that end I focused on:

- The *voices* of the textbook authors that directly communicate from the front matter of the textbooks;
- The documented reflections of teachers of freshman English from the late 60s and early 70s in textbook reviews, advertisements, and "Staffroom Interchanges"; and
- Scholarship from and on the 60s and 70s on the experience of teaching writing then.

I found that collectively these sources documented the views, intentions, and perceptions of the new approach to writing pedagogy from that moment in time, not exhaustively, but adequately for what I was doing here. These sources recorded the shifts in the pedagogical approach as it manifested in the new genre of *multi-media* textbooks, which I believe are artifacts of this defining moment in composition's (pre)history. And as they did this, these *voices* left clues on the possible causes and effects of the *multi-media* moment of the late 60s and early 70s.

The Reflections from the Past in Light of my Three Questions:

The differences between the past and the present are nuanced and therefore complicated. This complexity is evident in the textual sources as I began to historicize. To ensure that I understand these perspectives in a way that would make sense to my project, which is a future-oriented study, I analyzed these past reflections from the perspective of the three questions I asked in the previous chapter. These questions are different as they each examine one aspect of *multimodality* and *multimedia* in the writing textbooks of the late 60s

and early 70s, but they are also deeply inter-connected because they are all subject to the same culturally defining forces of the past.

Question #1: *If the use of multiple (digital) modes to teach composition happened before the introduction of the term* multimodal *in writing in the 60s and 70s, then how was the intentionality of this use of multiple modes to fulfill a pedagogical purpose articulated in the late 60s and early 70s writing classroom? Also, how did this intention manifest in writing textbooks from 1968-1973?*

This question addresses the lexical preferences and involves examining the vocabulary that at that time proved inadequate to accommodate the shifts that were evident. Composition of today, with a "C," was "freshman English," or "composition" with a "c" in the late 60s and early 70s. In 1968-1973 composition itself was still unformed, but some teachers of writing recognized something more was in the offing. The establishment of the Conference of College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1949 indicated that composition was recognized as an area of study; however, composition's disciplinary status was still some years away. David Chapman and Gary Tate published the "Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition" in 1986, where they traced the beginnings of the discipline of rhetoric and composition to the "scattered voices" of the 70s. They found that the call for the "acquisition of skills, not merely subject matter" had begun by the late 70s (John Gerber qtd. in Chapman and Tate 124). By the spring of 1986, Chapman and Tate found that 53 institutions of 123 doctoral programs in English claimed to offer specializations in composition and rhetoric (Chapman and Tate 125).

Added to freshman English or composition's pre-disciplinary status was the issue of a vocabulary that was not robust enough to articulate these shifts in writing pedagogy. Several *multi-media* textbook authors pointed to their growing conviction that the writing students of the time were far more sophisticated than traditional writing pedagogy acknowledged. These authors argued that the freshman English student of the late 60s and early 70s needed mental and emotional engagement as opposed to grammar, syntax, and punctuation to produce good writing. It was this impetus that prompted many *multi-media* textbook authors to shift their focus from disseminating knowledge to the students, to getting the students to produce knowledge. This in turn led to the "construction" of the new genre of *multi-media* textbooks. However, the new approach and the new genre of textbooks did not have a vocabulary that could articulate these shifts. Bowman and Whithaus saw this connection between an "unborn" discipline and an under-developed vocabulary as logical outcomes to one another. In 2013 they pointed out that when the "act of naming a genre" coincides with the naming of the text-tool, getting the two entwined is not hard to imagine (3). This meant that as the writing instructors' redefined sense of purpose resulted in a new *multi-media* genre, the act of implementing and analyzing these pedagogical movements lacked a vocabulary nuanced enough to adequately articulate and document these shifts.

The driving force that resulted in the emergence of a *multi-media* approach was a palpable shift in how teachers of writing were beginning to experience the writing class of the late 60s and early 70s. In 1970, W.E. Coles pointed out that "composition," as he called it, was a method in the writing classrooms of the 60s and was being (re)understood conceptually. He described his writing class as "not the usual Freshman English Course," but a course that could be summed up in one word, "composition" (27). Coles defined

Composition with a "C," as "a course in composing, selecting and arranging, putting together and it could as well be called Puzzle and Problem Solving." (27). He said that this course is about "the shaping of experience in words, sentences, paragraphs; and we try to see how the composer, the problem solver, the writer in English goes about doing this" (27). Relevance was central to Coles's notion of composition, and educating the student in "method, and no matter what department of knowledge the student is concentrating in" was a writing teacher's main goal (27). Richard Williamson noted in 1970 that this focus of relevance and critical thinking as being the defining goal for the writing teacher often made the freshman English class of the late 60s and early 70s "the composition class" (133). Williamson also described this shift on the focus of relevance and critical thinking as being the defining goal for the writing teacher, which according to him made the English class of the late 60s and early 70s "more often the composition class" instead (133). This shift towards a more defined notion of composition studies is evidenced in the 1971 February issue of the *CCC.*

Prior to 1968 all the textbook reviews in the *CCC* were grouped in one part of the journal. There were no sub-categories of types of texts that indicated a sense of specialization. In 1968 and then from 1969 onwards *CCC* organized the textbook reviews according to schemes that mirrored the issues and trends within the emerging consciousness of writing as a discipline by itself. In 1968 and 1969 onwards *CCC* organized the textbook reviews under sub-groups, namely "Composition, Rhetoric and Media"; "Language"; "Literature and Criticism"; and "Professional." These reviews indicated not just the *type* of textbook, but the influence of emerging trends that demanded the attention of teachers and scholars of writing in the late 60s and early 70s. It is noteworthy that "Composition, Rhetoric and Media" had a section all to itself and asides from being the largest sub-group in the 1971

issue, its importance is clear because of the number of titles included in this sub-group. *CCC* placed "Composition, Rhetoric and Media" first among the sub-groups and included 43 reviews. Considering that there were 66 titles reviewed in all, this indicates the dominance of textbooks under "Composition, Rhetoric, and Media" textbooks. Also, note-worthy is that the *CCC* allotted 50 pages of the 100-page issue to textbook reviews alone and of these "Composition, Rhetoric and Media" had 25 pages, from pages 49 to 74. The remaining half of the allotted pages was shared by the other three categories. This page allotment by the *CCC* for reviews, particularly freshman English textbook reviews, was the highest during 1968-1973 as the regular allotment was an average of 15 to 20 pages of a 100-page issue for textbooks on "Composition, Rhetoric, and Media".

I also see this as evidence that the impact of an emerging of freshman English as more than just writing was felt by some scholars involved with writing pedagogy at the time. This difference of approach was something textbook authors emphasized and seemed to be proud of, as seen in the front matter of textbooks. For example, the editors of *Montage*, William Sparke and Clark McKowen, intended *Montage* to be *felt* differently from any other textbook and proudly declared how *Montage* was unlike any other textbook in the teacher's manual. This intention to inspire "good thinking" as the forerunner to "good writing" was also stated in no uncertain terms by Fred Morgan, the author of another multi-media textbook from 1968, *Here and Now*.

To understand how the *multi-media* of the 70s is akin to the *multimodal* of today, we have to review *multimedia* and *multimodal* as media (the physical object) as *media* (a mechanical means) and media as *modes*. According to Kress and Leeuwen, *modes* are the semiotic resources that allow the simultaneous realization of discourses and types of

(inter)action and can be realized through multiple ways of production (media) (*Multimodal Discourse*). Conceptually, *mode* is different from *medium* because *medium* is "the material resources used in the production of semiotic products and events, including both the tools and the materials used" (*Multimodal Discourse* 22). The key factor as I see it is that the implementation of medium towards pedagogical value addition determined whether media remains *media* or whether media become *modes*. For example, a Xerox machine is a piece of technology that is used to reproduce an exact replica of a document. The process of duplication without pedagogical intention does not directly create intellectually motivated, original texts. On the other hand, when the same Xerox machine is used as Ray Kytle used it in *The Comp Box,* the medium of the photocopy machine is now a *mode.* This is because here the Xerox machine allows the simultaneous realization of discourses and types of (inter)action as it produces documents. Here understanding *medium* as *mode* is not about convenience, but about motivating students into critical engagement while giving them strategies and approaches so the students can write better.

This intention in the late 60s and early 70s was met by a vocabulary not nuanced enough to articulate these pedagogical (re)orientations. Paul Briand was one of the first to use the term multi-media in the "Staffroom Interchange" section of the 1970 issue of *CCC* to denote the use of all kinds of modes of audio, visual, and audio-visual materials like "film, film strips, television kinescopes, 35mm. slides, transparencies for overhead projectors, records, audio tapes, programmed instruction for teaching machines and programs in computer-assisted instruction" (267). Briand's intention to use multi-media was to engage bored students and to address his need to find instructional content and themes that would fulfill his course's requirements (267).

Shortly after Briand's use of "multi-media," Lewis Paige Sego used it again in 1971 to name the new genre of "multi-dimensional" and "graphic-verbal" textbooks that were emerging at the time (54). Sego connected the intent of the multi-media textbooks to the studies of Jerome Bruner and William J.J. Gorden that examined the thinking-learning process in education (54). Sego reviewed *Mixed Bag* by Helen Hutchinson, *Montage* by William Sparke and Clarke McKowen, *Reading for Insight* edited by J. Burl Hogins and Gerald A. Bryant Jr., *Worlds in the Making* edited by Mary Jane Dunstan and Patricia W. Garlan, and *The Writer's Mind* by Wallace Kaufman and William Powers as examples of such multi-media textbooks. These textbooks, when mapped on the Framework, show that they displayed varying degrees of modality in their function and forms (Appendix 1). Sego not only reviewed the textbooks' facts, but Sego also commented on the degree to which these textbooks departed from more traditional textbooks. For example, Sego mentioned *Reading for Insight* as a textbook for "the more cautious who want pictorial reinforcement without sacrificing the customary format" (55). I would argue that this shows a certain caution that instructors exercised when considering these multi-media textbooks *as* textbooks for their writing classes.

The recognition of multiple modes as *multimodality* as we understand it today appeared only in 1996 when the NLG coined the term *multiliteracy*, and from that came *multimodality* in 2000. The NLG defined *multiliteracies* as the word chosen to acknowledge and accommodate the shifting cultural, institutional, and global order as well as "the multiplicity of communications channels and media, and the increasing saliency of cultural linguistic diversity" (Candez et al. 63). The NLG articulated the concept of *multimodality* as how *multiliteracy* must be realized in a learning-oriented, forward-thinking composition

classroom (Cope et al. "Multiliteracies"). This evolution in our pedagogical vocabulary happened only recently, three decades after such shifts actually began.

So, while conceptually writing pedagogy was benefitting from exploring *multi-media* options outside of the alphabetic modes, the vocabulary to articulate these distinctions was still some steps behind. This is why I argue that the multi-media textbooks of the late 60s and early 70s is the embodiment of the *multi-media* or *multimodal* approach and not that of contemporary *multimedia*, which is the use of multiple media in writing pedagogy without pedagogical value addition. Instead, we need to read "multi-media" of 1970-71 as *multimodal* where the deployment of multiple media as *modes* must result in intellectually enhanced pedagogy. This includes the use of all kinds of digital and non-digital modes with the intention to improve critically meaningful student engagement. Therefore, *multi-media* of 1970-71 is akin to *multimodal* of today, and *multi-media* of 1970-71 is not *multimedia* as we understand it now.

Question #2: *If the use of multiple modes was seen in the writing textbooks of 1968-1973 (Palmeri; Jasken), then what role did the period of the late 60s and early 70s play in defining how multiple modes were used in textbooks? Also, how did the very concept of the writing textbook as a set of conventions for a writing class get challenged?*

Analyzing the 60s and 70s as a historical examination is beyond the scope of this project because my focus is not the period, but rather the impact of those years on writing pedagogy of those times. Therefore, to create a working sense of the larger context of this period, I will discuss author intention during this period based on scholarship from the late 60s and early 70s, as well as contemporary studies that also revisited the late 60s and early

70s. Then I will explain how, as a result of this period, the term *multi-media* manifested in the textbooks of 1968-1973.

In 1967, Charles Deemer believed that the late 60s were a "Happening," which meant that Deemer saw language becoming a means of personal growth. In 1969, Don Murray documented the undeniable presence of politics and student power in the classroom. The NCTE also recorded increased student diversity in the writing classrooms of the American colleges and universities at the time. In the introduction to "Rhetoric Readers" under "Composition, Rhetoric, and Media," in the *CCC* 1971 issue, Donald Stewart lamented the collective inability to acknowledge the diversity of "fifty mini-markets" (49) that according to Stewart, was the changing reality of the writing classroom. Stewart was concerned that this inability to recognize these shifts on a larger scale would lead to a corresponding failure to (re)think of writing as a means of thought, reflection, and realization. As Stewart went on to review how "openly traditional" or diverse these textbooks were, Stewart's concerns are important because they indicate that while scholarship recognized shifts in everything from student demographics to writing approaches, the common perception was somewhat less aware of these changes.

When we look back today, after all these years, the importance of that moment remains. David Fleming recently argued that the late 60s and early 70s was:

> …sui generis, its own cultural moment, unassimilable to other periods, a time of radical rupture in the incipient discipline as well as higher education itself, when one era literally and figuratively came to an end and another, haltingly, incoherently, began. (*From Form to Meaning* 197).

M.J. Heale described the late 60s and early 70s as an era "shaped by intersecting dynamics of unprecedented prosperity and unusual youthful population" when "politics rooted in class and economics was displaced by a politics rooted in race and culture" (135). He saw this period as "dominated by the imperatives of the Cold War" and one in which "the personal became the political, dissolving the distinction between politics and culture." This was, according to Heale, "a watershed, separating the political culture of industrialism from the political culture of post-industrialism" (ibid). Ohmann recalled in a 2014 interview conducted by Nancy Smith that the late 60s and early 70s was "a good, an expansive, confident time, and that confidence pervaded," making this the "Golden Age of the U.S. University" (4). Berlin saw the establishment of the CCCC as, among other things, a response to a change post World War II when most Americans began going to school and a nod to the need to address student and teacher concerns of the time. Berlin saw the CCCC as a response to the need to safeguard the academic status of composition teachers as well as a commitment to democracy and welfare of the students (*Rhetoric and Reality*).

All of these changes, at least as they were perceived in scholarship, also began to impact how the student was being represented. The freshman English writing student was no longer a passive receptacle of knowledge, rather this student was now seen as an *actor* in the creation of critically defined texts. Connected to this were writing instructors acknowledging the value of the *texts* that students carried within themselves in their real-life experiences. This, I believe, was almost immediately evident in the multi-media textbooks of the time. In some instances, the multi-media textbooks redefined this student-teacher relationship from the safety of familiar textbook conventions. For example, *Montage* pushed the teacher outside the textbook entirely. However, the presence of instructional apparatus would still

characterize *Montage* as textbook, allowing for more instructors to be able to use it. However, there were a few multi-media textbook authors who chose to reinterpret this student-teacher relationship by not only deemphasizing the instructor, but also going over and around the instructor entirely. These authors did this by eliminating the instructional apparatus from the textbooks, and this is a significant development because the instructional apparatus is what separates pedagogical instruction from a peer-to-peer communication among equals. For example, *Course X* reads more like a text from one writer to another. Another example is *The Comp Box* by Ray Kytle where the form of the textbook and the instructional apparatus have been altered entirely to engage the student as a writer. These unusual textbooks demonstrate how convention was challenged not just in terms of how multiple modes were incorporated in writing pedagogy, but even in terms of the *types* of texts recognized as textbooks. This perception of what was being considered a textbook for a writing class challenged the idea of what a textbook *could* or *should* look like.

Such shifts were met with non-uniformity in how they were implemented and also in how they were perceived by the larger community of writing instructors who were, at the time, trained in Literature. Corbett and Wayne Booth believed that the 1950s and 60s saw a revival of the old rhetoric, and they document the divide between the "exponents of the older mode of discourse [who] have been too slow to recognize the efficacy of the new techniques of communication," and the "practitioners of the new rhetoric [who] have been too quick to reject the proven soundness of many of the strategies of the older rhetoric" (Corbett 296). Corbett noted that the rhetoric that began in the 50s and extended into the 70s was unlike the rhetoric of old. This 50s and 60s version of rhetoric was now defined by the use of non-verbal "muscular rhetoric," or alternatively called "body rhetoric" (Corbett 291). This form

was collaborative and group based; coercive, rather than persuasive; and marked by the presence of "unreason" (Corbett 293). Corbett connected the emergence of this new rhetoric in the writing classroom to "its successes in affecting attitudes and actions in regard to such matters as the Vietnam War, civil rights, the military industrial alliance, the rationale and content of the college curriculum" (296). Corbett used the examples of Marshall McLuhan and George Steiner, who pointed to the intensification of human sensoria due to electronic media; the immediacy, intensity, and simultaneity of the aural, visual, tactical images over words strung one after another on a page; and the "retreat from words" where the writer uses a more "watered-down" concept of alphabetic literacy because "the sum of realties of which words can give a necessary and sufficient account has sharply diminished" (292). In essence, Corbett was referring to the shifting role of the audience, who was traditionally the student, as one that has been redefined by a multimodal approach to articulating their expressions. This expression was, as Corbett points out, effective, but it was also outside of the conventions of pedagogy that involved instruction, a designated classroom, and the use of familiar teaching and learning materials.

It is a short hop from Corbett's reflections of what was happening in and around the 60s and 70s writing classroom, to understanding the how the textbook's form was impacted at the time. Given the importance of the textbook in the classroom (Horandan; Knoblauch; Welch; Connors; Woods; Stewart; Mead et al.; Corbett; Kitzhaber), the alternative concepts of the textbook reflected the *zeitgeist* of the times. The fact that these *strange* textbooks were being seen as textbooks either in reviews, advertisements, and/or textbook scholarship, even though the textbooks defied convention, is proof that the teaching community was grappling with shifting classroom realities. Not just the inclusion but even the exclusion of certain well-

known multi-media texts signifies how confusing, perhaps even dis-orienting these changes must have been. For example, *The Comp Box* established a marked shift in how *multi-media* was approached as a concept, particularly as it manifested as a textbook.

The Comp Box was a textbook that has elicited excited if somewhat puzzled reactions from modern-day scholars like Palmeri. He examined *The Comp Box* in great detail as an example of a text(book) that marks the tradition of using multiple modes in writing pedagogy (*Remixing*). *The Comp Box* was also advertised in the 1971 and 1972 issues of *CCC,* which points to *The Comp Box*'s popularity at the time of its publication. Yet, curiously enough there is not a single review or even a mention of *The Comp Box* in the textbook review sections of the *CCC* from 1968-1973. Was *The Comp Box*'s defiance of convention responsible for its exclusion? Was it best left alone because it was too different? Perhaps too controversial? Those answers remain unknown, and to a degree they are not as important as the fact that it *was* excluded. This exclusion doesn't just speak to how the teaching community might have been grappling with *The Comp Box*'s unrecognizable form; it also shines a light on how the multi-media approach was still subjected to some conventions that it had to follow to be *safely* considered. This question of what was acceptable as a textbook in a writing class, versus the notion of a text that is too radical to be of real use, is one that several teachers and scholars were asking then. The reactions that followed ranged from an approval through imitation as is evidenced in the textbooks reviewed in Chapter Four, to a complete disapproval or at the very least a distant acknowledgement as is seen in *The Comp Box*'s exclusion from the reviews of the *CCC* issues.

This split between the different approaches to incorporating *multi-media* among the teaching community was on ongoing, somewhat heated debate in the late 60s and early 70s.

Williamson, C.F. Angell, and Joseph Comprone's debate about filmmaking as a mode that can enhance writing pedagogy was documented across three issues of *CCC* from 1970 to 1971. Williamson's suggestion to use filmmaking as a mode to enhance writing pedagogy prompted Angell to respond against it, rather aggressively, on the grounds that filmmaking was too different a mode from the alphabetic to be legitimized in a writing course as a potential text. Sarah Etlinger also addressed this issue in 2012. Etlinger defines this misguided assumption that "analytical methods of print can be directly applied to other media" as *media equivalency* (12). In 1971, Comprone argued that the judicious use of multiple modes in a writing course was the middle ground to Williamson and Angell's points of view. Comprone argued that it is the common intention that unites all writing teachers, which is to "help us motivate self-discovery *and* communicat[ion]" in our students (58), and that must be what guides the methods that we finally adopt and endorse.

Comprone's final statement that incorporated both Williamson and Angell's points of view ended *that* discussion. However, the question of *multimodality* in the writing classroom continues even today, with a slight twist. The Williamson-Angell-Comprone discussion in the early 70s documented an important disagreement about how media works across modalities. The point that Angell was making was that even though the medium is the message, "the perception of reality is altered by its mode of presentation" (257). Today, few writing instructors would argue that *multimodality* used to enhance the writing pedagogy is a bad idea. However, whether *multimodality* is determined by intention or by the use of media irrespective of intention is what we, as writing teachers, must pay attention to.

Question #3: *If the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973 were perceived as motivating and engaging to the students then how did this perception influence the successful yet traditional textbooks of the 60s and 70s?*

This question has multiple parts. The first is the role of media in a traditional writing class and the second is of the process of revising a successful textbook. The first part has to do with the idea of a writing class from a perspective that is larger in scope than just the textbook, while the second part looks at how a traditional textbook must be revised if the textbook is to be considered a *real* revision and perhaps an improvement from its older version.

In a panel discussion in 1969, Edmundo Garcia-Giron, George Allen, William Gibson, and Richard Ohmann, mediated by David Mead, discussed the concept of the writing textbook, in particular the notion of an "effective" textbook as opposed to a "good" textbook. This panel discussion is important because it explored larger questions akin to those to that run through this study. George Allen articulated the definition of an "effective textbook" as one that was "designed to arouse the student's interest so that he will be moved to read beyond the selections" (19). If the textbook inspired the students, Allen argued it had done the job of a "good" textbook. Allen pointed out that "teachers sometimes discover only after they have adopted a book and tried to use it with their students" (2) that the textbook was a wrong fit for their course. Further along in this discussion an audience member reflected that in their experience "good" textbooks have turned out to be the worst in a classroom situation (20). In essence the problem was that the theoretical definitions of a "good" textbook often did not work in the reality of the classroom. According to the opinion of an audience member

this was due to "[t]he absence of reliable information about the effectiveness of the product" (21).

Edmundo Garcia-Giron noted that three factors would ensure the success of the new practical techniques of teaching through multiple modes, namely the "validity of language theory," the instructor, and the textbook (qtd. in Mead 6). Garcia-Giron saw these new writing textbooks as "[u]unquestionably… far more attractive (and expensive) than the pre-war gray grammars" (qtd. in Mead 6). Garcia-Giron was quick to point out that he did not believe that either the physical beauty or the price of a textbook ensured its quality as a "good" textbook (qtd. in Mead 6). Ohmann argued that "the main quality control" is "exercised by the professor when he decides whether or not to adopt a book" (qtd. in Mead 12). Ohmann saw the textbook as a transaction between professors who write these textbooks and those who adopt them (qtd. in Mead 12). Ohmann's question is particularly on point here. He asks:

> The decision is made for the most part in the privacy or quasi-privacy of your offices or your homes. My question, then, is a simple one. How do you decide whether or not to adopt a book? And why do you adopt bad books -- if, in fact you do? My question is addressed to anyone who has ever made an adoption – anyone who can give me some idea of what goes on. (qtd. in Mead 20-21)

As Murray pointed out in 1969, there was a clear lack of student engagement due to a "teacher-centered educational system which keeps the students in a state of permanent adolescence" (118). Many teachers during the late 60s and early 70s noted this state of affairs irrespective of which side of the *multi-media* debate they found themselves on. The intention to "motivate self-discovery *and* communicat[ion]" (Comprone 58) was articulated differently

depending upon the textbook authors' intentions and implementation methods. Even though alternate pedagogical processes emerged, there was a group of textbook writers who acknowledged these multi-media methods staying within the boundaries of visible convention. Often the authors of successful textbooks found themselves caught between the realization of what the multi-media approach could offer and a desire to still appeal to their traditionally oriented market base. Entirely ignoring the new multi-media market was not an option, and neither was losing a loyal and already established following.

In 1969 Murray saw the inculcation of critical engagement through a set of joint responsibilities for the writing student and the writing teacher. The responsibilities of the students were that they had to discover their own voice: find, document, and substantiate their own subjects; earn their own audience; and find their own forms of expression (Murray 119). The main responsibility of the teacher was to create an atmosphere that placed the students' responsibilities on the students' shoulders. The idea here was that students must be rewarded for their initiative at the end of a job well done and not rewarded for their ability to follow directions (Murray 120). The teacher could do this by creating a psychological and physical environment in which students could fulfill their own responsibilities by allowing and using failure as a learning tool (Murray 121) and by approaching feedback as a diagnostician, where students are empowered to see and address one fundamental problem before other problems in their writing (Murray 122). In this scheme the multi-media intention is clear; however, the specifics of how media implemented this intention is not as Murray neglects to specify any lesson plans. While this is building up to a multi-media course, it remains unarticulated as one.

However, media does become important as it fulfills, or at least aims to fulfill, the student and teachers' joint responsibility of publishing the students' texts. This was a common course goal (Murray; Kytle) that could only be realized using media "with ditto, Xerox, carbon paper, overhead projector, wall display, or merely student folders open to all members of the class" (Murray 122). The value of this process, according to Murray, was that through this text production, the student writer must learn to face the audience, "listen to contrary counsel of his readers and must learn to ignore his teachers and peers, listening to himself after evaluating what has been said about his writing and considering what he needs to do to make it work" (122). Such a role for digital media as a means to realizing a bigger *multi-media* goal of the writing class points to a larger acknowledgement of the use of technology in a writing class.

Here I must underscore the importance of the connection between the intention and the implantation as articulated by the instructional content, *even* during the 60s and 70s. Coles believed assignments to be the bedrock of the textbook where the author tries to "contrive a set of assignments not to be nonsensical, but to have an effect like that accompanying the attempt to make sense of nonsense" (28). The way is to ask the students to "isolate something within their experience and then [the teacher] asks questions about what [the students] have done in this act of separating … [and finding] patterns" (Coles 29). These patterns then ask the students to "re-examine things from this perspective," and these assignments then question many different areas of experience to which they can logically extend (Coles 29). The case study in Chapter Five examines *Writing with a Purpose* from 1950-1980, to trace the influences of this moment on *Writing*'s otherwise consistently traditional orientation.

It is important to consider the process of revising textbooks, particularly how the process of revision was perceived in the late 60s and early 70s. Garcia-Giron pointed out that in the past the author worked up to the ideas he gained from teaching the subject of his book, which could entail

> [T]alking informally with his friends and colleagues, reading rival books in the field, carefully weighing criticism of his outline or manuscript made by able teachers at other universities and paid for by his publisher, and heeding the suggestions of his publisher's editor. (6)

This system prevailed because it fulfilled the financial motive of the textbook author, which was to maximize sales. Garcia-Giron argued that while this method may have promised a "good" textbook, it did not ensure an effective textbook (6). Garcia-Giron then presented alternate methods to writing textbooks, and on point here are two methods: instructor collaboration and textbook model imitation. In the first method the instructors would collectively choose and mimeograph materials for students (making the textbooks relevant and up-to-date in the best sense of the word), making this sound similar to *The Comp Box* in concept. The second textbook model-imitation method was to take inspiration from long running textbooks that consisted of "workbooks, teachers manuals, [which were] in format are quite handsome" (Garcia-Giron 6). The textbooks that Garcia-Giron used as models for inspiration were Spanish textbooks that, by Garcia-Giron's description, sound similar to *Montage* and *Mixed Bag.*

These ideas are crucial for two reasons. The first is that textbooks like *Montage* and *Mixed Bag* were being seen as exemplary, and the second is that some textbooks like *Writing with a Purpose* did begin to show traces of the influence of the multi-media moment of the

60s and 70s on their own forms. During this panel discussion, Allen argued that even the best of textbooks can benefit from revisions provided that these revisions are not superficial, which meant that changes went deeper than "alterations [confined to] the type face, or the jacket, or the updating of the bibliography" (2). This is when new material may be added; however, older assumptions are left unexamined (2). Allen believed that one of the reasons for this "inadequate integration" was the success of the textbooks, and teachers often discover that "under the surface, [the textbook is] the same old thing … only after they have adopted a book and tried to use it with their students" (2). Allen saw this process of revision as essential particularly when the development of a new method of teaching proved effective, or when new theories and scholarship altered the landscape of the classes. *Writing with a Purpose* exemplifies these conflicting forces as they acted on a textbook in that time period.

Connecting the Past and the Present:

Today, as in the late 60s and early 70s, the use of multiple types of media (*multimedia*) was guided by the goal to create critical awareness and engagement, making it *multimodal.* Lemke said that meaning is never made with language alone ("Multiplying Meaning: Visual and Verbal Semiotics" n.pag. n.d). This translates into stating that human communication deploys multiple semiotic sources and combines them towards a goal, or function. When this function was the intention to motivate and critically engage the freshman English students, the multi-media textbooks of the 60s and 70s began to emerge. This impetus continues to define the *multimodal* approach of today. *Multimodality* is a post-2000 term that articulates how we think of multimodality in composition studies. The late 60s and

early 70s did not have the term *multimodality* to differentiate the use of media as *media* or as *mode*. In essence, I see *multi-media* of the 60s and 70s akin to modern-day *multimodality*.

In 2010, Selfe drew a distinction between tools and the intent, saying, "it doesn't matter how important your rhetorical purpose is or how focused your rhetorical intent is or how keen your rhetorical understanding is, you have to know how to work with the tools" (Selfe qtd. in Bailie). I extend this into arguing that unless you know the affordances of the tool expertly, you will not be able to deploy them effectively. This connection between the intention to motivate the students and the use of multiple medium to implement and realize these central functions was true then as it is today. Whether we are reviewing the debate between Williamson, Angell, and Comprone in 1970-71, or considering Palmeri's interdisciplinary approach to multimodal assignments, the role of technology should be to allow for the course or resource to be truly *multimodal.*

Linda Adler-Kassner wrote in 2008 that "the idea that writing instruction contributes to the development of students' 'critical intelligence' is a mainstay of the field" (52). This mirrors the previously articulated ideas of various writing teachers from late 60s and early 70s as they reimagined the function and form of their writing classes back then. Selfe's summarizing is apt of how intent has always defined our pedagogical practices and how we have employed various modes through multiple media. She argued that by teaching students how to use video work in composing classes, we were not making students Spielberg; rather "[w]e're going to teach them to be good rhetoricians who can deploy any number of modes of expression and media to make meaning. We're going to teach them to use all available means to accomplish responsible rhetorical ends" (qtd. in Bailie). And in the words of Comprone, isn't that what we all want?

CHAPTER THREE: TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS I: EXPERIMENTING WITH MODALITY IN TEXTBOOKS FROM 1968-1973

Author intention, external perception, and content implementation of multimodal textbooks form a paradox in themselves. To fully appreciate how intention, implementation, and perception were articulated in these multi-media textbooks, recalling the influences of the late 60s and early 70s is important. As a consequence of a shift that had brought power, politics, and critical consciousness into the writing class, this period saw many textbooks either claiming to be multimodal or claiming an intention similar to that of multi-media textbook authors. Authorial intention to enhance writing instruction through *multi-media* manifested in two patterns of content implementation in the textbooks of this genre: multi-media textbooks that redefined its function, but conformed to the conceptual conventions of a textbook; and a set of multi-media textbooks that not only redefined function, but also redefined the form of instructional content including the conventions that define a textbook.

This chapter analyzes those multi-media writing textbooks from 1968-1973 that mark the range of modality from "high" to "low" within the conventions of a textbook. They demonstrate that even within the genre of multi-modal textbooks there was a range of modality. The multi-media textbooks that show high degrees and levels of modality are:

- *Montage: Investigations in Language* by William Sparke and Clark McKowen
- *Here and Now: An Approach to Writing Through Perception* by Fred Morgan

And multi-media writing textbooks that show lower degrees and levels of modality are:

- *Students Voices/One* by Christopher Reaske and Robert F. Wilson, Jr.
- *Word, Self, Reality: Rhetoric of Imagination* by James Miller

It is important to state that I do not judge these textbooks in either my textbook analysis or in my mapping these multi-media textbooks on to the Framework. My analysis aims to understand modality as a consequence of function and form, defined by intention, and articulated through implementation. The textual analysis as well as the Framework illustrate how these intentions, implementations, and perceptions differed in these multi-media textbooks and illustrates how the suitability of a textbook varies depending on these elements.

Montage: Investigations in Language, by William Sparke and Clarke McKowen (1970)

(Author) Intention of *Montage*:

Physically *Montage* conforms to the conventions of a textbook. It is a predetermined set of pages made of paper, bound in a predetermined order, and with some content conventions found in regular, or traditional, textbooks. Sparke and McKowen intended to stimulate the student into critical engagement as students "feel," "hear," and "move" across time and space through *Montage*. Sparke and McKowen's intentions to redefine the role of the textbook as being for and to the student was evident in their reduction of the teacher's presence in the textbook to a shadow. To that end they eliminated the preface, the introduction, and the table of contents from the main textbook and moved the voice of formal instruction, as embodied in their own voices, outside the physical boundaries of the textbook to an accompanying teacher's manual. This manual is a thin, achromatic, booklet-like guide, from which Sparke and McKowen communicated directly with the teacher, but they kept their "voices" down to a whisper when they spoke to the student from *Montage*. This suggests where Sparke and McKowen believed the teacher, instructor, and/or author must

stay, literally *outside* the textbook as a point of reference, or guide, for the student. Sparke and McKowen explain how they envisioned the functions of *Montage* in how they constructed the textbook. The short half-page introduction in the manual is Sparke and McKowen's statement of intent stating that *Montage* was intended to be a multi-sensory experience for the students. Their pride at *Montage*'s difference from other English texts is evident as they claim that the students will find *Montage* unusual because of the variety of its readings ("Teacher's Manual" 1).

For their novel approach, Sparke and McKowen's were careful to include in their intentions the concerns of more traditional writing instructors. They claimed that "language [was] the focus in every section, [and] the traditional topics are examined in terms of their interrelation with other arbitrary compartments of our world" ("Teacher's Manual" 1). In the manual as well as in the textbook, "Aspects of Language" is the first topic, and according to Sparke and McKowen, "[t]he intention [was to] set up a language orientation and frame of reference and awaken students' sensitivity to knowledge" ("Teacher's Manual" 1). This goal to "awaken students' sensitivity to knowledge" addressed various aspects of language like the linguistic, historic, etymological, philosophical, phonetic, cultural, and the role of media. Sparke and McKowen did not dwell on this section, but they mentioned that it is "an array of games, quizzes, anecdotes, and excerpts – each requiring the students to do something or think about something" ("Teacher's Manual" 1).

Sparke and McKowen outlined specific functions using *fusion* words, words that combined disciplines, perspectives, and experiences making Sparke and McKowen's deployment of multiple modes deliberate. Even the word *montage* for the title of the textbook is a direct reference to not just their intention to make *Montage* a collection of bits and parts,

but their establishment of a process where these bits and parts would in turn create a new *montage* text. Sparke and McKowen's articulation of their focus on students' sense of involvement and awareness echoed Freire's concept of *conscientizacao. Investigations in Language* in the title of the textbook points to the process of investigation as being primary, and language as it is connected to critical consciousness of the world is the subject of this investigation. Sparke and McKowen envisioned the final step as enabling students to write "to shape [the students'] own thoughts through the common medium of language – that is, to be creative artists in the use of language" ("Teacher's Manual" 4). Sparke and McKowen began with the knowledge of (language) conventions and took the students to critical consciousness rooted in the real world. Along the way, Sparke and McKowen intended the student to develop a consciousness so they would imbibe through observation and *feel* the impact of various modalities in the making of meaning.

(Instructional Content) Implementation of *Montage*:

While Sparke and McKowen designed *Montage* differently enough to stimulate students, they did maintain some key textbook conventions. In terms of their instructional content, Sparke and McKowen included assignments that were "designed so that students, through their own involvement and interest, want to become more and more aware of the patterns of language and of themselves as human beings - thinking with and feeling through language" ("Teacher's Manual" 5). This intent defines the conception of most multi-media textbooks, but what set *Montage* apart from other writing texts were the forms that Sparke and McKowen deployed, which were visibly different from those of any other textbook.

Montage's instructional content is in an informal, conversational, peer-to-peer tone rather than as a lecture from a teacher to the students. This informality comes across through Sparke and McKowen's use of personal pronouns as opposed to the more formal third person of traditional textbook theoretical instruction. Further, even though *Montage* has instructional apparatus throughout, the forms that this instructional apparatus takes is different. For example, Sparke and McKowen asked the students to perform informal, non-writing tasks like an assignment that asked students to reflect on a code of ballet movements without asking them to write about it (*Montage* 41). Not only is this a prompt that avoids referring to the act of writing directly, but it is from well outside the purview of the discipline of Literature. Another novelty is Sparke and McKowen's reflective and collaborative exercises. Almost all multi-media textbooks I analyzed here have a significant presence of reflective exercises, or in other words, exercises that ask the students to contemplate the reading provided from their own perspectives. The presence of reflective exercises outside the discipline (of Literature) and the value of students' experiences in this process is another common thread that connects the multi-media textbooks. *Montage* additionally incorporates more collaborative exercises than any of the other multi-media textbooks generally.

In the "Teacher's Manual," Sparke and McKowen included a variety of disciplines, fields, perspectives, and opinions through the kinds of authors they included in *Montage.* They did this by including over "ninety essays, paragraphs, and novel excerpts, sixty poems, ten short stories, Zen stories, and innumerable short passages and fragments" ("Teacher's Manual" 1). Sparke and McKowen implemented their intention, including their promise to focus some of this content on traditional topics taught by instructors. These knowledge of convention topics do not naturally align naturally with *Montage*'s function and form. Yet, the

authors fulfill this criterion by including a few assignments that focus on word study and vocabulary, like the exercises on pages 25, 29, and 241-243; sentences on page 3; and some basic disciplinary knowledge on Literature-centered topics on pages 226 to 228. Even here, Sparke and McKowen re-presented the form of such reading-based assignments to include reflection through unusual methods like games, quizzes, and anecdotes. Sparke and McKowen's innovative interpretation of familiar pedagogical apparatus makes *Montage* not just a textbook that asked students to be critical, but a situation that would require a critical engagement. For example, on page 100 in *Montage,* Sparke and McKowen played with the familiar convention of the multiple-choice test. Note the example that follows:

> MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST
>
> The correct tool for examining the world is:
>
> A.
>
> B.
>
> C.
>
> D.
>
> None of the above
>
> All of the above

Here the idea of a multiple-choice test, which to me is the oversimplification of mass-produced knowledge in quick doses, is challenged. The question has no simple answer and the absurdity of it all is that the options of "A," "B," "C," and "D" have no previous reference. It is a complex question with impossible answers, and Sparke and McKowen illustrated the absurdity of such a convention in this deceptively simple assignment.

Montage is structurally hard to define because it follows none of the conventions like including a table of contents or even chapters. There seem to be nine sections, but the liberal use of typography makes it hard to decisively conclude where some sections end and others

begin. The only way to ascertain that these are indeed sections akin to chapters of the more traditional composition textbook format was to return to the "Teacher's Manual." Sparke and McKowen titled the sections in *Montage* differently from how they referred to them in manual. The only way I made some sense of *Montage*'s content organization was by matching Sparke and McKowen's stated intentions for each section in the manual with the instructional content in *Montage.* As I went back to compare the manual with textbook, I found *Montage* did not bear a one-to-one relationship with the topic list in the manual. I tracked and compared the sections and found that by deriving the functions of these sections, I could identify the forms of a few topics (table 2). The rest remained undecipherable. *Montage* displays an impressive variety of forms of instructional content as well as modes deployed. Sparke and McKowen included a variety of alphabetic and visual genres like short stories, poems, limericks, comics, advertisements, and posters, often on a single page (Appendix 6). They also included a myriad of visual stimuli including illustrations, photographs, art, diagrams, and movie stills. Sparke and McKowen even included other senses for example a section dedicated to the olfactory sense. Using the form and function of the human nose (*Montage* 241-3), Sparke and McKowen deployed the sensory aspects of human's understanding of their world to a degree that is truly innovative. An example of an aural prompt is an assignment that focuses on sound, but the absence of sound using silent movies (*Montage* 299). The students are given materials that would excite their senses and also lend to the creation of an original text. Additionally, this variety also suggested Sparke and McKowen's effort to ensure that a majority of students would find at least a few things in *Montage* that would excite and engage them.

Table 2: Sections Titles in *Montage* versus the List of Sections in the Teacher's Manual

Montage, Teacher's Manual	*Montage,* the Textbook
Aspects of Language	(Undecipherable)
Travel Bridge	Going Places Seeing Things
The Language of the Eye	Brought Close
Journalism	Investigations
Pictures that Move	(Undecipherable)
Sound Bridge	We Are Not Equipped With Earlids
Words on Paper	(Undecipherable)
Analysis: Observation and Evaluation; Prose	(Undecipherable)
Final Bridge	(Undecipherable)

Montage displays an impressive variety of forms of instructional content as well as modes deployed. Sparke and McKowen included a variety of alphabetic and visual genres like short stories, poems, limericks, comics, advertisements, and posters, often on a single page (Appendix 6). They also included a myriad of visual stimuli including illustrations, photographs, art, diagrams, and movie stills. Sparke and McKowen even included other senses for example a section dedicated to the olfactory sense. Using the form and function of the human nose (*Montage* 241-3), Sparke and McKowen deployed the sensory aspects of humans' understanding of their world to a degree that is truly innovative. An example of an aural prompt is an assignment that focuses on sound, but the absence of sound uses silent movies (*Montage* 299). The students are given materials that would excite their senses and also lend to the creation of an original text. Additionally, this variety also suggested Sparke and McKowen's effort to ensure that a majority of students would find at least a few things in *Montage* that would excite and engage them.

(External) Perception of *Montage*:

Montage was seen as a textbook that challenged the notion of what writing pedagogy could be, particularly in how it manifested as a writing textbook. In *CCC* 1971, Sego pointed out that *Montage* was a "surprising and shocking volume" that broke barriers and "struck out at the medium of print with such boldness that conventions of bookmaking have turned and fled" (55). Sego enumerated *Montage*'s moments of departure from convention that gave it its unorthodox flavor. Sego noted the electrifying green and pink lettering in different fonts contrasted by the hard, black cover and the mirror-image design of the cover's print as if the letters were not letters, but objects against a mirror or a glass door that show an unusual play

of visual perspective. Sego was struck by the use of typography so the "format is so compelling that it leaves the impression that the content itself is of relatively little importance" (*CCC* 55). Sego wondered about *Montage*'s departures, bordering on becoming legally problematic, like no introductions, table of contents, and preface. Sego also noted *Montage*'s pedagogical approach that used words like "seeming to study aloud with the student as he reads"; "random, non-linear organization [that] captures the Joycean stream-of-consciousness atmosphere"; and an "overriding and over-writing" that "provoke investigation in language and to awaken all the senses" (55). So, aside from documenting the shock value that *Montage* had on the discipline at the time, key words in Sego's review gave us a glimpse of how *Montage* came across in its own time.

Sego was quick to acknowledge how overwhelming *Montage* was for the "more traditionally oriented" users. This Sego foresaw as a problem that could possibly hinder *Montage*'s wider use and appeal. Yet, the review seems favorable because Sego argued that *Montage*'s wealth of innovations would satisfy all those teachers who long for something radical at the time. Sego's enthusiasm resonates even today. *Multimodality* came after *Montage*, yet *Montage* is recognized as *multimodal* by several modern-day scholars even today. Thirty-four years after Sego's first review of *Montage,* Jasken's 2004 dissertation identifies *Montage* as embodying the idea that "creativity is necessary for voice to emerge and that creativity stems, in part, from valuing the notions of hybridity and disruption" (Jasken 67). Jasken uses *Montage* as an example of a multi-media textbook that encouraged students to consider the various choices that are available to them in how they choose to communicate. Jasken also uses *Montage* to illustrate what is lost when students decide against one method of communication over another (Jasken 64). Using the exercises in

Montage, Jasken helps the students "consider how using different modes elicits shifts in meaning" (Jasken 64). Jasken refers to *Montage*'s use of the means and methods that were current then like television interviews for example, to illustrate description and narration among other things (Jasken 64). To her the exclusion of the textbook's table of contents and introductions are interesting, but what is really radical is that the assignments are designed "to privilege the students' many diverse voices over the textbook's singular authoritative voice" (Jasken 65) as a prerequisite to true creativity (Jasken 67). Palmeri also perceives *Montage* as a multi-media textbook that "greatly pushed the boundaries of textbook design, seeking to create an interactive, nonlinear experience that could enable students to invent ideas through creative juxtaposition" (*Remixing* 100). Palmeri focuses on *Montage*'s use of unrelated elements to create new ideas and true creativity. Using examples from the textbook, Palmeri illustrates how *Montage* deals with functions like rhetorical knowledge using typography and visuals in nonlinear, highly stimulating ways.

From 1971 to the present, *Montage* has been an enduring example of the multi-media textbook. Advertisements of *Montage* from its own time document its radical approach to writing instruction. In the 1970 issue *Montage* appeared four times and once again in the 1971 issue where this textbook was advertised. The script of the advertisements, as it appeared in 1970 and 1971, reads as follows:

> This revolutionary textbook plunges the freshman English student into the experience of thinking creatively-individually-imaginatively. As a montage of essays, poems, and stories, accompanied by paintings, sculpture, and other cultural phenomena, this book encourages the student to learn with all his senses. Each topic requires that the student participate through such devices as

games, puzzles, or experiments, and then explore the meaning of these activities. (*CCC* n.pag.)

Overall, *Montage* is a textbook that embodies what Sparke and McKowen had intended it to be, an overtly multi-media textbook that stimulates the senses. The perceptions of those around *Montage* at its time of emergence showed a belief in *Montage*'s approach, even if they did not rush in to use it.

Here and Now: An Approach to Writing Through Perception by Fred Morgan (1968)

(Author) Intention of *Here and Now*:

Like *Montage, Here and Now* is another example of a multi-media textbook that shows a high degree of modality, which means that it incorporates several modes into its pedagogical apparatus. Both *Montage* and *Here and Now* are multi-media writing textbooks that show the same underlying intentions and instructional apparatus that define multi-media textbooks in particular. Yet, despite *Here and Now*'s similarities to *Montage*, *Here and Now* is nothing like *Montage* either in Morgan's use of modes or in his approach to writing pedagogy. While *Montage*' demonstrates Sparke and McKowen's experimentation with textbook conventions, *Here and Now* shows Morgan's interpretation of *multi-media* in a way that is implemented differently from how Sparke and McKowen interpreted it.

Morgan's intentions were based in "the premise that good writing grows organically out of good thinking and that good thinking must begin with the materials of immediate experience" (ix). The front matter in *Here and Now* points to Morgan's trajectory further arguing that the absence of self-awareness is responsible for thought and expression being defined by a reliance upon stereotypes and clichés. This was the idea upon which Morgan

articulated his interpretation of the *multi-media* approach to the writing course. Morgan claimed that he selected the readings to tap into the uniqueness of the students' individual experiences. Morgan also discussed the student who would best benefit from *Here and Now*. Morgan stated that *Here and Now* was not a handbook of the fundamentals instead it was geared towards the more advanced writing course. Morgan's intentions are clear: he did not focus on knowledge of convention issues, choosing to focus on student experience.

(Instructional Content) Implementation of *Here and Now*:

The intention that Morgan expressed in the preface comes across in the 14 chapters of *Here and Now*. These chapters are titled using terms that indicate an intellectual trajectory that Morgan outlined in the Preface of *Here and Now*. Morgan laid emphasis on perceiving objects in the immediate environment, thoughts, and emotional attitudes; evaluating possessions and people; and looking at society through custom, goals and "extending awareness." All of these go back to Morgan's stated belief that good writing must come from good thinking and that good thinking comes from a reflective, critical awareness of one's experiences and identities.

Morgan gave each chapter the same format and provided individual chapter introductions that briefly outlined the goals of that chapter. These goals range from reflective to critical thinking, where the students must reflect on the issues and questions beyond their own personal spheres of experience to include the world at large. As stated in the preface, the goals of knowledge of convention were eliminated entirely. Each chapter has a chapter introduction followed by one class assignment and a writing assignment. These assignments are activity-based and do not ask for writing as an end. For example, in "Perceiving Objects"

the writing assignment asked the students to "Describe a lemon" or even "An orange, apple, or egg" (8). The students are asked to reflect on the object in ways that are left open to the student's interpretation, perhaps as guided by the instructor.

This reflection assignment is followed by a sketching assignment that relies on observation and the use of multiple senses as students must note the experience of taking in the stimuli. Sketching used in this way is akin to a visual articulation using form, like writing, but using forms that imitate the objects the writers see (copying form) rather than shapes of the alphabets that spell that sound. Morgan's use of this form of print-based articulation is also similar to Ann Berthoff's use of drawing and writing assignments. Ira Shor's assignments in *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life* published in 1980 struck me as similar to Morgan's reflection exercises here. The point that I am making here is that when boiled down to their essence, these assignments are all designed to awaken a critical consciousness, akin to Freire's idea of a critical consciousness in the student as the way to better writing. In *Here and Now* Morgan sought to awaken the students' reflection through a visual awareness of the non-alphabetic "text."

In terms of staying with the forms of (textbook) conventions, Morgan organized these various alphabetic and non-alphabetic modes in a recognizable format. *Here* is organized in identical units,14 chapters each comprising 14 cartoons, 14 short stories (the longest being 26 pages long) and 14 poems. It would seem that Morgan's organization of *Here and Now*'s instructional content was closer to the traditional textbook format particularly when compared to a radically different textbook like *Montage.* Morgan included alphabetic readings in the form of prose and poems from students and professional writers, though

poems are more frequent than the prose. There are a few visuals included in the instructional content and these are not anywhere close to the extent to which visuals are used in *Montage*.

Here included reflective questions that accompany the readings and the students are expected to work on these assignments. As familiar as this instructional content form is, the function is akin to *Montage* in that Morgan encouraged reflective action from the students and the use of critical thinking that connected the student to the world and the world to the student (31). Further, Morgan intended that the exercises forced the students "to think of things around you that are far away" (55). This pattern in *Here* is again similar to *Montage*'s use of recognizable genres of alphabetic readings alongside the use of visuals. There are instances when Morgan coaxed his students to free-write, mistakes and all, once again pointing to Morgan's focus on personal experience, critical reflection and identity development and not on the technicalities of writing conventions.

In terms of the types of visuals included, Morgan included cartoons that seemed to have a specific function. While some cartoons parody the process of learning and teaching writing, others are *texts* that came with a set of discussion topics accompanying them. It is important to state here that *Here*'s use of visual modes is not a measure of the textbook's departure from convention. By this time even traditional textbooks had beginning to use visuals in a way that resembled Morgan's use of visuals in *Here.* For example, *Writing with a Purpose* (1967) had more visuals than *Here and Now* had. However, *Writing*'s use of visuals was only beginning to integrate visuals in more meaningful ways to the instructional matter. In *Here* this connection between the modes within the textbook was clear and deep.

Here and Now included multiple sensory perceptions as a means to gathering experiences, but unlike in *Montage, Here and Now* is more discrete about it. For example,

the textbook asks the students to "let [their] ears and nose do their work and allow sensations within [their] body make themselves felt" (15-16) following which the student had to "[j]ot down on a piece of paper the things [they] observe." It continued, "Let all your nerves work and take in as much as they can" (16). This sensory focus of *Here and Now* continues through the chapters, as seen on pages 25-26 and 32. There is a connectivity between the images and these multi-sensory prompts, for example, on pages 27 to 29 and this mirrored Morgan's intention to harness the students' individual, meaningful, and definitive experiences, collected through perception, to create thought. *Here and Now* not only guided the student to harness these thoughts but followed through as it guided the students towards the intended notion of "good writing."

(External) Perception of *Here and Now*:

In the February 1970 issue of the *CCC,* Stephen Judy reviewed *Writing Step by Step: Exercises in Structured Creativity* by Audrey J. Roth and Thelma C Altschuler, as a textbook that deviated from the norm by emphasizing the personal rather than the academic. Judy compared *Writing Step by Step* to *Here and Now,* along with *Stop, Look and Write!* by Leavitt and Sohn as examples of textbooks that were, in his opinion, similar. By comparison to *Writing Step by Step* and *Stop, Look and Write!*, Judy argued that *Here and Now* was focused on the experience of the student, valuing it as a source of relevant and valuable information to the classwork. *Here and Now* was perceived as a textbook that included and acknowledged subjects of student interest that had the students look *within* for resources and information rather than outside. However, despite the student-centered focus Judy felt that *Here and Now* was a textbook that needed the presence of all the trappings of a formal

composition class, teachers, assignments, examinations to work. The text in Judy's opinion was *not* a "total" composition course. Instead *Here and Now* could be an "engaging and profitable experiences for the student writer" if the textbook was "used in conjunction with a variety of other materials and activities" (69). *Montage* and *Here and Now* were examples of multi-media textbooks from 1968-1973 that displayed the multimodal approach to writing in textbooks of that time. Even though differently, both *Here and Now* and *Montage* embodied *multi-media* in a way that articulated, or implemented, this modality in more obvious ways.

The second group of multi-media textbooks that mark the lower side of how the textbook's modality was expressed in textbooks that implemented a similar *multi-media* intention as *Montage* and *Here* differently. These textbooks do this by what I see as a selective approach to the use of *multi-media* when implementing the *multi-media* intention. There I do not intend any value-laden indictment of a textbook's quality or effectiveness in the analysis. Rather, this analysis illustrates how within the new genre of multi-media textbooks, a wide range of textbooks suited to different visions of a *multi-media* writing course also emerged. The aim here is to not just conceptually establish *multimodality*, or the 60s and 70s notion of *multi-media* as defined by function and form, but also to recognize the degrees and types of modalities that manifested in textbooks that were perceived and acknowledged as multi-media textbooks then and now. Examples of multi-media textbooks that had low levels of modalities are:

- *Students Voices/One: On Political Action, Culture, and the University*, ed. by Christopher Reaske and Robert F. Wilson, Jr.
- *Word, Self, Reality: Rhetoric of Imagination* by James Miller

Student Voices/One: On Political Action, Culture, and the University, ed. by Christopher Reaske and Robert F. Willson, Jr (1971)

(Author) Intention of *Student Voices/One*:

In the preface of *Student Voices,* Christopher R. Reaske and Robert F. Willson, Jr. articulated their underlying intention for *Student.* This impetus was student engagement through students' preferences, in students' voices. Reaske and Willson saw "one unmistakably important difference" between *Student* and all other textbooks of its time and that was the connection that *Student* tried to make with students. Reaske and Willson stated that "*every* selection included here has been written by a *student*" (vii) and that these texts mattered because they were relevant. Reaske and Willson suggested that the relevance of these selections made these texts commonly available and therefore easily accessible, which in turn engaged students. Reaske and Willson's intentions to engage students through relevant material is significant because it once again underscores the common intention of multi-media textbook writers like Sparke and McKowen, and Morgan. However, while Sparke and McKowen, and Morgan sought to stimulate students through their own experiences to facilitate good writing, Reaske and Willson directly incorporated these experiences into their textbook by using student writings, even though they were "corrected" by Reaske and Willson.

Reaske and Willson were quick to state their reasons for choosing student writers as their source because according to them all students irrespective of their demographic variations "have a great deal to say," and that they "have the ability to say it well" (vii). Also, as with Sparke and McKowen, and Morgan, Reaske and Willson wanted to appeal to a wide variety of students too. They pointed out that by including a variety of topics that scholars

like Murray in the late 60s, for example, saw as concerning most students, topics like political action, culture, and the university, they would engage the students' critically meaningful participation. Reaske and Wilson's intention to tone down their own voices while dialing up the voices of the students was stated in no uncertain terms, in the front matter, as Sparke and McKowen did in *Montage*. They wrote, "[w]e have kept our editorial voices to a minimum, so that what you read here is the true student voice. The only changes we have made are to correct obvious typographical errors" (vii). Once again, the implication is clear that Reaske and Willson wanted the teachers to stay in the background. And like the textbook, teachers must merely be facilitators to discussions and must therefore must not be(come) the textbook themselves.

(Instructional Content) Implementation of *Student Voices/One*:

Student is a collection of student essays that are primarily reflective in content. This singular function of critical awareness and rhetorical knowledge is conveyed through a variety of genres and topics. For example, the topics and lengths of the essays vary from over 10 pages to each essay, like "Sitting in and Getting Busted" (31-43) or "I am Furious" (61-76), to less than two full pages, like "Race and Class Bias in Draft" (44-46) and "Ecology Action" (84-85). Each of these readings is followed by discussion questions that have four to five questions in a set of discussion questions and in a few instances, Reaske and Willson included even up to 10 questions to a reading ("Peace" 97-98). This goes back to an important pattern emerging in these multi-media textbooks that addressed a diversity in the students who were using these textbooks. *Montage, Here and No*w, and even *Student* included not just a sense of diversity that was redefining the freshman English writing class,

but the range of experiences and backgrounds that these students were bringing in. Perhaps in some way Stewart's "mini-markets" were being addressed in these multi-media textbooks.

Student is a textbook in that it did include instructional apparatus like questions and discussion topics. In most instances the questions in *Student* require the students to reflect on the readings, rather than use the readings as a springboard to move beyond the textbook. There are a few such assignments, but they are not as many as in *Montage.* Reaske and Willson did not specify if the students were expected to include their experiences as a part of the responses, but they did ask for the students' opinions. Functionally, the questions cover knowledge of convention topics, including vocabulary and paragraph; rhetorical knowledge and writing processes; the choices that writers must make; and finally, a few questions that did encourage critical reading, thinking, and writing. A few examples of critically oriented questions from *Student* are "What is the force of the final quotation from Marx and Engels? Do you agree with it? How 'oppressed' do you think the American woman is?" (77); or "Can you think of other areas in our culture where there is evidence that government does indeed exist 'to protect the public from itself'?" (126). These questions sometimes encourage students to reflect and comment on the real world as it related to either the text or to their own life experiences.

Reaske and Willson end *Student* with a list of 10 writing prompts that require the students to exercise the skills they must, or are expected to develop over the duration of the course. In keeping with the pattern of textbooks that were striving to fit into the multi-media writing class of the 60s and 70s, *Student* includes a few images like cartoons, photographs, and art work, particularly logos. Yet, these visuals are few compared to *Montage* and more in

keeping with *Here and Now* as they are relevant and meaningful to the assignments they accompany.

(External) Perception of *Student Voices/One*:

The general perception of *Student* from the past is seen in the content and frequency of the advertisements of *Student* in 1970 and 1971. The 1970 advertisement for *Student* reads:

> An imaginative, stirring collection of student writing that encourages the novice writer to express himself. The selections include essays, editorials, protest flyers, political pamphlets, and diaries; they concern themselves with such topics as political action, women's liberation, ecology, drugs, civil rights, and war protest. Photographs and illustrations throughout the book are also the work of students. (*CCC* n.pag.)

Irrespective of its length, this is interesting because of the advertisement's choice and arrangements of words. The point is that this advertisement focused on students as the core around which the textbook was constructed. This inclusion of the student voice as the main and only content matter is followed through in Reaske and Willson's implementation of the instructional content in *Student.* The advertisement also highlights these aspects from the get-go. It begins with stating that *all* the contents, both alphabetic and visual, were entirely created by students. Further, the advertisement mentions that the topics are diverse, relevant, and engaging. A significant point, then, is that the advertisement seemed to hint that the students were composers already and composers across various modalities. The choice of words in this advertisement highlights the points that the authors and publishers would like to

make known about the textbook. This advertisement ran in *CCC* and this information was a reference to the changing representation of the freshman English writing student as more critically able and aware. It is possible that this advertisement was also a response to, or an acknowledgement of, the idea that students were at the time being seen as *already* and perhaps naturally multimodal.

The second time *Student* appeared in an advertisement was in *CCC,* 1971. This appearance is briefer, with just the title along with the basic information like the names of the editors, publishing house, year of publication, number of pages and price of the textbook. The advertisement does not elaborate on author intent or content and from then on *Student* silently and absolutely disappeared from *CCC.*

An even shorter advertisement of *Student* appeared in the 1970 October issue of *College English.* It is in a section of advertisements for textbooks that ask the reader to "Listen," and despite an introduction to the general section that promises to do justice to presenting what this textbook intended to do, this advertisement is no more than three lines of basic, factual information like the 1971 *CCC* advertisement. The reason this 1970 *College English* advertisement is significant here is because of the textbooks that are advertised alongside *Student.* These textbooks focus exclusively on knowledge of convention functions, like *Oral/Written Practice* by Helen E. Lefevre and Jack. H. Minnis; and *The Random House Dictionary of English Language*, which was "designed to strengthen the student's control of standard English forms, both written and spoken" (*College English* n.pag.). Was *Student* seen externally as a risky proposition as a textbook irrespective of Reaske's and Willson's intentions? Was this an implication that along with the student writing that *Student* promised, there came the need for textbooks on knowledge of convention to accompany *Student*? Reaske

and Willson assure their readers that they fixed "obvious typographical errors" (vii), yet was *Student* seen as a stretch in terms of being a textbook to instruct students on writing? These questions may be entirely circumstantial, but then the absence of proof is not the proof of absence. As a textbook, does *Student* perhaps stretch innovation too much and too far? It does not do this as visibly as *Montage* does or as assuredly as *Here and Now* does. However, to prove that *Student* does not visually assert itself is hard to do.

Word, Self, Reality: Rhetoric of Imagination, by James Miller (1972)

(Author) Intention of *Word*, *Self, Reality*:

In the preface of *Word,* James Miller explained his reasons for including a multitude of texts as wanting to "inform and inspire the beginning writer as well as challenge the more advanced" (vii). J. Miller wanted to highlight the relevance of writing across several fields of knowledge by exposing the student to "important discoveries of the spoken and written language by other disciplines" (viii). Dartmouth was "a key experience that affected [him] deeply" as it "brought new dimensions to [J. Miller's] thinking about the role of creativity in English teaching and learning" (ix). In the introduction of *Ways,* J. Miller clearly excluded all knowledge of convention concerns from the purview of *Words*. Knowledge of convention issues, like "sentences, paragraphs, essays; exposition, narration, description, argumentation; fiction, poetry, drama" or the "externals of form" (2), according to J. Miller, restricted human creativity and imagination. Another function that J. Miller pointedly ruled out for *Words* was instruction on how students need to structure their essays, specifically organizing paragraphs. J. Miller believed, as did other multi-media authors, that freshman English students were

already "programmed" to understand these fundamentals (*Words* 2-3) and that the freshman English course must focus on higher cognitive skills.

The main intention that J. Miller had for *Words* was "to restore awareness of the mystery of language and respect for its ways and possibilities" (3). The primary function of language was to, according to J. Miller, "serve the individual" in the understanding of the world and the individual. J. Miller believed this could only happen when the student was motivated and that motivation is the source of good writing. J. Miller argued that this motivation had to stem from emotions like "desire, pain, ambition, curiosity" (3) and that motivation would "tap language resources dammed up inside every human being," (3) so emotion would flow freely. J. Miller's stand against knowledge of convention concerns in writing pedagogy was among the most directly articulated. In *Words* Miller called for "a moratorium [to] be declared on propriety in language," and added that the desire for "good grammar" must come from within the student and not be imposed from external sources (3). J. Miller suggested that imagination and language are inseparable as "there is no use of language that does not involve some part of imagination. And, conversely, the imagination no doubt finds some of its finest manifestations in language" (3). J. Miller was clear that conventions, or the logic-center of language instruction will not enhance neither student creativity, nor will it ensure student motivation. To do this J. Miller believed that the student must look at the self and outside the confines of academia, the academic subject, and the classroom.

J. Miller saw "this bewildering technological, electronic culture, [where] reading and writing have become a matter of survival" (6) as one that redefined the function of writing itself. Miller asked a crucial question in *Words*, "*Why write?*" (6). This question also

captured the perspective that was redefining the process of writing pedagogy during the late 60s and early 70s. To J. Miller the late 60s and early 70s was a moment of "crisis (perhaps the personally agonizing) in *being human* for the individual *human being*" (7), where the only salvation was in reading and writing harnessed through language *and* imagination. This would enable humanity to "*seek out the truth and unravel the snarled web of our motivations"* (7; original emphasis). This was, in J. Miller's opinion, the way to "become," and the reason for writing. This was the intent that defined the textbook's form, and for the choices J. Miller made in writing *Words*.

As was the case with *Student*, *Words* was a multi-media textbook that implemented this approach more selectively than the other multi-media textbooks like *Montage*. Yet J.Miller's intentions were as wide in their scope as Sparke and McKowen, and Morgan's intentions. J. Miller specified that language was "too vital in our lives and too important in our fate to reduce … to a matter of 'good grammar' or refined propriety" (2).

(Instructional Content) Implementation of *Words, Self, Reality*:

J. Miller's focus was on creating connections between the individual, language and the world. This was evident in the topics of the main chapters of the textbook and J. Miller's adherence to a structure. Despite J. Miller's *multi-media* orientation, the organizational symmetry of *Words* is relatively precise, particularly when compared to other multi-media" textbooks like *Montage* and *Mixed Bag*. J. Miller divided *Words* into two parts with three chapters in each part and each part addressed the duality of the identity-language relationship from inter-changing vantage points. Part one, "Words in the World" (9 - 106), looks at language that constructs the world around the individual, and how language defines thought

and feeling that in turn gives meaning to language. Part two, "The World in Words" (107 - 216), reverses this perspective and examines language as a means of exploring the world. This section looks to understanding the self through the various domains of the public and private that make up an individual's world.

Both parts of *Words* are almost identical in their form with three chapters each and each of these chapters has four sub-topics. Furthermore, each sub-topic is approximately the same number of pages to a topic compared to the corresponding section in the other part (table 3). Each main part has a short introduction, that was a single paragraph long. In this introduction J. Miller outlined the primary functions for each of the parts, whether it was to "provoke [the student]into seeing, experiencing , and using what has probably become, through familiarity, unnoticed or invisible – *words in the world*" (9), or whether it was "to implant and nourish the power of the individual , to discover and to explore, to form and to shape, to create and to recreate – both in work and in play - *the world in words*" (107). Such a regimented organization that gives both sides of this pedagogical approach equal importance speaks back to J. Miller's intentions to address the questions of identity and critical consciousness. J. Miller dealt with topics that were consciousness awakening in function, but he was relatively less radical in the forms he chose to attain these pedagogical goals.

Table 3: Analysis of the Organizational Structure of *Words, Self, Reality*

PART 1: Words in the World			PART 2: The World in Words		
Language as Creation			Writing as Discovery: Inner Worlds		
Title	Page Range	Total No. of Pages	Title	Page Range	Total No. of Pages
The Linguistic Environment	11-16	5	Discovering the Self	109-117	8
Interior Language	17-24	7	Versions of the Self	118-125	7
Person, Place, and Thing	25-32	7	Dreams: Windows on a Surrealistic Self	126-137	11
Creating Order Out of Chaos	33-41	8	The Ultimate Self	138-146	8
Writing, Thinking, Feeling			Writing as Exploration: Outer Worlds		
Language and Thought	42-49	7	Encountering the World	147- 155	7
Thought and Feeling	50-55	5	Interweaving the World	156-163	7
Logic and Argument	56-62	6	The Language of Media	164-170	6
Beyond Logic	63-72	9	Causes and Commitments	171-182	11
Writing and Meaning			The Individual Voice: Styles Private and Public		
How Language Means	73-80	7	Personal Writing	183-190	7
Words as Psychic Events	81-88	7	Variations and Varieties of Voice	191-199	8
Language Games	89-96	7	Two Poles of Style	200-206	6
Making Language Mean	97-106	9	Preserving the Human	207-216	9
		84			95

Some multi-media textbooks worked towards their pedagogical goals from an all-around approach that meant the contents of these textbooks approached the issues from all sides, seemingly all at once like *Montage* did. In *Words* the chapters that make up the two main parts create an almost linear flow that lays bare the logic of progression as J. Miller saw it. The titles of these chapters, for instance, use words that build off words from the title of the chapter preceding it. For example, "Language and Thought" is followed by "*Thought* and Feeling" (added emphasis). J. Miller created some kind of flow, whether linear, circular, or contrary, that builds to achieving the main goals of both parts of *Words* overall. All the chapters begin with short readings by professional writers that are then analyzed, where one unit of instruction is a group of short readings along with an assignment section that follows. These units are repeated several times to form sub-sections and four subsections make one chapter. The assignment sections comprise two groups of prompts, "Ideas and Experiments" and "Further Points of Discussion." The "Ideas and Experiments" are prompts that ask the students to reflect on the instruction that preceded it, while the "Further Points of Discussion" are writing topics for students to complete. To illustrate the difference between the "Ideas and Experiments" and the "Further Points of Discussion" sections, consider the examples below:

Part 1: Words in the World

Chapter 1: Language as Creation

Sub-section 1: *The Linguistic Environment*

Ideas and Experiments:

2. Concentrate on a single episode during the day, a coffee break, a luncheon, a bull session: describe the variety of linguistic elements that entered into the

occasion, those that were intentional as well as those that that were accidental. Describe and attempt to account for the course of talk or conversation, how it moved from topic to topic and why. (15)

Further Points of Departure

1. Write a letter to yourself from your father (or mother) giving you advice on how to get along in an uncertain, dangerous, and cruel world, with particular emphasis on the various kinds of treacherous people you will meet (or are meeting). (16)

These prompts mark the end of one section and the new sub-section begins immediately. J.Miller's implementation comes across as less multi-media heavy because of his use of only the alphabetic mode to implement reflective assignments. Unlike Sparke and McKowen, and Morgan, J. Miller did not use any other mode in the instructional content implementation in *Words*. Yet, despite such a straightforward, almost prosaic presentation of the instructional materials, the assignments are clearly reflective and work towards exciting the imagination of the students. There was an effort on J. Miller's part to bring in external reflections from the students using the textbook, which was something that is largely missing in *Student.* For example, in *Words,* "Ideas and Experiment" prompt three asks the student to "[a]ssume the role of a novelist and dramatize the stream-of-consciousness of someone you know or imagine – even yourself if you can imagine yourself as an imaginary person" (23). Such a prompt used the word "imagination," or "imagine," three times in this one sentence alone, suggesting J. Miller's hoped to engage the students' imagination. However, for the most part J. Miller left the actual teaching to the instructor. For example, by giving an assignment without specifying the assignment's end product,

J.Miller may have been nudging the students to explore affordances of their modalities on their own. Such clarifications would dramatically define how *Words* uses modes in its instructional process and given that *Words* is intended to be a multi-media textbook, such freedoms can work in many unexpected and varied ways.

By restricting the forms of implementation vis-à-vis the modes used, *Words* did not come across as immersed in the use of multiple modes as textbooks like *Montage* or *Here and Now* did. Nonetheless, *Words* invokes the use of media as modes through its intention to create original, critically inspired texts from the students and J. Miller did this by following most of the conventions that defined a writing textbook. This made *Words* a multi-media textbook in spirit and form, even though it was one that did not overtly display its multimodality as some others did.

(External) Perception of *Words, Self, Reality*:

In an advertisement in the February 1972 issue of *CCC*, *Words* was presented as "a non-prescriptive" textbook that aimed to recover the excitement of language. *Words* appeared in *CCC* 1974 Richard C. Gebhardt's review of textbooks that proved the growing interest in "self-awareness-through-writing approach to the teaching of composition" (83). Gebhardt mentioned textbooks alongside *Words* like *A Search for Awareness,* by John Bens; *You,* by Joseph Frank; and *Identity through Prose*, by Richard Janaro. Gebhardt again used *Words* in *CCC* 1979 to review *Writing in Reality* by J. Miller and Stephen N. Judy, published in 1978. As Gebhardt drew the similarities between *Writing in Reality* and *Words,* he indicated that *Words* was generally seen as a "flip-flop of material" (66) and the opposite of, or at least

something other than a "straightforward and [un]useable text" (66) where the practical demands of writing in the world actually played out in instructional content.

Harrington et al., in a 1979 issue of *College English,* saw *Words* as an impressive collection of varied writings, but also as heavily dependent upon free association (646), which meant that instructionally, *Words* came across as a bit vague. William Woods in 1981, used *Words* as an example of a different type of textbook and the antithesis of *The Holt Guide*, which was according to Woods an attempt at being the all-inclusive, comprehensive one-stop-shop of everything that an English teacher might need as instruction. Woods believed that *Words* reflected J. Miller's "interest in depth psychology," and that *Words* focused on "stimulating one's mediations on self and world" (399).

All in all, while *Words* was intended to critically engage and motivate the student through a claim that challenged the conventions of traditional pedagogy, the implementation of the instructional content in *Words* stayed very much within the realm of conventional structure. This, to be clear, does not impact the *multi-media* intent of the textbook. It does, however, impact its overall multimodality because its implementation restricted the form of modes that can be used to achieve these ends.

Conclusion:

Holistically these patterns indicate that *multimodality* in the writing of the multi-media textbook mark not just a shift from product to process, but from the use of resources from within the textbook alone to resources from the world beyond the textbook and the classroom. These patterns also indicate that a similar authorial intention that defined the *multi-media* approach in textbooks was not uniformly implemented, particularly when

compared with the intention and implementation of writing textbooks outside this genre during the late 60s and early 70s. In some instances, like *Montage* and *Here and Now,* the authors made unapologetic and radically visible forays into the world of multimodal teaching instruction. On the other hand, there were those authors who marked their approach to multimodality in a somewhat more conservative way. These differences in modality among the multi-media textbooks impacted how noticeable these textbooks were to those around them, as well as how instructors would use them in their writing courses.

These larger patterns that emerged through examining these similarities and differences in these multi-media textbooks from 1968-1973 are summarized as follows:

- Multi-media composition textbooks showed common author intentions. These common intentions are:
    - A desire to engage or motivate the students by harnessing materials from their own experiences;
    - A belief that good writing was a result of reflecting on and awakening a critical consciousness that examines these experiences; and
    - An attempt at awakening this consciousness through the multi-sensory stimulation that the multi-media approach afforded.
- The differences in how the authors implemented the instructional content in these multi-media textbooks are what created a range of *multi-media* approaches in textbooks.
- Functionally these multi-media textbooks resemble each other, but the textbooks display a greater degree and level of modality and these seemed to attract more (positive) attention.

This final point is particularly significant because it suggests to teachers of writing that multimodality, particularly in textbooks, is noticeable and does not have a defined format. This means that once we begin to recognize *multimodality* in textbooks as a concept and not as a set of conventions, this understanding of *multimodality* will expand how we, as writing instructors, view the affordances of the resources around us. This is also important because it extends this conceptual understanding beyond textbooks to include all the various characteristics that define a composition course. From here, we begin to redefine not just the use of composition textbooks in multimodal composition courses, but also our approach to the concept of a textbook as a set of conventions.

Framework Analysis of "Multi- media" Textbooks.

In this concluding section of this chapter, each of these textbooks has been mapped on the Function & Form Framework based on their instructional content *alone.* Here neither intention nor perception is considered because the Framework maps the textbook from the perspective of an instructor, who in this case is me. My perspective is defined by the textbook implementation of instructional content from the vantage point of a multimodally inclined writing instructor, looking at options of teaching textbooks. Therefore, the mapping must *not* be seen as a final truth in any way. Rather it must be considered in two ways:

- First, as a visual representation of *multimodality* (use of media as *modes*) and *multimedia* (use of media as *media*) on a conceptual Framework; and
- Second, this mapping is a demonstration of how the Framework can be used as other instructors begin to experiment by placing their own variations of the dimensional elements, making the Framework their own.

This Framework is designed to be flexible and is in that respect like the textbooks it analyzes. This, I believe, makes the Framework's compatibility with the textbooks greater. This, I argue, gives a more realistic visual understanding of the textbook as a multimodal pedagogical tool. This Framework is adaptable and customizable, so that far from dictating how we must view *multimodality*, it opens up the possibilities in harnessing new modalities. This, I believe, will enable instructors to independently develop their own customized and *truly* multimodal, composition courses.

The Framework analysis visually demonstrates that despite a similar authorial intention, the implementation of these textbooks as manifested in various degrees and types of forms, makes these textbooks *feel* different despite their belonging to the same genre of multi-media textbooks from 1968-1973.

Framework Analysis for *Montage*:

Montage was intended to be a textbook that was a multi-sensory experience. The hope was to get the student to "feel," "hear," and "move" across time and space through the book. Looking at the instructional content of *Montage*, I would argue that *Montage* did do this in as much as a textbook can tap into our sensory experiences of the world while remaining a textbook as we understand the concept of one. *Montage* fulfills a range of functions from knowledge convention, to critical thinking, reading, and writing. It is important to note here that *Montage* is one of the very few textbooks from 1968-1973 that incorporates *all* of these functions in the forms of media and content.

Sparke and McKowen's intentions for *Montage* were realized when the instructional apparatus was implemented incorporating as many forms of media (alphabetic, visual, and

extra-sensory) as modes, as well as many forms of instruction (reading, reflection, research, and collaboration) as it could. The way in which *Montage* articulates the intention of multimodality, that is, its deliberate deployment of various forms of media as modes in a textbook, makes *Montage* not just a highly *multimodal* textbook but also as varied as a multi-media textbook could have been then and probably even today.

Table 4 : Framework Analysis of *Montage*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research			●	●
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
Visual	Feedback		●	●	●
	Research		○	○	●
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	○	●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback	●	●	●	●
	Research		○	○	●
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	○	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis for *Here and Now*:

Montage and *Here and Now* are similar in terms of their authors' intentions, even though their forms of content delivery (medium) were different. My analysis of the degree and nature of *Here and Now*'s modality using the Framework indicates that this textbook covered a large functional range, almost as extensive as *Montage*'s. The job of *Here and Now* was, according to Morgan, to garner reflection and the process of "good thinking" as a prerequisite to "good writing." Knowledge of convention, or issues of grammatical accuracy, were clearly outside the purview of this textbook. According to Morgan's promise, when implementing the instructional apparatus of *Here and Now*, he focused on all the functions other than knowledge of convention concerns. This is why in terms of purpose *Montage* addresses one more function as compared to *Here and Now*, only notionally.

Here and Now does a thorough job of covering all of the other functions, focusing mostly on critical thinking, reading, and writing. These functions are fulfilled across a range of forms of instructional content like reading, reflection, and research-based instructional content, which are communicated through the use of media as *modes* like the alphabetic, the visual, and even the aural, where assignments make students use sound, specifically the enactment of sound, as a step toward critical reflection and writing (*Here and Now* 26).

Table 5 : Framework Analysis of *Here and Now*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research		●		
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
Visual	Feedback				
	Research		●	●	●
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research		●	●	●
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis for *Student Voices/One*:

Student is an interesting textbook when it comes to the question of how intention, implementation, and perception come together. In terms of the intention, *Student* aligns with the patterns seen in other multi-media textbooks like *Montage* and *Here and Now.* As a textbook it focuses on critical thinking, reading, and writing. Reaske and Willson intended to achieve this through the inclusion of student writing reflecting on experiences critically and meaningfully. In terms of my mapping it on to the Framework, *Student* does cover several functional goals that multi-media writing textbooks aspire to. These functional goals are rhetorical knowledge across both alphabetic and visual media, as well as initiating critical thinking, reading, and writing. However, the implementation of this reflective process is almost entirely centered in the readings within the textbook, and don't seem to require the experiences of the student *using* the textbook. It is for this reason and based *solely* on the instructional apparatus of the textbook, namely the discussion questions that follow each reading that the implementation of this clear multimodal intention is not as rich as it might have to been.

Table 7 : Framework Analysis of *Student Voices/One*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●	○	●
	Reading Centered		●		●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	○	●	○	●
	Reading Centered	○	●	○	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis for *Words, Self, Reality*:

Mapping the implementation of the instructional apparatus of *Words* on the Framework shows that it did include interesting materials from William James, Susan Langer, Eliot, and others as promised by J. Miller. Functionally, *Words* focused on critical thinking, reading, and writing, particularly on the reflective and in part collaborative content. However, despite fulfilling these intended functions of inculcating critical awareness and sensitivity, *Words* is not as modally varied in its form as it is in content. *Multimodality* is the confluence of form and function, which means that despite having an instructional content that is reading based, reflective, research based, *and* collaborative (as seen in the examples of prompts that ask students to "dramatize"), the lack of a multiplicity of modes, particularly the visual, reduces the textbook's *spread* on the Framework.

This reduction in number of modes used might suit certain instructors better than *Montage*'s level of visual stimulation does. Different types of multi-media textbooks fulfill different course needs and this mapping draws a portrait of the textbooks' multimodality. It demonstrates most importantly that such interpretations of *multimodality* are *still* modalities with their own pedagogical value, provided we can see the affordances of each one therein.

Table 8 : Framework Analysis of *Word, Self, Reality*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○		○
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○		○
	Reading Centered				
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				○
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

CHAPTER FOUR: TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS STUDY II: *STRANGE* TEXTBOOKS CASES, 1968 TO 1973

Textbook Analysis I established that a similar intention defined the notion of the multi-media textbooks. In that first group of textbooks, namely *Montage; Here and Now; Student Voices/One;* and *Words, Self, Reality,* the degree and nature of a textbook's modality was defined by the author's intentions through the author's stated functions, as well as the forms in which a textbook manifested. However, the second group of multi-media textbooks I analyze here examined authorial interpretation as they experimented with forms of instructional content. Despite their challenging the forms that typically defined a textbook, these texts were perceived by the community of writing teachers as textbooks, their opinions notwithstanding. Here, I analyze this group of multi-media textbooks that are defined by a similar intention and implementation strategy, but textbooks that defy the conventions of what a textbook *should* be. Here, the term *strange* is not intended to mean *alien*, or *unsettling*. Rather, *strange* in this context is more akin to *unorthodox* or *anomaly,* but without the formality I see in these terms. These multi-media textbooks defied the familiar concept of a writing textbook and did this with generous portions of fun, humor, and *play* and that is why I chose the word *strange* to describe to them.

A writing textbook has been seen in many ways, for instance Gale and Gale saw it as, among other things, an artifact that records the prevalent knowledge in a discipline at the time, or as an object that embodies the idea of something that "takes place in the *discourse of direct instruction*" that tells the students what to do and how to do it (Gale and Gale 5). Joshua Miekley believes a textbook must be "a good fit for teachers, students, and the

curriculum" (2) and it must be "interactive and "task-based" (4). Nora Lawson identifies certain features that modulate the level and suitability of a textbook, features such as vocabulary, tone, and assignments. The multi-media textbooks did record a genre of knowledge during that time, and these textbooks are interactive. They are also in a sense, task-based; also, their vocabulary, tone, and overall communication were geared to the students. However, this group of textbooks *played* with instructional content in a way that challenges the familiarity that otherwise defines a textbook. The multi-media textbooks used for this textbook study are:

- *Mixed Bag: Artifacts from the Contemporary Culture* by Helen D. Hutchinson
- *Course X: A Left Field Guide to Freshman English* by Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl
- *Ways of Seeing* by John Berger
- *The Comp Box: A Writing Workshop Approach to Composition* by Ray Kytle

Each textbook, in its own way, redefines the idea of what a writing textbook could be. Intention, implementation, and perception highlight the uniqueness that makes these multi-media textbooks distinct, even though they were perceived as textbooks from the new genre of multi-media textbooks that had emerged in the late 60s and early 70s.

As resources for intellectually stimulating students, these textbooks seem functionally as effective as the previous group of multi-media texts that were recognizable as textbooks. However, the unorthodox implementation of these unusual multi-media textbooks marks them as departures from recognizable textbook conventions. These deviances might be inconsequential, stimulating even, for the more experienced writing instructor. But these anomalies of form can potentially derail an (multimodally) inexperienced writing instructor.

This textbook examination analyzes these examples, prompting us to rethink the very concept of the textbook itself in our own present moment.

Mixed Bag: Artifacts from the Contemporary Culture, by Helen Hutchinson (1970)

(Author) Intention in *Mixed Bag*:

Hutchinson believed that writing is the culmination of thought that leads to a sense of involvement. In her forward she outlined the purpose of the book, which was to "excite interest" and "elicit emotional response" through the "colors and forms from the world outside," which she saw as a medley of assorted, provocative materials. All of these provocative, real world materials, in Hutchinson's opinion, must create "an idea explosion in a mixed bag" that according to Hutchinson, was akin to being in a state of wakefulness that resulted in an improvement in all aspects of writing. Hutchinson believed that it was not enough to simply put together provocative materials. According to Hutchinson, student involvement could only come from their relating to the material that they saw and that this material must be artifacts from the students' own culture, like advertisements, cartoons, photographs, paintings, graffiti and song lyrics, even objects like buttons. Hutchinson explained that the readings in *Mixed Bag* were the reality in the world as she saw them and that facing them head-on was the only way to deal with them. This is why she chose readings that were strong statements and biased positions. This Hutchinson saw as the only way to engage the student in a meaningful and critically reflective way.

As with other multi-media authors, Hutchinson had a plan for the students who used *Mixed Bag.* The plan began with critical engagement through familiar yet provocative stimuli that culminate in emotionally charged thoughts finding expression in the writing classroom.

Hutchinson believed that it is when this happens and "if we are lucky, learning and writing and original thinking begin. In other words, [Hutchinson hoped] that both teachers and students consider this book as incomplete, as theirs to finish" (Forward n.pag.). Hutchinson's intentions are clear: the textbook must begin a conversation that the students must re-interpret through their own meaning and take forward.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Mixed Bag*:

In the forward of *Mixed Bag* Hutchison had promised readings that would be self-contained reflections of the real world. To this end, Hutchinson included a range of visuals, alphabetic genres like poems, short stories, and articles, all arranged according to issues that reflect the real world. *Mixed Bag* comprises six chapters titled "Family," "Violence," "Race," "Death," "Religion," and "Tigers." Initially the chapter titles and their arrangement seem arbitrary. However, upon closer examination, these chapters create some larger patterns that emerge against the textbook's larger scheme. Firstly, these chapters aim to provoke and then placate in a repetitive pattern. "Family," "Race," and "Religion" are loaded topics, but they are not as provocative as "Violence," "Death," and "Tigers" as topics. Hutchinson created a larger theme of life with upward and downward swings and she did this by organizing the chapters in this way.

Mixed Bag was nonetheless different because it includes no instructional apparatus like assignment prompts, theoretical instruction, summaries, or overviews. Without direct instructional content, *Mixed Bag* is more akin to a collection of resources than a textbook. *Mixed Bag* can be used as needed, without clear and frequent instructional apparatus to guide this textbook's unusual content, but using it as a primary textbook for a writing course could

be challenging for an inexperienced instructor. This makes *Mixed Bag* a text that is rich as a resource for thought, but possibly overwhelming as a primary textbook that is expected to support a writing course.

Mixed Bag does not, at first glance, come across as a textbook. The proof of *Mixed Bag*'s inclusion in the genre of (multi-media) textbooks is *Mixed Bag*'s inclusion in the 1971 *CCC* textbook reviews. In this analysis I use *Montage* to explain how *Mixed Bag's* implementation set it apart, as content implementation in *Montage* resembles *Mixed Bag.* Yet, *Montage* was a textbook that blends the *multi-media* moment and the notion of a textbook in way that displays both the textbook's *multi-media* orientation as well as its acknowledgement of textbook format conventions. Sparke and McKowen were careful to include instructional apparatus throughout *Montage,* even though it was in unusual ways. Sparke and McKowen's use of prompts to guide their students' extra-sensory experiences allowed the inclusion of modalities that extended beyond the alphabetic and the visual. As Sparke and McKowen could guide the instruction, instructors and students would have an inkling of what and how these modalities can be used.

Hutchinson did not use any direct assignment prompts, but she did experiment with the forms of assignments just like Sparke and McKowen did. Hutchinson included hybrid texts, texts that depend on each other to create context for the discussion to move forward, in *Mixed Bag*. An example of a *hybrid* text is the poem "The Last Echo" by Walter Lowenfels where a mirror-reflection of the poem creates an additional visual impact (*Mixed Bag* 35). Hutchinson also used *compound* texts, or smaller texts that though independent readings can be seen as a single, larger text. An example of a *compound* text is a series of comics under a section titled "The Crisis of American Masculinity" (*Mixed Bag* 61). Each of these strips is

an individual text that addresses an aspect of the identity development of the American male through his comic sense, his political sense, his aesthetic sense, and his moral sense (*Mixed Bag* 58). Yet, even though each of these comic strips does not depend on one another, each works as effectively when considered together.

(External) Perception of *Mixed Bag*:

In *CCC*'s 1971 textbook review issue, Sego included *Mixed Bag* as one example of the new genre of multi-media textbooks that was attracting widespread attention. Sego noted Hutchinson's motivations and saw her efforts as having "discarded the traditional 'one-thing-at-a-time-please' outline in favor of a potpourri organized loosely around six emotionally laden and not mutually exclusive, subjects" (55). Sego noted that the variety of topics and perspectives were all arranged in a way that were aimed at motivating the student and she also noted the visual appeal of the textbook as successfully becoming an experience, one that Sego believed would definitely generate communication.

Before Sego's review came out, Hutchinson's claims were stated in the textbook's advertisement that appeared in *CCC* 1970. This advertisement mentioned the absence of instructional apparatus, stating that the teacher would be left to "make their own connections between what they see and read and what they write" (n.pag.). Given that this was an advertisement, not a review, such an inclusion is interesting because of the questions it raises. Was this advertisement a forewarning to instructors who may not be able to handle *Mixed Bag?* Or was this a promise of a degree of instructional freedom that many instructors had probably not yet experienced?

This advertisement was also important because it provided additional, important information that the main text leaves out. *Mixed Bag*'s last chapter, "Tiger," is by its title an odd inclusion in the list of other chapters. It is the advertisement that tells us that the tiger was "the common symbol of most artistic and commercial uses" (*CCC* n.pag.). This information clarifies the significance of the chapter in *Mixed Bag*'s rhythm of chapters and the larger pattern of *Mixed Bag* is maintained. *Mixed Bag* was intended to be a collection of provocative reflections from everyday life interspersed with topics that mark the more mundane aspects of reality. The tiger, as an animal, is not unusual, but is considered dangerous. Life too, is not unusual, but it is marked with dangers. "Tigers" by its very title suggests the culmination of the dangerous with the regular that is a part of everyday existence. The rest, as in *Mixed Bag* in general, is left to the users' interpretation.

Jasken examined *Mixed Bag* as an example of a multi-media textbook that attempts to incorporate the visual medium to articulate voice. Jasken describes *Mixed Bag*'s function as "the belief that the concept of voice should move beyond the linguistic into the visual, aural, spatial and temporal" (Jasken 62). Jasken was highlighting the multiple modalities that *Mixed Bag* focuses on, that would give student voice. These multimodal delivery mechanisms are coincidently the same as the New London Group's notion of *multiliteracy*. Jasken also notes *Mixed Bag*'s lack of instructional and editorial apparatus. To Jasken this was Hutchinson's attempt to "relinquish control of the text by leaving its interpretations to the students" (Jasken 65). This intention to exclude the voice of instruction from the textbook was a common trait that *Mixed Bag* shares with other multi-media textbooks.

Montage and *Mixed Bag* are similar in the way they present their instructional materials. Some of their common traits are the glossy finish of the paper, an unrestrained use

of color and images and unusual placement of texts and readings. Yet, to imagine that these textbooks would have created similar pedagogical experiences means ignoring the central roles that instructional apparatus play in textbooks. The presence of some instruction, even suggestions, versus the absolute lack of instructional guides in *Mixed Bag* could be either liberating or intimidating, hence limiting. Jasken's analysis of how assignments can create an environment that encourages students' expression through visual presentation of information (67) underlines the central role of guiding prompts, particularly in these unusual textbooks. The example that Jasken uses is from *Montage* where students are prompted to use a blank page to create something that would "epitomize this book in some visual way" (*Montage* 129). In asking the students to synthesize their interpretations of the textbook's meaning into the textbook itself, Sparke and McKowen were creating an environment where students feel that they can express themselves through visual presentation of information (Jasken 67). I would add that Sparke and McKowen were also giving the students a taste of being active producers of knowledge by incorporating students' texts into the bound pages of an official textbook.

This assignment is important for two reasons, first as an example of a *free* assignment within the purview of instructional content and second as the authorial act of creating a free space that is conducive for expressing student voice and producing text. This assignment in *Montage* did not leave the teacher or students out of the intention that underlines this assignment. In *Mixed Bag* the lack of instructional apparatus does provide unlimited freedoms, but it also runs the risk of pedagogical opportunities getting lost in hints that might not be received by the textbook user. Jasken valued the inclusion of the variety of the texts in *Mixed Bag* and saw this approach as one that gives students' voices articulation through a

range of genres (71). Jasken perceived *Mixed Bag* as an experience in itself and as designed to excite, motivate, engage, provoke, and inspire.

Course X: A Left Field Guide to Freshman English, by Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl (1970)

(Author) Intention in *Course X*:

Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl's true intentions come across not so much in what they claimed, but in how their content was implemented. Greenbaum and Schmerl's intentions seem as anti-establishment, while their instructions guide the students through the inevitable reality of freshman English. This they claim is to help the student make it through freshman English with less stress, but though not directly unstated, Greenbaum and Schmerl also ended up helping the teacher by helping the students through the course. Greenbaum and Schmerl believed that freshman English must get the students to "develop the measurable ability to teach [them]selves" (xxii) and understanding freshman English was, according to Greenbaum and Schmerl, the only way to tame the beast that was freshman English.

In the introduction to *Course X*, Greenbaum and Schmerl outlined what they saw as the main problems of the freshman writing class, as they called it. These problems were:

- The teacher-student relationship that was defined in terms of a power imbalance in favor of the teacher;
- The impermanence of the knowledge disseminated in this directional transaction;
- The distorted conventions and symbols of traditional pedagogy like grading and testing, passing or failing; and

- An inability to differentiate between knowledge and skill.

As Greenbaum and Schmerl articulated the problems, they also outlined the ideal resolutions for each of these failings:

- Creating a "classroom converted to learning" that encouraged student experimentation and where "acquiring knowledge and strengthening [student] abilities" (xv) is the most important element;
- Realizing that learning is neither a finite thing, nor can it be "neatly structured" and organized and that student interaction must inform student text-production at all stages;
- Differentiating between acquiring knowledge and acquiring skill;
- Re-presenting writing is a subtle skill;
- Redefining the student-teacher relationship as one of an inquisitive mind (student) referring to a resource (teacher); and
- Specifying achievement so it can be recognized and documented along with clear completion criteria for all tasks accessible to the students at all times (xix).

Greenbaum and Schmerl's claims also defined the student for whom for *Course X* would work the best: the hapless, clueless freshman English student to whom freshman English was a problem to be solved. To Greenbaum and Schmerl, *Course X* was the first text that presented the problems of the course critically from the perspective of the students and as articulated by experienced and for concerned teachers (Introduction *Course* X). As Greenbaum and Schmerl saw it, *Course X* would help students understand the problem that is freshman English and then give the students specific and assured ways to fix this problem (xxi).

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Course X*:

Greenbaum and Schmerl divided *Course X* into two main parts, Part I "The Ecological Perspective," and Part II "Strategies for Survival." Parts I and II are punctuated with an "Interlude" that is a 27-page, short story that marks the textbook's halfway point of the textbook. Parts I and II are made up of five chapters and each chapter deals with one aspect of the larger issue. Greenbaum and Schmerl's intention, as mentioned in the introduction of *Course X,* were to address two problems: acquiring awareness of the reality that is the Freshman English course and guiding the student as they navigate this inescapable reality. Part I gives context about this world, and to the inhabitants of the world of freshman English; and Part 2 gives practical suggestions to the students on how to navigate the challenges that freshman English will throw their way.

In terms of organization, *Course X* was similar to *Words* by J. Miller. Greenbaum and Schmerl followed a repetitive structure for Parts I and II, as well as within the chapters, maintaining the conventions of an alphabetically articulated textbook just the way J. Miller did in *Words*. Greenbaum and Schmerl employed an informal, almost conversational tone that addressed the student directly, the only difference being that in parts Greenbaum and Schmerl talked only to the students, sometimes speaking over the head of the teacher. To that end, the language, tone, and style place the teacher clearly outside this peer-to-peer-like communication that Greenbaum and Schmerl established. Greenbaum and Schmerl are on the side of the students, while the teacher, the establishment, and the university are on the other side.

In terms of its content, Greenbaum and Schmerl explained the forces and factors that have resulted in the freshman English course they were experiencing. Part I explains what the

Freshman English course is all about and Part II focuses on giving the students strategies for completing the course in a way that teaches (how to learn) while getting the job done. There are no assignments, but Greenbaum and Schmerl's overall conversational tone seemed to invite the student into discussing, or at least contemplating, the various problems with Freshman English. *Course X* is entirely alphabetic, and, aside from the cover which plays on the semiotics of typography, it contains nothing but the visual mode to stimulate. There are no assignments or topics of discussion that guide the process of stimulating the senses as in the other multi-media textbooks. In fact, Greenbaum and Schmerl don't even try to engage the student through an experience that goes beyond the writing course. Greenbaum and Schmerl's intentions were, to be sure, similar to the intentions of other multi-media textbook authors as they wished to foster a critical reflection through personal experience, but from the outside.

(External) Perception of *Course X*:

As an instructor of composition, I align myself with Greenbaum and Schmerl's idea of the experienced and/or at the very least, the "concerned teacher." I believe there would be few instructors who would see themselves as not the "concerned teacher," and who would look to gain more experience if they feel they lack it. Through a promise and a condition, Greenbaum and Schmerl present *Course X* as a text for an instructor who wishes to acknowledge the stressed-out, struggling students. However, *Course X* as a writing textbook might prove challenging in ways that are similar to *Mixed Bag*.

As with *Mixed Bag,* I initially did not perceive *Course X* as a textbook. *Course X* began to challenge some of my previously held assumptions about what a writing textbook

could mean. I believe that *Course X*'s use and perception as a textbook is proved by in its inclusion in the 1971 *CCC* textbook review issue. If the *CCC* recognized and accepted of *Course X* as a textbook, or at least a text that could be counted among textbooks, *Course X* was strange enough as a textbook to be included in this analysis of unusual multi-media textbooks from 1968-1973.

Wilma R. Ebbitt reviewed *Course X* along with some well-known titles like *Uptaught* by Ken Macrorie and *On Writing* by Roger Sale. Ebbitt described *Course X* as a text that did the next best thing after Greenbaum and Schmerl's "crusade" to abolish freshman English, *Course X* focused on the short-term goals that would make Freshman English better for the students. Ebbitt saw *Course X* as "a manual in how to survive Course X – Reading and Writing, Grammar, Rhetoric, Sociology, Soul, or whatever else goes on in the name of Freshman English" (64). Ebbitt considered Greenbaum and Schmerl's approach "predictably brilliant and ruthless" (64) and saw the real value of *Course X* in the history of Freshman English that Greenbaum and Schmerl present. Ebbitt noted that amid all the ways that Greenbaum and Schmerl listed to abolish Freshman English they also gave "a good deal of solid instruction in how freshman should go about doing precisely what every teacher of Course X wants them to do" (65). Despite Ebbitt's overall approval of *Course X* as a text, she did not see *Course X* as a textbook that could guide a writing course. Ebbitt noted, "*Course X* can't conceivably be a required text in Freshman English" imagining that publishers could at best hope for an "underground circulation among students." Its real value, according to Ebbitt, lay in the mirror it holds up to the teachers and the course itself, so that the teachers may begin to reflect on their roles and identities (65).

Course X was advertised in the *CCC* 's February issues of 1970 and 1971 and here, too, the advertisements read more like a warning than an invitation. The advertisements warn the conservative instructors of writing being rattled with a candor that comes from instructors "seasoned by years of Sysiphan effort in the classroom" (*CCC* n.pag.). The advertisement warns that this text will "expose the minor indignities and major failures of Freshman English" along with "offering the student a strategy for survival and, perhaps, success" (*CCC* n.pag.). Here, too, both audience demographics are acknowledged so that the student will be delighted, particularly during "the dismal hours of his college career," and "the instructor will chuckle with recognition of the torments he endures as the auto-da-fe of his profession" (*CCC* n.pag.). Was this a "keep-away-unless-incredibly-brave" warning, or was this more of an invitation that invites by forbidding, or forewarning at the very least?

Ways of Seeing, by John Berger (1972)

Ways of Seeing is the only textbook in this study that is not strictly a writing textbook, but is an Art textbook. There are two compelling reasons for my including *Ways of Seeing* in this textbook analysis:

- *Ways* is interdisciplinary: Based on Palmeri's claim that an interdisciplinary approach is not only within the purview of composition studies, but is a desirable approach to multimodality in composition studies, *Ways* lends itself appropriately to writing pedagogy. *Ways* uses art to engage, inculcate and motivate students to articulate their critical reflections through feeling and understanding the visual and alphabetic modes.

- *Ways* implements its form of instructional content in ways very similar to a writing textbook: *Ways* uses alphabetic and visual essays to explain composition, visual as well as alphabetic. The act of engaging, reflecting, and critically examining is what is primary, much like the other multi-media writing textbooks.

(Author Intention) in *Ways of Seeing*:

Ways, like other multi-media textbooks, challenges convention even before the text begins. There is no preface or an introduction other than a brief "Note to the Reader." Author intent is unusual, because while Berger is the sole author, he wrote "[t]his book has been made by five of us" giving equal footing to another four invisible authors: Sven Blomberg, Chris Fox, Michael Dibb, and Richard Hollis. Berger did not explain the role of these co-authors much as he did not have to explain his own role in the composing of the textbook. But Berger's use of the word "made" instead of "written" to describe the process of composing this textbook stood out to me. Dibb played some part in the television series on which the book was based, yet Berger included a collective in the authorial voice that was always in the plural, using "ours" and "we." Berger's name alone appears on the bibliographies of this textbook, yet Berger's wished that *Ways* be seen as a team effort and that authorial intention be plural.

Ways, the textbook, was conceived from ideas in a BBC television series of the same name, *Ways of Seeing.* The intention and influence of the incorporation of multiple modes in *Ways* is evident in the opening lines when the author(s) stated that the ideas in the television series "have influenced not only what we say but also how we have set about trying to say it. The form of the book is as much to do with our purpose as the arguments contained within it"

("Note to Reader" *Ways* n.pag.). Berger intended *Ways* to raise as many questions as any other textbook would, makings its function as well as authorial intention similar to other multi-media textbooks. Yet, *Ways* is unusual because of its interdisciplinary origin and form making it unique and a unique example of an Art-freshman English hybrid textbook.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Ways of Seeing*:

Despite an intention that aligns with those of the other multi-media textbooks, *Ways* does not have the standard instructional apparatus of a multi-media textbook. Like others, *Ways* does not have a preface, an introduction, or a table of contents. The only thing that stands in for all these supporting structures is Berger's brief "Note to the Readers" that is half a page long, in a small-sized textbook. In this note, Berger articulates the collective authorial intention, briefly explaining the textbook's form of instructional content and modes deployed. The instructional content of the textbook is divided into seven "essays," but these essays are not as writing teachers would understand them. They have no titles, only numbers one through seven, of which four are hybrid essays of the alphabetic and visual modes, while the other three are only visual "essays." Berger has in the process presented a textbook that inverts the conventions of the textbook by presenting the instructional content through *only* the visual, whereas textbooks would either be only alphabetic or alphabetic and visual. However, the function remains *multi-media* where dual modes of the visual and alphabetic analyze the explicit and implicit messages through critical, reflective examinations.

Berger arranged these *essays* in a rhythmic pattern where essays one, three, five, and seven are hybrid, while essays two, four, and six are visual. The "Note to the Reader" states that these seven essays focus on "particularly those aspects thrown into relief by a modern

historical consciousness," and can be read in any order. However, close examination shows a pattern that defines the sequence of these essays in an underlying theme. This relationship becomes more evident between certain sets of essays within the seven essays themselves. The first essay, "1," is akin to an introduction to the whole idea of how perception works in the world. Essay one begins with "Seeing comes before words. The child looks and recognizes before it can speak" (*Ways* 7). After a sizable gap, the essay continues, "[b]ut there is also another sense in which seeing comes before words. It is seeing which establishes our place in the surrounding world; we explain that world with words, but words can never undo the fact that we are surrounded by it" (*Ways* 7). The larger theme of *Ways* is similar to other multi-media textbooks, connecting the individual with the world. *And* like these other multi-media writing textbooks, *Ways* does this through the visual arts of painting, photography, and alphabetically conveyed theory. Within this larger theme, each essay has a function that determines the essay's sequence, but a function that does get enforced through author instruction.

All of the alphabetic essays have a theme that, as Berger pointed out, draws inspiration from previous writings by the German critic Walter Benjamin. These focus on art as a means of recoding perceptions and the dynamics therein. Essay two, a completely visual essay, and essay three, a hybrid essay, examine social and cultural gazes on women; essays four (visual essay) and five (hybrid essay) are about oil paintings in particular; and essays six (visual) and seven (hybrid) examine the mundaneness of the human existence, globally and locally. A pattern emerges in how these essays are arranged: essay one introduces the main idea of the textbook, and from then on, pairs of essays are tied to a common idea that, as in

Mixed Bag, moves from issues of human existence to subjects that pertain to the mechanical nuances of a discipline, in this case Art and the nuances of visual composition.

(External) Perception of *Ways of Seeing*:

Robert Farris Thompson's 1975 review of *Ways* presented *Ways* as a discussion of the psychological and sociological implications of multiple productions and its logic of the textbook's organization. Here "[f]amous works of art are frequently juxtaposed with advertisements and the final essay is on modern publicity images" (439). John Adkins Richardson described *Ways* as "a small unpretentious book" with its "anemic grey reproductions [that] are not even poor memories of the works they illustrate and are, in any case, overwhelmed by their context" (111). Richardson saw a pattern where the three visual essays were on "views of womankind" and on "contradictory aspects of the tradition of oil painting" (111) that were effectively juxtaposed with Berger's main point. Berger, Richardson pointed out, was attempting to illustrate to the "unsophisticated students" the 'social issues that "respectable" art histories gloss over and ignore (112). *Ways* focus on critical reflection through works of art is from outside the disciplinary discussions of the mechanics of art, which is why *Ways* works as a writing textbook as much as it does an Art textbook.

Ways is not just received as a textbook, but as a commentary that aligned with multiple perspectives. Yasmin Gunaratnam and Vikki Bell look at *Ways* as an "invitation to see the world differently" (1). Gunaratnam see Berber's contributions to situate the gaze upon women in the context of "political otherness" (2). Josephine Livingstone sees the strength and the weakness of *Ways* through the same focal point of synopsis. Livingston says

that the while Berger's ability to simplify vast tracts of an intellectual area into simple concepts makes *Ways* easy for the college freshman to understand while covering sizable subject ground. On the other hand, this simplification is also seen as an oversimplification and this meant that to some, Berger's generalizations are often misleading.

In as recently as 2017, Pratibha Rai reviewed *Ways* in *The Oxford Cultural Review* as a book that displays a balance of "refreshing moral grit" and a "sagacious study of our psyche through visual culture." Rai considers Berger's approach as a blend of "kindness" that also challenges his subjects. Berger, Rai argues, forces us into "stretching our minds to think outside out personal periphery and into the imperative of universal justice." The series *Ways of Seeing* is described by Sukhdev Sandhu of the *Guardian* as "a landmark work of British arts broadcasting, but as a key moment in the *democratizing of art education*" (1; added emphasis). What Sandhu pointed out here is the key reason for *Ways* to be counted among writing textbooks: it makes art a means to accessing one's consciousness and it makes this route to critical awakening more commonly accessible. This "anemic" and unassuming little textbook, as Richardson describes it, has the potential to engage and stimulate the senses in a way that few textbooks could aspire to, particularly when it is accompanied by a television series of its very own.

The Comp Box: Composition as Assemblage, by Ray Kytle (1972)

(Author) Intention in *The Comp Box*:

The Comp Box, like *Montage,* came with an "Author's Guide" that looked like nothing much more than an inconspicuous booklet. Yet, this booklet was Ray Kytle's *voice* as he addressed all the authors in the room: the instructors *and* the students. The first point

that Kytle addressed was the unusual form and nature of *The Comp Box* and the need for an introduction that must therefore be equally unorthodox. Outside of the author's guide, Kytle removed himself from the main text, like Sparke, McKowen, and Hutchinson did. From the "Author's Guide" Kytle shared all he believed he must, from sharing the fortuitous circumstances that led to the conception of *The Comp Box,* to why he constructed *The Comp Box* as he did, and to what *The Comp Box* was and was not. Above all else, Kytle established that *The Comp Box* acknowledged the complexity in the process of composing texts. He wrote that neither was he in "the ranks of the grand simplifiers," nor was *The Comp Box* "The Truth" when in the process of composing (Author's Guide 3).

According to Kytle's narrative *The Comp Box* happened by chance, from the use of loose sheets from a forthcoming full-scale rhetoric that was still in production. Kytle's intentions to create *The Comp Box* were fueled by the similar impulses that drove all the other multi-media textbook authors. Kytle also noted this common intention and he articulated this in his initiation to other instructors "[i]f it turns out that our experiences have been alike, our reflections similar and our frustrations equally acute" ("Author's Guide" 1). Kytle outlined the assumptions upon which *The Comp Box* was based:

- First, the textbooks were "the very epitome of a pedagogy that outlived its limited usefulness," and even "the most sophisticated and up-to-date text makes educational assumptions which are indefensible in an age dominated by technology, mobility, and media" (Allen qtd. in "Author's Guide" 2).
- Second, teaching is the most effective learning ("Author's Guide" 3).
- Third, the student "can effectively teach himself composing a work capable of instructing others" ("Author's Guide" 3).

This was a new approach to writing and Kytle mentioned that "The New English" respected the student by encouraging the student to think, act, and feel like a professional writer complete with "trials and pleasures for actual publication" ("Author's Guide" 4). So complete was Kytle's inclusion of this experience that as he asked the students to send in their texts for publication, he also asked them to enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope "in case we have to return it with a rejection slip. That's part of an author's life, too" ("Author's Guide" 17).

The Comp Box's greatest strength, in Kytle's opinion, was giving the students the freedom to create texts that acknowledged their individuality. He argued that in this approach "free writing" was as valuable as the essay, and also that all writing is defined by the confines of "particular assignments, particular projects, particular purposes, and particular limitations" ("Author's Guide" 4). The point he was making was that *The Comp Box* encouraged individual creativity and expression, but within the boundaries of purpose. This goes back to the value of instructional apparatus, particularly when the textbook is not of the regular format in other important ways. Along with purpose, Kytle specified that creativity must be defined by the realities of a deadline and while the instructor could manage the overall movement of the class's schedule the student with the teacher's approval must outline individual work timelines.

Kytle imagined that *The Comp Box* would empower the students by making them producers of text rather than submissive consumers of text alone. Kytle wanted students to develop a critical understanding of how media impacted reality and how they created each other. Kytle likened *The Comp Box* to a "second generation computer" of textbooks as it could "do everything that a bound book of its genre [could] do; but it also [had] many other

capabilities that its first-generation counterparts lack[ed]" ("Author's Guide" 5). Kytle argued that while other texts, even those that advocated an interdisciplinary approach, tended to overlook the counterforces that compartmentalized and specialized subject matter, *The Comp Box*, being a collection of loose sheets separated only by subject folders, presented not just a new pedagogy and methodology, but a new philosophy. Kytle argued that this philosophy did not make place for grading that "judged," but for a course that sought its prize in the promise of publishing the texts that the students produced at the end of the course. As Palmeri notes, Kytle's intention for *The Comp Box* was to expose the students to the various means by which they could compose and articulate their thoughts. Palmeri records Kytle's intentions to encourage the students to discover the modalities they could access and the potential of each of these in composing an original text (*Remixing Composition* 104).

Kytle briefly narrated *The Comp Box*'s origin story to demonstrate how medium is the message. The simple act of physically binding pages together transformed what was previously seen as effective material into "less successful [material] than when they had used the same material in unbound and nonprinted form" ("Author's Guide" 2). Palmeri also noted Kytle's observation that if the medium was the message, then the bound textbook symbolizes the intellectually bound student who must silently and passively receive the knowledge the teacher hands out. The students' role is restricted to reflecting on this given text. *The Comp Box* was a retaliation where the unbound, or "free" textbook symbolized the unbound, intellectually free, student. Here, Kytle asserted that the student was not a spectator, but a participant, an actor, in the production of new text. *The Comp Box* was intended to be used in the manner the student wished, however blasphemous it may seem. As Kytle urged the students at the end of the "Author's Guide" to '"[c]ut it up, throw parts of it away, rearrange

the bits and pieces" (77), he was arguing that *The Comp Box* was not a textbook, but rather a resource that must belong to the students, much like the teacher was.

The "Author's Guide" and Kytle's voice within it presented not just the logic behind *The Comp Box,* but how Kytle wanted those who approached it to see and understand, it. Kytle argued that *The Comp Box* was a tool, one that did not dictate *the* way, but *a* way to achieve critical engagement from the students and *to* the world at large. Kytle's intentions stemmed from his assumptions that set aside the symbolic and outdated hegemony of the traditional textbook in favor of teaching the student to be the real "teacher," and encouraging students to learn *how* to learn.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *The Comp Box*:

Physically, *The Comp Box* is a cardboard box that comprises six folders. Each of these folders has covers made of paper that is harder than regular sheets of notebook/letter paper but more flexible than the cardboard from which the box itself is made. The colors are subdued shades of browns and maroon-reds. Each of these folders is the same size and fits snugly inside the box. The form indicates the function: the box is the *book* and each folder is a *chapter*. Each *chapter* comes with its own table of contents, a list of the readings included in each folder, printed on the folders' covers. These readings deploy the alphabetic and/or the visual modes in different proportions. Each of these folders is unique in terms of their focus and therefore, their content (table 9). In terms of their similarities they are all single-sided sheets that allows for the altering the form of the materials through cutting, pasting, and so on. Outside of the colored folder covers, the contents themselves are primarily in the alphabetic and visual modes and are entirely devoid of color. Despite their physical

similarities, each file is different. There is a wide range from items in each folder; for example, “Miscellany” has 140 items, while “Life Styles” has few as 22 items. The number of images included also varies, but the range is not as wide as the difference in the range of items. For example, “Miscellany” has 36 images, while “Liberation” has 10. Here it is important to note that “Man’s Inhumanity to Man: A Photo Essay” is similar to *Ways* in that it is, as its title suggests, only images that tell stories. However, in terms of proportion the alphabetic outnumbers the visual, but the value of the images to the instructional content is by far the most among the textbooks I analyzed.

For the most part the contents of each of these folders integrates images and texts that capture the essence of the unit’s topic. The materials are designed to guide the students forward as they would have aimed to collect their own materials to supplement what *The Comp Box* offered them. Each of these chapters has approaches that work best with that chapter.

Table 9: Comparative Details of the Six Folders in *The Comp Box*

Title of Unit	No. of Items/Unit	No. of Images/Unit	No. of Page/Unit	Color of Unit Folder
Miscellany	140	36	83	Rust Orange
Minorities in America	39	14	32	Pistachio Green
Man's Inhumanity to Man: A Photo Essay	25	25	13	Shell White
Mass Media	31	20	53	Deep Maroon
Liberation	36	10	36	Cream Yellow
Life Styles	22	14	29	Olive Green

These approaches were outlined in the "Author's Guide" as "Approach 1: An Edited Anthology," "Approach 2: A Magazine," "Approach 3: A Rhetoric Text," and "Approach 4: A Mixed Bag." Each of these approaches is explained in terms of the expectations of the convention, steps to completing the assignment successfully and the units/chapters/folders best suited to that approach. For example, Kytle suggests "Liberation," "Minorities in America," "Life Styles," and "Mass Media" as suitable sections for "Approach 2: A Magazine." Kytle cross-referenced the materials in these folders with popular examples of magazines that students could use as models as they begin their own compositions. Another example is "Approach 4: A Mixed Bag" where "one man's exciting book may be another's boring irrelevancy" ("Author's Guide" 63). Here Kytle used pages from "Liberation," "Minorities in America," and "Man's Inhumanity to Man" as units that could give students a place to start working from.

Of the units included here, "Man's Inhumanity to Man: A Photo Essay" and "Miscellany" need some elaboration because each is unique. While all the other units stay within the boundaries of a particular theme expressed alphabetically and visually, "Man's Inhumanity to Man: A Photo Essay" and "Miscellany" play with these rules, giving the student-writers authorial elbow-room as it were. As in *Ways of Seeing,* "Man's Inhumanity to Man: A Photo Essay" is a collection of images, black and white images for the most part, that each has a "story" of its own. Each photograph remains true to the theme of man's violence toward man and the theme is not left to speculation. It is one of the smaller units and the students are free to add visuals or alphabetic materials to augment this photo gallery as they see fit.

"Miscellany" is by far the bulkiest of the folders. It is an assortment of materials that are drawn from the world at large and is made up of 83 pages, 140 units, and multiple genres in both the alphabetic and visual modes. Kytle explained that this unit was as much of the world that could fit in a box and this is what this unit really is. It has poems, fairy-tale adaptations, plays, essays, songs; and it has numerous visual genres as well, like cartoons, posters, and photographs, as well as inherently hybrid texts like newspaper articles, comics strips, and advertisements. What is unique about this section is that it is everything and perhaps nothing. For example, it has a title "Miscellany," but the title is a negation of itself. The contents either speak back to either supporting materials from other units or could become the seed from which something outside of what is provided might emerge.

In all the units the central idea is to get the students to begin a conversation with each other and with the world, but most importantly, with themselves. *The Comp Box* engages the student in the conceptual realties of the world through the issues it tries to capture. It also attempts to get the student to experience real engagement with the world in a critically reflective manner. Whether or not the contents suffice to achieve the task is not important; rather what is important is that through *The Comp Box* Kytle gets the student to learn by immersion. By making them active producers of texts and by giving them a fair chance at succeeding, *The Comp Box* is to me a true example of a multi-media textbook of its time. *The Comp Box* is arguably the closest manifestation of the idea that a textbook need not be a physical reality as we know it and that it could be a customizable concept. This, I argue, could probably even inform our notions of what multimodality in a textbook today could be, rather than should be.

External Perception of *The Comp Box*:

Palmeri comes across as understandably intrigued by *The Comp Box* as his review of this text indicates. Palmeri's review moves from dutifully representing *The Comp Box* in the way Kytle intended it and Palmeri sees it, to underlining the challenges that *The Comp Box*'s departure from the norm might have presented. Palmeri's concerns about the legality of actually using the resources in *The Comp Box* to produce new texts in a writing course seem valid even though they are not related to the multimodal intention, but specifically focus on Kytle's silence on the matter of intellectual property rights as students uninhibitedly use non-original materials to construct their original texts. Palmeri sees *The Comp Box* as a chance to discuss the ethics of intellectual property in pedagogy (DeVoss and Webb; Johnson-Eilola and Selber) with students (*Remixing Composition* 107). Nonetheless, in Palmeri's overall estimation, *The Comp Box* is a strong example of how multi-media textbooks of the late 60s and early 70s were unconfined, literally and figuratively, pointing to the sheer possibilities texts like these opened up.

Palmeri also considers *The Comp Box* an example of how technology defined innovation and in (re)defined the textbook then. Kytle used the Xerox machine to push "compositionists to [reconceptualize] writing as visual and alphabetic assemblage" (*Remixing Composition* 107). I would argue that the use of the Xerox machine as a mode used towards pedagogical value addition like Kytle used it, sets an example for how almost all medium has potential to become a mode. Secondly, Kytle demonstrated that technology was in some measure always harnessed *by* the students, so they experienced text production rather than only consuming texts provided. This use of technology would in turn demonstrate to the students that there were various modes of communication that could enable them to not

only consume texts but also allow them to create text through the use of this technology (*Remixing Composition* 108).

Kytle's more traditional textbooks, *Prewriting: Strategies for Exploration and Discovery* and *The Complex Vision,* the latter a collection of short stories edited by him, were reviewed in *CCC* February 1972. However, *The Comp Box*, for all its innovation, was not reviewed in the February textbook issues of the *CCC* during 1968-1973. And aside from an advertisement in *CCC* February 1972, *The Comp Box* was not discussed in the review sections before or after this one appearance in *CCC*. Once again, the advertisement for *The Comp Box* was different from other textbook advertisements. The norm for a textbook advertisement was for its length to range from a small section of a few lines to one full page at the most. *The Comp Box* got two full-length, adjoining pages and was designed more like a review than an advertisement.

The advertisement opens with the title in a large, all upper-case, sans-serif font, that reads: "What Students Say About the Do-It-Themselves English Textbook." Below this is a large, half-page picture of *The Comp Box*, and between this title and the picture are Kytle's intentions, particularly his focus on the student as seen as an author. The advertisement presents *The Comp Box* as Kytle's response to "the Do's and Don'ts of English composition textbooks [that] put students in a bind" (*CCC* n.pag.). The advertisement then goes on to do three things:

- It outlines how the student can use the textbook;
- It outlines the most important function of the textbook according to Kytle, which is making the student the author; and
- It presents student reviews of *The Comp Box*.

This is an advertisement so the testimonies here would understandably be glowing ones. For example, June Johnson said that *The Comp Box* '"makes a much more enjoyable and worthwhile class"; Brenda Kallmeyer wrote, "At least in *The Comp Box* class I'll have a finished product of a book *I* put together"; Liz Smith believed that *The Comp Box* "enables students to be creative in the field"; and Pat McPhillips felt that "*The Comp Box* permitted us to go through an experience which only existing authors are likely to go through." All of these facts lead to some important questions, like did Kytle choose to have students rather than teachers speak about *The Comp Box*? Was the advertisement space the only place available in *CCC* for *The Comp Box*? Or was this Kytle's way to get around the absence of a review in the *CCC* in the first place? Why was there no one to review *The Comp Box*? Or did *CCC* did not include a review? Would the inclusion of a review of *The Comp Box* have said something about *CCC*? If so, what? Investigating these questions would be interesting, but what is more significant for my purposes is that *The Comp Box* is an important piece of evidence that embodies much of what was happening around writing pedagogy at the time. It also illustrates to the degree of modality and innovation in writing textbooks. What *is* most important long term is thinking about how we, in our own present moment, effect such a paradigmatic shift.

Conclusion:

The underlying impetus that defined the multi-media inspired writing classes of 1968-1973 is succinctly summarized by Ebbitt in *CCC* 1971:

> What teachers should do is ask questions to which they do not know the answers, questions to which there are no good simple answers but many good

> complex ones. And the right question to ask a student about his paper is: "does this seem true to your experience?" The key moment in the career of any writer comes "when he no longer treats writing, even writing English papers, as a means of getting the world off his back, and when he sees that in his writing he might just be able to say, to himself and to the world, what he most wants to say." Then he is ready to learn to write. (63)

Paradoxical as it may sound, the genre of the multi-media writing textbook of the 60s and 70s was beginning to take on some recognizable features, as we see in the Textbook Analysis I. Some of these key features that define the convention of the multi-media textbook are: the abundant use of visuals, including typography where the alphabetic *is* art; the inclusion of multiple genres of the modes deployed; the experimentation with various sensory modes; and most importantly, a similar intention among the authors to critically engage the students are some of the key features that defined this new genre. The multi-media textbooks in this analysis like *Mixed Bag, Course X, Ways of Seeing* and *The Comp Box,* also show the same underlying intentions. Each of these textbooks, aimed to do everything that the more *regular* multi-media textbooks sought to do. However, these textbooks that I analyzed in this chapter implemented this common multi-media intention in ways that redefined the scope of the *multi-media* approach, as well as the notion of the *textbook* itself.

Mixed Bag looks and feels like a writing textbook because of its similarity to *Montage,* but without any instructional content, thereby challenging what *Mixed Bag* expected from its teachers. *Course X*'s anti-authority approach is a paradox because it guides the students to fulfill the requirements of the very writing course that it saw as problematic in

the first place. In its own way *Course X* focuses on the world beyond the discipline of Literature by focusing this real-life consciousness in the common experience of the American college student. *The Comp Box* and *Ways of Seeing* are, in their own ways, one-of-a-kind texts in that they are perhaps the first and the last to invoke modalities as they do. *Ways* came with its own TV show and *The Comp Box* literally set the student free, treating students as writers without being patronizing. Kytle's "New English" "respects the student, encourages the student to adopt the habits of the professional writer, emphasizes the public nature of writing, stresses the importance of writing for a real audience and proceeds inductively rather than deductively" ("Author's Guide" 4). Collectively, this second group of multi-media textbooks move the function, or goal, of writing pedagogy far away from knowledge of convention concerns to a degree even greater than the first group of multi-media textbooks do. In some instances, they pushed the boundaries to a degree that I argue no writing textbooks have, then or now.

These *strange* multi-media textbooks are not for the faint-hearted writing instructor. The instructor who would have chosen any of these textbooks would have to be confident, experienced, and knowledgeable of Freshman English in all its intricacies. Such an instructor would have to know the students as fellow authors, sharing a relationship that is more professional than pedagogical. As a consequence, these strange multi-media textbooks make a significant contribution to our understanding of the definition and relationship of *multimodal* with *multimedia* and also force us to review our own fixed notions of what a composition textbook *could* be. When we understand the degree of innovation in modes, *outside* of the issue of medium, the importance of these multi-media textbooks becomes

clear. They have, in the process of their innovative articulations of the *multi-media* moment, pushed the boundaries to an extent that few have since been creative or daring enough to try.

Framework Analysis of the *Strange* Multi-media Texts.

As in Textbook Analysis I, this chapter concludes with a Framework analysis of each of the *strange* multi-media textbooks. Once again, this mapping is based on the instructional content of these textbooks *alone.* The Framework analysis section here primarily aims to demonstrate:

- The similar authorial intention that has manifested in different forms of modes can manifest in different forms of instructional content;
- The different forms of instructional content still fulfill the functions achieved by the multi-media textbooks that follow the more traditional conventions; and
- The relationship between innovation as a concept and technology as the means to realizing the innovation as well as the ways in which writing pedagogy and its tools can be (re)interpreted.

Framework Analysis for *Mixed bag*:

Depicting the degree and nature of *Mixed* Bag's modality on the Function & Form Framework is unusual because the key functions that define the multi-media approach are only potentials in *Mixed Bag.* As there is no clear instructional apparatus, *Mixed Bag* as a textbook depends almost entirely on how the teacher uses the materials within it. The *Mixed Bag* can fulfill a range of materials from knowledge convention to critical thinking, reading, and writing, but unless indicated, the path forward can potentially thwart the endeavor. The

modes the textbook deploys can be anything the instructor recommends, and the forms of instructional content can range from reading to reflection, research, and feedback. *Mixed Bag* has the potential to do all of those things, but no instructional apparatus in the textbook itself forces the instructor to fill in these gaps that in practice determine the success (or failure) of a multi-media class. The questions that this raises and the gaps that the Framework captures concerns the role of the instructor who chooses to use *Mixed Bag*'s in the classroom. How has author intention expressed itself through content implementation? Does the idea of a multimodally inspired multi-media textbook *actually* amount to its *being* a multimodal writing text*book*?

It is for these reasons that I marked all the areas that I saw as clearly possible, but only as potential, with white circles. The Framework shows that while *Mixed Bag* is innovative, it leaves a lot to chance. This is what an instructor must be aware of *before* selecting a textbook like *Mixed Bag* for their course.

Table 10 : Framework Analysis of *Mixed Bag*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Visual	Feedback	○	○	○	○
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	○	○	○	○
	Reading Centered	○	○	○	○
Alphabetic	Feedback	○	○	○	○
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	○	○	○	○
	Reading Centered	○	○	○	○
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis for *Course X*:

Mapping *Course X* on the Framework is revealing because even though this is not a textbook as we would probably recognize or accept it (Ebbitt), the Framework confirms Ebbitt's opinion that *Course X* does fulfill a range of functions. Greenbaum and Schmerl guide the students into critically thinking about the reality of various academic careers. As claimed in the Foreword, *Course X* is the first textbook of its time and perhaps even the first textbook *ever* to critically examine composition studies. Greenbaum and Schmerl claimed *Course X* directed this conversation by speaking at the student not as teacher. They did this to the extent that in parts it would seem like they were going over the heads of the instructor in the manner of former, somewhat bitter freshman English students helping successive generations of freshman English sufferers on how to make it through. Despite this radical approach, *Course X* fulfills the functional goals of a freshman English writing course. As the textbook wraps up, as does the course, the student *should have* completed the assignments. At best the students will one day change reality, or will learn (to learn) from it and move on. The hope is that at the end of it the student has completed the work, but more importantly has developed a critical perception on how to consider the reality within which all of this work is being done.

On the Framework, *Course X* shows a wide functional spread that is akin to the spread as seen in other multi-media textbooks. As multimodality is the result of function and form, *Course X* is multimodal functionally and instructionally, but not modally. As *Course X* only used alphabetic modes, it also has a low spread upwards that indicates a low degree of modes used. *Course X* is a radical multi-media textbook that does not conform to the multimodal form of the other multi-media textbooks.

Table 11: Framework Analysis of *Course X*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Alphabetic	Feedback		●	●	●
	Research		●	●	●
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis for *Ways of Seeing*:

Depicting the degree and nature of *Ways of Seeing*'s (the textbook) modality on the Framework is on the one hand straightforward because *Ways* is an alphabetic and visual text that functionally focuses on critical thinking. On the other hand, plotting the degree and nature of *Ways* on the Framework is complicated because, like *Course X* and *Mixed Bag, Ways* informs through the essays, but instructionally says nothing. This makes the intersections on the Framework more about the potential of *Ways*, not about the promises the textbook can make to the teachers and students.

To add to this complexity is an almost parental relationship between the television series and the textbook. Given the growing popularity of the television as technology that redefined the 60s and 70s, as well as the fame of the television series, the importance of this textbook as a multimodal teaching tool is exciting to imagine. On the one end it could have been extremely useful in a classroom because it did have a whole television series to work alongside it, while at the same time it could have been entirely overshadowed by the series making the textbook almost redundant. Either way, I believe *Ways* is a textbook, that for all the reasons stated above, is interesting as an inter-disciplinary, *multiliteracy*-oriented textbook, particularly in terms of the external relationships in-class teaching tools like textbooks can have with external resources like TV shows, radio programs, and even the movies.

Table 12 : Framework Analysis of *Ways of Seeing*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research		○		○
	Reflective		○		○
	Reading Centered		●		●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research		○		○
	Reflective		○		○
	Reading Centered		●		●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Framework Analysis of *The Comp Box*:

As I analyzed *The Comp Box,* I began to see an important parallel between the Framework as well as *The Comp Box* particularly in how they are intended. Both the Framework and *The Comp Box* are tools that encourage a reflective approach to the functions they aspire to fulfill. Kytle wished to empower the students by enabling them to be able to become the creators of original texts, using modes they felt worked the best. I too aim to empower instructors by enabling them to be able to create original multimodal courses based on their unique visions. In this sense I felt that the Framework shared a kinship with *The Comp Box* in how function and form converge towards similar ends. Functionally, *The Comp Box* addresses a range of functions, focusing on critical thinking, reading, and writing. Even what it does not overtly address, *The Comp Box* fulfills, for example, the knowledge of convention functions. By outlining the requirements, observing conventions and steps, and providing samples to specific approaches, Kytle provided instruction across all functions. In the case of *The Comp Box,* knowledge of convention needs to be slightly redefined. While in the traditional framework it is defined as "[v]ocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines," in the *Comp Box* knowledge of convention is the mechanical and technical considerations that define the formal expectations of a genre's conventions, and the textual genres here are the edited anthology, the magazine, the rhetorical text, and the assorted collection.

Like several other multi-media textbook authors, Kytle also alluded to the freshman English writing student as now more sophisticated than previously perceived. Each of these approaches seems to acknowledge this sophistication, and by presenting a path forward, Kytle demonstrated his belief in this idea.

Kytle deployed a variety of forms of content and modes without specific instructional content instruction aside from the four approaches in the author's guide. The most visible modes are the alphabetic and the visual modes, which includes the typographic where the alphabetic *is* the visual. However, color is not a visual element that *The Comp Box* provides. *The Comp Box* is a "Xerox" publication and given that colored Xerox machines were not yet commonly accessible technology, the fact that all the contents in *The Comp Box* are limited to nonchromatic shades of white, black, and gray, is logical. Yet, color is referenced in the folders of the units. Kytle did not discount the use of color in additional sources; however, given that his suggestions for the common use of resource materials must be contingent around photocopying materials only, the texts students produce would logically be sans color.

The form of contents is again left to the teacher and there is no instructional apparatus in the main textbook section of *The Comp Box.* Kytle's notes, strategies, suggestions and ideas in the "Author's Guide" are more like guidelines and point students to adhere to publishing conventions as would any professional writer. Aside from encouraging the teacher to balance freedom in the process of composing a text per se with regular, class-oriented assignments, Kytle left the assignment planning to the instructors. The function of *The Comp Box* is to give student freedom with the modalities and media that the students wish to use. Kytle stated that "it might be a collage, it might be a cartoon or comic strip, it might even be an original essay or narrative, it might be an edited tape of an interview with accompanying photographs – it might be anything" ("Author's Guide" 16-17). This reference to an edited tape of an interview, which points to the use of the aural mode, does not ensure the certainty

of using aural as a mode, and whether a student chose to deploy the aural mode would require a case-by-case analysis of students' use of *The Comp Box*.

It is tempting to imagine the possibilities of *The Comp Box* even beyond the Framework. For example, Kytle mentioned motion as a possible mode which is the "Gestural" and "Spatial" in NLG's list of modalities. *The Comp Box* has high reading-based and research-based instructional content along with Kytle's unmistakable emphasis on critical thought, reflection, and engagement. Kytle, it would seem, guided the assignments without really instructing the teachers or the students, in a way that falls between *Mixed Bag* and *Ways* on the one side, and *Course X* on the other. I would argue that few, if any, instructors would be bold enough to venture too far away from the guidelines Kytle equipped them, given how unorthodox *The Comp Box* was as a textbook. Kytle was redefining almost every convention there was, an example being grading of writing assignments as a pedagogical practice. Kytle was vocal about his aversion to grading, yet he did include the overarching idea of purpose as being what defined writing inside and outside the classroom. So, while Kytle did not specify an assignment, he was clear that the process of composing using *The Comp Box* must happen within the confines of an assignment, or purpose, and he articulated four approaches in great detail to that end. Finally, there must also be the incentive of publishing that underlies the main function of *The Comp Box*, to see the student not as a student, but as fellow writer who should face the joys and the trials that come with being one.

Table 13: Framework Analysis of *The Comp Box*

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback		○	○	○
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	○	○	○	○
	Reading Centered	○	○	○	○
Visual	Feedback		●	●	●
	Research		●	●	●
	Reflective	○	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	○	●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback	○	●	●	●
	Research	●	●	●	●
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

CHAPTER FIVE: TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS STUDY III: EFFECTS OF THE 60S AND 70S *MULTI-MEDIA* ON ESTABLISHED TEXTBOOKS

The previous textbook analyses demonstrated that multi-media textbooks were primarily defined by a similar authorial intention and that the different forms of multi-media textbooks were a result of ways in which these authorial intentions were implemented. Textbook Analysis III examines the effect the *multi-media* moment and multi-media textbooks had on established textbooks that belonged to the traditional genre of writing pedagogy. Using James M. McCrimmon's *Writing with a Purpose* from 1950 to 1980, I demonstrate that *multimodality* as seen in the *multi-media* approach of the late 60s and early 70s did influence the successful but conservative textbook series *Writing with a Purpose.* Kevin Miller asked "[h]ow has *Writing with a Purpose* been influenced by developments in composition theory and to what extent is [*Writing with a Purpose*] a barometer for those developments?" (13). I respond to K. Miller's question using the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973.

Why the Seven Editions of *Writing with a Purpose*?

Before moving into the analysis per se, it is important to explain my reasons for using these seven editions of *Writing with a Purpose* from 1950-1980. As a textbook, *Writing with a Purpose* is recognized as "an important historical artifact with much to tell us about how we came to be who we are as teachers" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 209). K. Miller considers *Writing with a Purpose* as "emblematic of current-traditional culture" (13). *Writing with a Purpose* was written in a world where, as McCrimmon noted with concern, the teacher

clung to the handbook as the sole means to keep the writing course afloat (Connors; K.Miller). According to scholars like K. Miller and Connors, *Writing with a Purpose*'s popularity was mostly due to *Writing with a Purpose*'s first edition's (1950) role in redefining, or at the very least becoming emblematic of the new paradigm during its own time. *Writing* (1950) presented writing instruction from the vantage point of process, as opposed to the then-dominant product-based approach to writing instruction.

I believe another reason for *Writing with a Purpose*'s prominence is its ability to survive through the decades. *Writing with a Purpose* could, as a series, absorb the shifts it experienced, molding itself to incorporate those influences while retaining its original flavor. Its adaptability is what ensured not just its longevity, but also its place as an artifact that recorded the evolution of writing pedagogy across the decades. This is why I chose these seven editions of *Writing* that were authored under McCrimmon. The editions of *Writing* from 1950-1980 passed through the multi-media moment of the late 60s and early 70s, and as it did it recorded this moment in terms of its own evolutionary trajectory. Authorial intention plays a big part in determining the genre of a textbook. This singularity of authorship is valuable when tracking how one genre of textbooks influences another. This allows us to fix the variable of authorial intent to one author, McCrimmon.

To understand *Writing* as "an important historical artifact" that will inform us about this disciplinary and pedagogical evolution, it is necessary to briefly present the context of the larger evolutionary trajectory of the Current-Traditional paradigm. Connors saw the concept of the current-traditional as a "dynamic entity, forever in flux" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 208), and reflected in this dynamism were the larger patterns of the evolution of writing pedagogy. In 1975, Harvey S. Wiener analyzed *Writing* at the cusp of when the

multi-media moment of the 60s and 70s had ended, or was, at the very least, fading fast. This did not mean a return to the Current-Traditional of the past, one that had emphasized product over process. But as Wiener's study shows, the paradigm that succeeded the multi-media approach brought back the knowledge of convention focus that the multi-media, expressivist paradigm had firmly and pointedly set aside. Yet, *Writing with a Purpose* retained some multi-media elements as well as seen in *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972. Wiener's analysis was based on the results of an American Department of Education (ADE) survey that found that of 436 institutions, 65 institutions still chose *Writing* (1972) as the textbook for their writing course (qtd. in K. Miller 82, 88). What is even more significant is that this use of *Writing* (1972) was widespread, across 49 states, according to the ADE survey. The fact that *Writing* (1972) still carried on into the next decade is important because *Writing* (1972) showed the highest degree of influence of *multi-media* in its instructional content implementation. *Writing* (1972) incorporates the best of both worlds and while subsequent editions of *Writing* (1976 and 1980) revert to a more conservative format, the mark of the *multi-media* on *Writing* and on writing textbooks in general, was made.

Writing with a Purpose, First Edition (1950)

(Author) Intention in *Writing* (1950):

In the preface to *Writing* (1950), McCrimmon stated that "the most useful approach to the problems of composition is through a serious concern with purpose" (vii). This, McCrimmon believed, would in turn, allow a judicious process of selection among the options in the various forms of organization, or patterns of development; formal and informal styles of writing; and the usage of diction, grammar, and mechanics (vii). The introduction

reiterates the preface, stating that "[t]hroughout this book you will find one dominant assertion recurring in various forms: *All effective writing is controlled by the writer's purpose*" (1). This purpose that McCrimmon emphasized was to either "inform or convince or delight them, to explain something to them, or to make them see or feel what he has experienced" (1). Using a golf metaphor and examples of student writing, McCrimmon pointed to the need for a "*predetermined* path" (2) as being of singular importance. McCrimmon stated that students thus far could only claim a rudimentary level of organizational knowledge and their focus in writing had been "mechanical" (vii). As a response to the problems that McCrimmon himself identified, McCrimmon claimed that *Writing* (1950) had three prime objectives:

- First, to "make writing a more deliberate act" that involves "free(ing) the student from the frustration of trying to get a result without first knowing clearly what result he wishes … give him a sense of control";
- Second, to "make [the student] linguistically more mature"; and
- Third, to focus on theme-based writing as "a convenient way of gaining experience, skill, and confidence in using the writing process" (vii-viii).

These stated goals aligned with McCrimmon's stated intentions and were in keeping with the product-to-process shift that *Writing* (1950) had introduced. In the preface to *Writing* (1950), McCrimmon explained that *Writing* (1950)'s five-part structure would take the student through the writing process to achieve the aforementioned functions. The five parts included topic selection and restriction, diction and semantics, grammar and mechanics of writing, some special assignments types, and "judgments on usage" that consider "latest linguistic research and the effect that formal or informal style has on deciding appropriate usage" (viii).

McCrimmon made sure to state that *Writing* (1950) departed from "the conventional fourfold classification of writing" (ix) and in that respect was intended to redefine writing in its own time and in its own way.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Writing* (1950)

The instructional content of *Writing* (1950) implements all of these promises in that it focuses on the process of writing and includes selected readings along with an analysis of those readings. Using examples, analogy, and even a compare-contrast method, McCrimmon analyzed these readings. Each chapter ends with a summary that lists, numerically, the main focal points of the chapter. This section is followed by "Exercises" that range from testing the students' knowledge of grammar and basic writing mechanics, to reflective, reading-based assignments. For example, this exercise in chapter 18 tests the students' knowledge of (grammar) conventions:

> The best way to develop a confident knowledge of conventions of punctuation is to observe how punctuation marks are actually used in modern writing. In the following selection, which is fairly formal, particular punctuation marks have been numbered. Write down each number and describe the purpose for which punctuation is being used. (Exercise B 369)

Or, a second example that does the same, this time asking the student to use the traditional symbol of the teacher's authority-the red pen:

> Rewrite and hand in to your instructor the following sentences, inserting as you write any punctuation clearly required by the conventions. If no punctuation is necessary, do not copy the sentence. To make your insertions

> obvious, use red ink or red pencil for punctuations which you add. (Exercise C 370)

On the other hand, there are examples of assignments that are reading-based, yet somewhat reflective. For example, exercises A and B in chapter 3: "Write a one-paragraph definition of a word" (Exercise A 63), or "Write a 500-word description of your home town" (Exercise B 63). Both of these assignments have "Analysis" sections that further detail the prompts as the student is guided through hints, ideas, and indications of the path that McCrimmon suggested as the best. The end of these prompts is written assignments.

McCrimmon addressed all the functions, except critical thinking, reading, and writing, focusing entirely on the alphabetic mode to communicate with the students. To say that the visual mode was entirely absent would be inaccurate because McCrimmon did use a few diagrams in *Writing* (1950), as seen on pages 123, 198-199, 244, and 467- 468. However, to consider *Writing* (1950) as deploying two modes would also be inaccurate as these few visuals do not contribute significantly to the instructional content. These diagrams are connected to the instructional content but the instructional content does not depend on these diagrams in a way that makes them essential to the instructional content. Understanding shifts of this kind is a question of relative differences between textbooks, which make for a more nuanced understanding of how *multimodality* is function and form. That is why maintaining such an awareness that moves beyond stated facts becomes crucial.

There is the presence of the aural mode, but it is through implication. McCrimmon included an assignment that required the students to engage with the medium of sound, in this case, pronunciation. In the chapter on "Vocabulary," Exercise C asks, "[w]hat pronunciations does your dictionary give for the following words?" (185). Beyond this

McCrimmon did not elaborate on how the students must learn pronunciation, and the assumption here is that either the students read the pronunciations from the dictionary or they sound out the words, thereby engaging the medium of sound. The presence of such an aurally oriented assignment suggests that McCrimmon recognized articulation of words as a pedagogical approach. However, the lack of specificity of how this assignment must be completed could indicate that the potential of the aural as a mode in writing instruction was not yet recognized and/or that it was a quick mention, a formality that carried down from elsewhere that did not need any further elaboration. Its repeated appearance in all subsequent editions indicates that McCrimmon thought it important, and that it was probably noticed. Yet, *Writing* (1950) was the first edition and it had other issues that it needed to focus on. Setting this aside, what is important is that the aural mode *did* appear in *Writing* (1950), irrespective how fleeting this appearance was or of its visibility in a writing class.

In terms of overall content, the readings that interspersed the entire textbook are mostly assignments that are reading-based. These assignments range from having the students mark statements from these readings as "True," "False," or "Acceptable" to test the knowledge of the student; to reflective assignments that ask the students to complete a task based on the reading. For example, Exercise A after "Paragraphs: Compositions in Miniature" requires the students to study a student essay and "decide where the paragraph divisions should occur. Then [the student must] write out and return to [their] instructor the first sentence of each paragraph" (134). This reading-based assignment is typical of the assignments in *Writing* (1950), where personal experiences and reflections have little to no part. And in almost all cases, the final form of the assignment is clearly stated. The few exercises that are reflective appear as late as in the "Critical Review" in the "Special

Assignments" chapter. An example of such an excise is Exercise A, which asks the students to read three reviews provided and "then write a paper in which [the students] rate them in order of merit and explain the good or bad points on which [they] base [their] rating" (548). Other exercises from this set are in a similar vein, where the student must reflect on the readings provided, and respond using their own opinions. There are also a few examples of reflective exercises in *Writing* (1950) that indicate a collaborative element (30-32); however, in these few instances McCrimmon does not elaborate on the mandates of the prompt. Once again, what is important is McCrimmon's nod to functions and forms, but as these are mere traces they would have been easy to miss in the reality of a writing classroom probably not geared for such a radical approach to teaching writing.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1950)

Even though *Writing* (1950) came to be closely associated with the Current-Traditional paradigm, it redefined the dominant paradigms of writing pedagogy that had carried over from the late nineteenth century. Both Connors and K. Miller note that *Writing* (1950) was "far more daring and experimental than any of the editions that followed it" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 209-210; K. Miller 108) because it challenged the dominant paradigm of its time. Doris Garey reviewed *Writing* (1950), giving it a glowing review stating that *Writing* (1950) stood out in the deluge of textbooks that were flooding instructors at the time. And though it still did not focus on critical thinking, reading, and writing, *Writing* (1950) did influence writing pedagogy from here on. Connors points out that prior to *Writing* (1950) the idea of teaching the writing process was unheard of. Instead the textbooks were full of what Kitzhaber called "static aberrations" that, Connors believed, "delineated those

subtle qualities of style and structure that are so easy to profess and so hard to teach" ("Shaping Tools" 103). Connors described *Writing* (1950) as among one of the primary examples of a "new thesis text" that reorganized the textbooks so that the older classification of Exposition, Narration, Description, and Argument were no longer seen as writing types by themselves ("The Rise and Fall" 452). In *Writing* (1950) purpose determined the rhetorical choices a writer made. McCrimmon shone a spot light on topics that included "effective reading" to the "organizing of the paper" (89).

This focus on purpose as the central thesis of the process of writing that McCrimmon established with *Writing* (1950) continues into the present edition despite a change in authorship. *Writing* (1950)'s longevity post-1970s indicates that purpose defining the process of writing held muster among instructors, as well as the publishers. *Writing* (1950) is also significant because of how McCrimmon incorporated formerly dominant old curricula with a new outlook that favored process over product. Aspects like the textbook's appearance, style, typography, and arrangements bore the marks of this hybridity and became what marked *Writing* (1950) as different from all the other textbooks flooding the market in the 50s.

Writing with a Purpose, Second Edition (1957)

(Author) Intention in *Writing* (1957)

In the preface, McCrimmon pointed out that *Writing* (1957) was a product of collaboration with instructors who suggested revisions on *Writing* (1950) after using it (ix). McCrimmon specified that the changes pertained mostly to the knowledge of convention topics like vocabulary sections, grammar conventions, and research-based topics. McCrimmon was also quick to add that "[a]lthough much of the text has been rewritten, the

basic theme of purpose, the attitude towards linguistic conventions, and the major emphases of the first edition have not been changed" (ix). From here on the preface of *Writing* (1957) is almost identical to the preface of *Writing* (1950), and aside from a few minor rearrangements, the introductions of both these editions are also almost identical.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Writing* (1957)

The similarity between *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957) continue despite McCrimmon's efforts to incorporate more aspects of the process of writing in *Writing* (1957). McCrimmon added a section that broke down the organization process in directional patterns of time (103); space (103-104); movements from particular to general (104–105) and from general to particular (105-107); question to answer (107-108); and effect to cause (107–108). These shifts can be seen in some assignments, for example in chapter 3, "Organization: Informal Patterns," Review Exercise A:

> As a review of Chapter 3, study and describe the organizational pattern of the following essays: First explain the overall structure if each essay; then make a paragraph analysis to show the relationship of the separate paragraphs to that overall structure. Be especially careful about the second essay. It was written impromptu in a 50-minute class period and its organization is not as neat as it seems to be. (53)

Here McCrimmon focused on the process of structuring an essay using paragraphs. Yet the lines, "relationship of the separate paragraphs to [the] overall structure"; and "[b]e especially careful about the second essay. It was written impromptu in a 50-minute class period and its organization is not as neat as it seems to be" (53), indicate

that McCrimmon saw knowledge of convention, and writing processes as connected, which in this case is through time allotted. Here McCrimmon directly addressed the teachers, guiding them to see process as more important than accuracy of convention.

McCrimmon retained exercises that suggested the use of collaboration and feedback in the reflective process. For example, in *Writing*'s (1957) exercise A in "Choosing a Subject" that was:

> designed to serve two purposes: first to suggest possible subjects to any student who finds such suggestions useful; second, to provide a common body of material for such class exercises and impromptu essays as the instructor wishes to assign. (28-31)

Some examples of McCrimmon's shift in focus towards a heightened collaborative dimension to the reflective assignments are in *Writing*'s (1957) exercise B in "Outlining":

> The following student outline looks good but is completely useless as a controlling plan for a long essay. All its weaknesses have their origin in the thesis. Study the outline carefully. Apply the tests for the thesis and for the relation among parts. *Discuss the outline in class.* (76; added emphasis)

And from "Paragraphs: Compositions in Miniature," exercise D:

> From the materials supplied on page 60, supplemented by your experience with other students, write a substantial paragraph developing the topic sentence: *Inferior students could help themselves by adopting the study habits used by superior students.* (128)

McCrimmon attempted to shift some knowledge of convention assignments to incorporate elements of reflective thinking, for example, in assignments like "Improving

Vocabulary" (223-227); exercises at the end of the "Synopses and Summaries" (243-248); review exercise D in "Special Assignments" (310 - 323); and the exercise set in "Arguments and Persuasion" (328-329). However, these examples are few. For the most part McCrimmon continued reading-based instructional content that did not include student reflection. Also, despite McCrimmon's intentions, traces of the product paradigm remained. For example, in "Purposeful Details," the subsequent theoretical introduction to the assignment set reads: "Let us look at a series of writing assignments, considering what details are needed to fulfill these assignments, and then showing the result when the appropriate details have been provided" (84). Here the assignment focus on the readings, and also provide a product against which the student can evaluate their own process of working out the assignment's mandate.

In *Writing* (1957), McCrimmon outlined an editorial role for the student. For example, exercise A in "Right Words" made the student assume, "[s]uppose you were editing a dictionary …" (160). In all these assignments McCrimmon tried radically new approaches by the standards of pedagogical convention at the time. However, McCrimmon remained firmly in the knowledge of convention functional range at this time. An example is assignment A in "Paragraphs" where the students must "take three assignments and work them out as finished paragraphs" (117). Such assignments required the students to examine the readings through a problems-with-the-product approach more than a find-a-better-process approach. There is little to no scope for external reflection and these assignments require a single-minded focus on mastering the conventions of a prescribed format of paragraph writing and organization.

Writing (1957) and *Writing* (1950) remain similar, even though there is an almost imperceptible shift in vocabulary detected only when familiar assignments were compared word for word. McCrimmon retained the aural assignment from *Writing* (1950) and once again McCrimmon did not ask the students to deploy the mode of sound specifically. As with *Writing* (1950), *Writing* (1957) continues to focus largely on the alphabetic and is predominantly reading-based. There is a marginal increase in the reflective as well as the collaborative, but unless an instructor is already so inclined, these slight shifts could be missed. The shifts in the instructional content between these first two editions are so slight that without comparing these two editions, word for word, the slight shifts are lost.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1957)

Connors pointed out that the Eisenhower Era and the Cold War marked a return to traditionalism that was reflected in *Writing* (1957). Even though there were some revisions between *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957), these shifts showed a marginal increase in the noticeability of certain aspects of purpose, rather than any significant shifts in the textbook's approach. Connors sees the shift from *Writing* (1950) to *Writing* (1957) as a "rigidifying" as *Writing* (1957), "assimilated material that resulted from the breakdown of nineteenth-century teaching methods that occurred during the thirties, forties, and early fifties" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 211). Connors and K. Miller both note that McCrimmon kept all the traditional materials and removed all the experimental sections, (Connors, "Shaping Tools" 104), making *Writing* (1957) more of an "ancestor of today's text" (K. Miller 210). This is significant because here is where *Writing* as a textbook series established an enduring image for itself. It is this image that assimilated the shifts that were already being felt, making

Writing with a Purpose a textbook that defined, or at the very least bore a very strong resemblance to, the commonly recognized textbook of today's composition class.

Writing with a Purpose, Third Edition, (1963)

(Author) Intention in *Writing* (1963)

Writing (1963) showed the influences of the cultural and social shifts on writing pedagogy at the time. In the preface of *Writing* (1963) McCrimmon moved straight into listing the changes, chapter by chapter. He stated that he chose to keep everything that was analysis-based, from "overview of the composition process" and a wider understanding of argument and persuasion, to the "relation of purpose to each stage of process," and from a "more detailed treatment" of sentence patterns, to including a "librarian's evaluation of reference sources" (ix). McCrimmon's no-frills-attached approach to writing textbook instruction is evident in the introduction of *Writing* (1963). The introduction, titled "Purpose: An Overview," once again established purpose as the guiding principle of *Writing* (1963). However, for the first time McCrimmon defined purpose as planning, writing, and revising. Another significant change is in the bibliography where McCrimmon arranged his sources under the categories "General," "History of the English Language," "Grammar," "Usage," and "Semantics." All of this shows a shift towards a clearer articulation of the aspects of writing McCrimmon was focusing on. Even though the range remains substantial, the act of naming indicated a growing maturity of the process paradigm in *Writing with a Purpose.*

Another step forward was an articulation of student perspective as being a part of the mandate of the textbook, something that was common among the multi-media textbook authors' approach to writing textbooks. In the introduction to *Writing* (1963) McCrimmon

stated that the problem with writing instruction was the need for ready-to-use writing skills, as "[e]ven in his first essay, a student must choose a subject, narrow it down to manageable size, select pertinent material, organize it logically, develop his ideas in detail, and express them in orderly paragraphs and clear sentences with due regard for the conventions of usage" (3). McCrimmon quickly connected this to "the theme of this book [which] is that *effective college writing is controlled by the writer's purpose*" (3; original emphasis). *Writing* (1963) is similar to *Writing* (1950) and (1957), but with one important difference. For the first time McCrimmon organized "Purpose: An Overview" under sub-headings that defined the goals of individual sections. For example, under the sub-heading "Writing With and Without a Purpose," McCrimmon placed samples of student texts with a strong and weak purpose. Similarly, "Purpose and the Whole Approach" examined rhetorical awareness using examples of poorly written letters. In *Writing* (1963) McCrimmon not only reiterated purpose as what defined the textbook, but also further defined purpose of writing in some of its more common, often student-generated, forms.

McCrimmon was closely watching the development outside of the traditional genre of writing instruction, and this was becoming evident in *Writing* (1963). Connors believes this was McCrimmon's nod to the "revolutionary force of the proponents of emerging theories" as he tried to retain the loyalty of "those older teachers who would stop assigning the book if he changed too much" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 211). I add that this is also the beginning of the movement that was to take on a whole new form, in later editions of *Writing*. The late 60s and early 70s were a period of cultural redefinition in America, and this manifested in the writing classrooms of the time. McCrimmon intended to incorporate the new, while eliminating what he saw as "the less defensible aspects of the older material"

("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 211), and *Writing* (1963) was McCrimmon's acknowledging of the shifting reality that was (re)defining the writing classroom of the early 60s.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Writing* (1963)

Writing (1963) exposes the first noticeable gap between McCrimmon's stated intention and the textbook's instructional content implementation. I acknowledge that the implementation of a textbook is subject to forces outside of author intention, and therefore putting gaps in implementation squarely on McCrimmon's shoulders would be inaccurate, perhaps even a little unfair. Yet, as McCrimmon is the author, the implementation of the instructional content must be attributed to him, even though this implementation may not be a reflection of his views entirely.

To be sure, McCrimmon made a noticeable effort toward moving out of a strictly traditional format with *Writing* (1963). Some of the changes that he made were to make the textbook more visually quick to assimilate and to make the apparatus more distinct, as well as familiar. For example, McCrimmon interspersed walls of dense theory with short review exercises in the middle of the chapters, rather than put all the exercises only at the end of chapters. He further made the distinctions more visual by demarcating these review exercises using symbols like "✓" along the edge of the page, marking these assignments. Assignments from previous editions that highlighted process defined by purpose, rhetorical knowledge, and (a continued) focus on convention remained in *Writing* (1963). In this edition McCrimmon tried to revamp older assignments; for example, a convention-focused assignment that tested the students' ability to reflect on and determine statements' validity (333-334) or reliability (339-340) was added to a set of older assignments.

A particularly noteworthy example of such an effort to reinvent *Writing* (1963) is in the repeated use of the aural assignment, which is in *Writing* (1963) more specific compared to *Writing*'s previous editions. This is noteworthy because it explicitly invokes the medium of sound as a mode. McCrimmon modified the aural assignment of the previous two editions by asking the students to "[p]ronounce the following words aloud, making a guess at the pronunciation of those not in your spoken vocabulary. Then check against a dictionary and use each word correctly in a spoken sentence" (176). McCrimmon's specific directions that asked the students to articulate words *aloud* made the deployment of the aural mode clear. This is still only one example, yet this specificity indicates a growing confidence towards the new approach. To be sure, the use of the aural medium as a mode in writing instruction is still very much outside the purview of *Writing with a Purpose,* but it was within the shifting paradigms of writing instruction in the early 60s, and McCrimmon did incorporate it, even though this incorporation was in trace amounts.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1963)

The struggle between the radical and the conservative forces that marked the following editions of *Writing with a Purpose* become evident from this point on. On the one hand, McCrimmon claimed an intention to move towards *multi-media,* and he did follow through in the shifts that he made across three editions of *Writing* from 1950 to 1963. On the other hand, McCrimmon stayed well within the boundaries of what *Writing* came to be known for, a traditional instructional textbook that embodies the process-oriented writing pedagogy. Connors believes that these contrary forces on McCrimmon forced him to acknowledge the push of the "revolutionary force of the proponents of emerging theories,"

while minding the pull of "those older teachers who would stop assigning the book if he changed too much" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 211). Connors notes McCrimmon's "judicious incorporation of new material and careful diminution of the less defensible aspects of the older material" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 211). K. Miller on the other hand mostly notes the simplification of *Writing* (1963) as one that re-presented the traditional textbook format.

As I see it, McCrimmon had, as always, done a bit of both. However, he stayed more traditional than radical, while he tried to get the students and instructors to focus on specific reading-based contents that would forward the process aspects of writing pedagogy but this time the purposes were also specified. *Writing* (1963) was a taste of what was to come in the following editions, and as I see it as McCrimmon's tentative steps into unchartered waters.

Writing with a Purpose, Fourth Edition (1967)

(Author) Intention of *Writing* (1967)

Writing (1967) was the most complex of the editions because it marks the furthest point away from the traditional format that McCrimmon would take *Writing with a Purpose*. Scholars generally agree that *Writing with a Purpose*, as a textbook series, belongs to the conservative camp. This general agreement of what *Writing* came to symbolize, or at the very least incorporate as its own essence, is what makes looking at the influences on *Writing* an important examination. *Writing* (1967) is an important landmark along this evolutionary trajectory because it marks the moment when the multi-media moment of the late 60s was actually *felt* by *Writing with a Purpose.*

In *Writing* (1967) McCrimmon claimed that the changes were "designed to achieve the following results:

- To extend the concept of purpose as artistic control over the selection, arrangement, and presentation of material by more attention to prewriting;
- To emphasize the importance of content and to suggest means by which a student may obtain information and generate ideas for his writing;
- To provide more help with organization than exclusive attention to outlining permits;
- To relate examples and assignments more directly to literature than was done in earlier editions; and
- To provide many new models and exercises (ix).

McCrimmon's use of the phrases like "artistic control," "attention to prewriting," "importance of content," and "generate ideas for his writing," suggest that purpose was now not just mechanical accuracy but an inclusion of student agency, reflection, and status in the pedagogical process. Here is a moment when McCrimmon turned up the student, taking *Writing* (1967) one step closer towards the multi-media textbooks' approach. Yet, McCrimmon kept the instructional apparatus largely within the confines of the traditional and effectively created a *true* hybrid of the *multi-media* with the *traditional* approach in textbooks.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Writing* (1967)

In terms of its content organization, *Writing* (1967) reversed all the changes that were made in *Writing* (1963) to go back to a more *Writing* (1950) and (1957) format. In *Writing* (1967) sections that had been combined in the previous editions were now reverted to their

former separate sections and chapters. For example, McCrimmon reversed the "Patterns of Organizations" section of *Writing* (1963) to the "Patterns of Development" in *Writing* (1950) and titled it "Patterns of Organization" in *Writing* (1967). Certain parts of the instructional content now included critical thinking, reading, and writing, for example, in chapter one, "Planning the Composition." However, the instances of such additions still did not dominate *Writing*'s more traditional functions like knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, and the writing process. McCrimmon continued to intersperse the chapters with review exercises, marking them through italics. This retained the visual demarcation of instructional apparatus from the theory, while adding a visual sense of the extent of these exercises in relation to theory. This, to me, is a significant shift because the use of the visual mode through typography was what multi-media textbooks were doing.

There was also a perceptible shift in McCrimmon's use of images in *Writing* (1967). McCrimmon previously restricted the use of diagrams to superficial illustrations that did not enhance the instructional content. However, in *Writing* (1967) McCrimmon used diagrams more deliberately, so its purpose supported the instructional content in important and more meaningful ways. An example is the review exercise analyzing a "clock diagram" that presented a framework for ascertaining acceptable topics for papers going forward. The "clock diagram" in *Writing* (1967) is a diagrammatic representation of "the relation between a general subject and some useful restrictions" (6). The general subject in this example is "College Education," and this is written in the center of the "clock." Around the title, where the hours of the clock would be, there appear twelve "restricted topics" instead. Each topic focuses on one dimension within the larger topic. McCrimmon then gave another list of twelve questions that further narrow the focus of each of these topics. The point of this

exercise is to demonstrate that there are "a dozen restrictions of one general subject, but it by no means exhausts the possibilities." (7). Here, it is not the exercise that is important, but McCrimmon's more meaningful use of a diagram to illustrate the theoretical instruction.

This limited but more deliberate deployment of the visual mode is also seen in McCrimmon's use of other aspects of the visual mode. For example, in an effort to illustrate the relationship between pattern and detail, McCrimmon used black and white artwork. In this exercise McCrimmon connected pattern and detail as depending on each other and he went on to demonstrate:

> A simple illustration of the technique of holding off general impressions until they grow out of detailed information is provided in the following notes, which record a series of observations of a picture (see page opposite). (35)

McCrimmon's enhanced use of the visual mode here asked the students to "observe a subject" and either "draw a picture" of it or to "look closely at it and to see details… *with the intent of drawing it"* (36). What is noteworthy is that the art work is needed to understand the theory as well as complete the assignment. To that end, McCrimmon specifically asked the students to refer to the picture as a part of to the instructions to complete the assignment.

These examples demonstrate that even though the visual mode was not new to *Writing* as a series of textbooks, McCrimmon's use of diagrams and illustrations was now becoming more purposeful. The "clock diagram" example demonstrated McCrimmon's use of more diagrams to explain more complex processes. This also extends into McCrimmon's tentative inclusion of more visual genres that were defined by a clear instructional purpose. There are a few other examples that show this, like diagrammatically representing the

structure of a paragraph (147) or visually presenting the range of styles of writing from "Very Formal" to "Very Informal," along a scale (175).

Some of these assignments are significant because they resemble assignments that modern-day multimodal scholars have used. In this context McCrimmon's observation exercise that asks the students to draw to observe is significant. The assignment reads as follows:

> If you can draw, even poorly, draw a picture of any object …[so that] it will force you to look closely at it and to see details of size, shape, texture, shading, etc., which you might otherwise miss; and it will force you to deal with details, since you cannot so easily escape into a general impression in a drawing. (36)

Ann Berthoff's assignment that was designed to demonstrate "that the process of composing mental images – the process of visual thinking – is analogous to writing" and that how meaning making through mental images will help "make meaning on a page" (*Remixing* 39), bears a striking similarity to this assignment in *Writing* (1967). To this end, Palmeri notes that Berthoff's assignment "encourages students both to write and to visually sketch observations of a common object over a week's time" (*Remixing* 41). I do not claim that Berthoff was directly inspired by McCrimmon, but I do go back to the point that McCrimmon's use of such visually embedded assignments show the influence of *multi-media* of the late 60s on the more traditional approach of *Writing* as a series.

Such a use of the visual mode is not significant in the frequency of its appearance in *Writing* (1967), but it is significant for what it stands for. By using more complex visuals across multiple genres, like illustrations (34), paintings (51), and photographs (52), *Writing*

(1967) made the visual mode more pedagogically relevant to *Writing*'s overall instructional content. This new use of visuals in *Writing* (1967) demonstrates how a well-recognized traditional textbook used medium and content as modes to incorporate the *multi-media* changes of the times. However, by limiting the number of such instances, McCrimmon kept *Writing* within the realms of the traditional writing textbook, though *Writing* (1967) hovered at the edge of the line that divided the multi-media writing textbooks from the traditional writing textbooks of the 60s and 70s.

In keeping with this general shift towards a modally more varied approach, McCrimmon included a few review exercises in *Writing* (1967) using music (66) and TV commercials (67). However, once again this push towards the use of modes outside of the alphabetic was counter balanced with McCrimmon's pulling back to the conservative. McCrimmon did not specify how the assignments required students to work with the medium of sound, or sound and movement in the television assignment. This meant that these assignments could be multimodally inspired, but monomodally implemented. For example, a research paper on music or television could mean an assignment that requires the articulation of sound and motion, perhaps through dramatization, making this a multi-media project. However, it could also mean writing a paper based on these stimuli, making this a traditional project. Either way, acknowledging such significant shifts is important even though these shifts are slight because they all collectively mark the influence of the multi-media moment, even if they do not amount to making *Writing* a multi-media textbook.

McCrimmon retained certain conventions that had been established in pervious editions in *Writing* (1967). For example, exercises remained that ask students to "judge" the "best essay" according to a given criteria (27-30) or exercises that have students write

summaries, outlines, and examine paragraphs (75-76). Just as McCrimmon tempered his more radical assignments with a conservative undertone, he repeated older assignments with a shift in perspective. For example, previous editions had several assignments that required the students to examine sample essays, assignments, and research papers as examples of what was wrong with the writing. In *Writing* (1967) McCrimmon revised these assignments so that the students still had to examine sample essays, but this time "as a fair sample of what a superior freshman student will do with a research project" (279). The changing face of the college student was now, as in Connors' words, " extremely intelligent and highly motivated" (Connors "Thirty Years" 212), and *Writing* (1967) demonstrated that shift in its tone, expectations, and its definition of purpose for these students. McCrimmon's attempts to infuse what *Writing* already was, a well-known conservative textbook, with what *Writing* could be resulted in what could arguably be the forerunners of the standard issue, modern, composition textbook.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1967)

The changes that McCrimmon made to *Writing* (1967) were indeed significant yet only when editions of *Writing* were compared among themselves. *Writing* (1967) did not match the changes that were now perceptible in the kinds of new emerging genres of multi-media textbooks. Connors considers *Writing* (1967) revised, but only superficially. He sees these changes as short sections of new materials "grafted" onto pre-existing chapters. In *CCC*'s 1969 textbook review issue, Richard Larson reviewed *Writing* (1967) focusing on illustration, definition, analysis, argument, persuasion, and language. Given that McCrimmon's focus stayed the same throughout, Larson seemed to overlook how

McCrimmon redefined purpose in *Writing* (1967). Was this because *Writing* had by then become so synonymous with purpose that reviewing purpose would be akin to stating the obvious? Or, was it that Larson detected a shift in McCrimmon's focus that in turn distracted reviewers from purpose? Whether the reality is one of the two, or something else is secondary to asking that, if Larson overlooked purpose when reviewing *Writing* (1967), then how many others did the same? Also, how would such a shift of *Writing*'s (perceived) focus impact its trajectory? These are the questions that *Writing* (1972) would have to answer, or at the very least, hint at.

Writing with a Purpose, Fifth Edition (1972)

(Author) Intention in *Writing* (1972)

The visibility of the multi-media moment of the late 1960s and early 70s was "the cry for relevant education" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 212). Though the multi-media approach did not replace the Current-Traditional paradigm (Stewart, "Composition Textbooks and the Assault on Tradition"), the multi-media approach did challenge the Current-Traditional paradigm. This was significant because the Current-Traditional paradigm was the dominant paradigm since its emergence. Writing pedagogy was in the midst of significant shifts that would define Composition as a discipline, further on. *Writing* (1972) embodied this shift more in its authorial intention than in its content implementation. *Writing* (1967) had already moved a few steps towards *multi-media*, so *Writing* (1972)'s shift was more to do with McCrimmon's claims than with its instructional content of *Writing* (1972).

In the preface of *Writing* (1972), McCrimmon listed the changes from *Writing* (1967) as:

- Simplification of content and style;
- Use of writing samples that are attuned to current student interest and preoccupations;
- A greater focus on purpose as "a guide through the composition process," particularly reader awareness;
- An addition of exercises that lent themselves to classroom analysis;
- More direct advice to the students on ways in which they can improve their writing; and
- An added focus on the revision process (v).

McCrimmon once again emphasized the context and purpose of students' writing, but this time he focused on the student-teacher relationship. McCrimmon now represented the student as a writer, and the instructor as one of the many readers of the student's work (v). The writing that the student did using *Writing* (1972) was now, in McCrimmon's opinion, "for the class, including the instructor as a member, not for the instructor alone" (v). This was once again similar to the multi-media representation of the student as a writer with an audience of more than one. *Writing* (1972) replaced the transactional nature of the traditional pedagogical model with one that saw the student as a professional writer or at the very least, in the same league as a professional author.

(Instructional Content) Implementation in *Writing* (1972)

Consider for a moment the opening lines of *Writing* (1967):

> A perceptive student once said, "The trouble with Freshman English is you're supposed to know everything about writing before you get a chance to study any of it." In one sense, at least, he was right. (3)

McCrimmon attempted to engage the student directly as the first act in the teaching of writing. He cited a "perceptive" student, someone who had McCrimmon's respect or who at a minimum had McCrimmon's approval. McCrimmon then shared this student's irritation at the writing course in a way that showed McCrimmon's partial agreement with the student's views. By doing this McCrimmon seemed to have tried to reach out to other students as well. While I see this approach as suggesting McCrimmon's shift in how he presented the student, it also indicates McCrimmon's retention of the student-teacher relationship unlike the multi-media textbook authors. The collegiality of the multi-media authors, who saw the student as a fellow writer, was absent in McCrimmon's approach to gaining the student's acceptance.

The opening lines of *Writing* (1972) did the same thing, but this time with a significant difference. In *Writing* (1972) McCrimmon asked his students, "[d]o you sometimes find writing a frustrating experience? If you do, you have something in common with many professional writers including some of the best" (3). Once again McCrimmon attempted to engage the student directly; however, in *Writing* (1972) McCrimmon connected the student writer with the professional writer through the common frustrations that marked the writing process for *all* writers. The meaning and the intention between *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972) is largely similar, but the shift in McCrimmon's choice of words in *Writing* (1972) gives a different *feel* to its introduction. McCrimmon presented the voice of one who understands the students' frustration, while the identity of McCrimmon, or the teacher's presence is left outside the conversation. McCrimmon acknowledged the student writer's frustration at the course expectations, presumably stemming from the teacher and attempted to create a space where students felt they could express themselves. This shift is significant because it illustrates McCrimmon's creating a space of the students' authorial

agency for the student writer as seen in some multi-media textbooks. For example, in *Montage*, Sparke and McKowen left a page blank for the students to fill (*Montage* 130). Sparke and McKowen literally stepped aside to make way for the student within the instructional, knowledge-making space of the textbook. Another example was Kytle's focus on treating the students as professional writers, who, according to Kytle, must experience the writer's experience in its entirety, rejection and all.

This decided shift in tone manifested in McCrimmon reorganization of *Writing* (1972). Like Paul Briand did in 1970, McCrimmon tried to reduce student frustration by making the assimilation of the instructional content quicker, easier, but more meaningful. In *Writing* (1972) this translated as a greater use of enhanced textual visibility, for example, the use of sub-headings akin to marginal notes to mark important paragraphs. McCrimmon also enhanced the importance of the diagrams included so they meant more to the instructional content of the textbook. These diagrams were now akin to creating mind-maps of the writing process, while the use of multiple fonts to highlight in-text readings made visual assimilation of the material far less tedious for a student, as opposed to requirements that students read every line. McCrimmon even visually separated the theory from the assignments using color, fonts, and typographical variations. *Writing* (1972) has some diagrams, for example on pages 90, 135, 138, and 167, as well as two drawings on pages 28-29. By using these visuals in reflective assignments, McCrimmon marginally increased not just the number of illustrations, but also the instances where these visuals worked as modes. Consider the following prompt from *Writing* (1972), chapter 3, "Patterns of Organization":

> With drawing pencil and paper before you, reread the foregoing selection one step at a time and make a contour drawing of a subject of your choice. Are

> there any steps in the process which are not in the best order? Are there any steps in the process which are not absolutely clear? (make your answers as specific as possible.) How practical is this recommended process? (61)

Here McCrimmon again engaged the visual mode to inform the alphabetic mode in a way that is similar to *Writing* (1967) (36). This exercise demonstrates "that the process of composing mental images – the process of visual thinking – is analogous to writing," and that students make meaning through mental images will help them "make meaning on a page" (Berthoff qtd. in Palmeri, *Remixing* 39).

The pattern that emerges indicates that it is not uncommon for author intention to not entirely translate incompletely into textbook content implementation. McCrimmon showed intentions that were clearly leaning towards the multi-media approach, but the implementation of *Writing* (1972) stayed within the traditional approach. By its very nature *Writing* went against the peer-to-peer, writer-to-writer communication that McCrimmon had previously claimed. Often and unavoidably, McCrimmon's pedagogical approach reinstated the traditional teacher-student dynamics, and this significantly contradicted the student's representation as a fellow writer. Kytle noted that some of this is inevitable as he addressed his students in the "Author's Guide" that accompanied *The Comp Box.* Yet, I argue that by acknowledging the paradox, Kytle set the scales back to seeing the students as professional writers. McCrimmon's push towards a multi-media style and the pull back to the traditional is seen throughout *Writing* (1972). For example, in chapter six, "Effective Sentences," McCrimmon used the visual typographical modes to present and differentiate alphabetic processes that the student samples went through. However, along with typography McCrimmon used red ink, one of the well-recognized symbol of the teacher's punitive

authority, to show how the original draft was revised. In *Writing* (1967) McCrimmon did this less visibly. He used this kind of exercise fewer times and used black ink to demonstrate the process of editing. McCrimmon's liberal use of red ink in makes *Writing* (1972) look like an old-school teacher let loose on a hapless student paper.

McCrimmon repeated the aural mode in *Writing* (1972), but once again with caution. McCrimmon added a new aurally oriented prompt alongside the long-standing exercise on pronunciation that appeared in the previous editions. The new aural prompt in *Writing* (1972), chapter 3, "Patterns of Organization," Exercise C read:

> Prewrite a paper of comparison or contrast between any two members if the following list. Or if you prefer, choose a topic of your own. After you have chosen your topic, determine which kind of structure is better for your purpose. If your instructor wishes, these prewriting activities may be developed into an essay:
>
> 1. Music: hard rock, folk, jazz, popular dance music of the 1940s (1950s etc.), symphonic music, medieval church music, etc.
> 2. Yankees, Southerners, Westerners, Midwesterners, etc.
> 3. The ideas, attitudes beliefs symbolized in the dress of modern young people, members of a religious order, the military, older people.
> 4. Some beliefs and values of your generation and another generation. (51-52)

Option one of this assignment incorporates sound, specifically requiring the students to compare and contrast genres of music. Even though the assignment does not ask the student to specifically *make* music, the need to listen to compare indicates a suggestion towards including sound as a mode in *Writing* (1972). Further, this prompt also demonstrates that

while McCrimmon retained the focus of the reading-based instructional content, he added reflective and critically based research assignments that would require the deployment of other modes outside of the alphabetic. I was particularly struck by the definite move away from the end being a written product as McCrimmon mentioned, almost as if it was an aside to the main assignment: "*If* your instructor wishes, these prewriting activities *may* be developed into an essay" (52; emphasis added).

Several of the older assignments have stayed on in *Writing* (1972), for example the idea development exercise in "Purpose: An Overview." However, McCrimmon does re-contextualize these older assignments with newer interpretations. It is important to point out here that even in these older reading-based assignments, McCrimmon made a decided effort to mix things up. For example, the exercise set in "Sources of Material" has a collection of prompts A to D where each prompt uses a different genre of writing. Prompts A and B use articles, C uses a short story, and D uses a poem. Similarly, the exercise set in *Writing*'s (1972) "The Critical Essay" section combines prompts from a discussion using a television series that was adapted from a novel (199-201), a student essay (201-202), a poem along with student criticisms (202-204), and a poem the student must critically analyze (204-206). There are not very many such revitalized assignments that invoke the use of multiple modes and instructional content formats and that also cover a range of functions that the instructional material must accomplish. Yet, the shift is indicative of how *Writing,* as a textbook series, was adapting to suit the call of the multi-media moment it was in.

A new addition is the introduction of the first truly feedback and review assignment in *Writing* (1972). In "Purpose: An Overview", Exercise B, McCrimmon asked the student to "write the paper you have prewritten," but "after discussing the notes with your instructor or

your classmates" (15). This collaborative, research-oriented instructional content was included through interviews that also provided the setting against which rhetorical and research-based assignments were set. For example, the assignment in "Sources of Material: Prewriting" in *Writing* (1972) asks the student to interview two participants of their choice on a set of given topics (34). This assignment is an important addition because it does several things at once. First, it is an example of project based in research in *Writing with a Purpose* since 1950; second, by allowing the students to choose the participants, the assignment gave the student control; and finally, it allowed the student to reflect as part of the research process.

The examples that I present here are not indicative of the volume of changes that McCrimmon made in *Writing* (1972), but are more to give a sense of the changes that were incorporated more so by representation than replacement. Several of the older assignments stayed on like the inclusion of dictionary references (148) and student essays (155-156, 168-169). Research-based work, beyond consulting a dictionary, was scanty and the critically oriented assignment was only just introduced in *Writing* as a series with *Writing*'s (1972) "Persuasion" section. The exercise read as follows:

> The following assignments contain various types of fallacies. Evaluate each and explain clearly what is wrong with it. Do not be content with naming the fallacy. The skill you are trying to develop is not identification but analysis; it is more important to explain the errors than to name them. (294)

McCrimmon's choice of words like "skill you are trying to develop" and "[do] not be content" indicate McCrimmon's sharper focus on nuances within the process of writing and on (re)understanding writing pedagogy itself. Writing processes were now a skill that must

be powered from within the students' aspirations. This idea that McCrimmon packed into these exercises bear striking similarities to the ideas of Greenbaum and Schmerl, as well as J.Miller. Greenbaum and Schmerl, in *Course X* articulated the need to present writing as a skill, not knowledge, as one of their ideals of the learning-situated classroom; and J. Miller, in *Words, Self, Reality*, saw motivation and imagination as the fire that forges good writing.

McCrimmon claimed that he simplified *Writing* (1972), but these inclusions in instructional content suggest a step forward that was intellectually more nuanced. Irrespective of whether these changes remained or not in successive editions of *Writing*, what is important is that the multi-media approach did influence *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972). This indicates that *multi-media* did impact traditionally oriented textbooks, in the late 60s and early 70s, even though the multi-media approach was not as wide spread.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1972)

Connors sees *Writing* (1972) as a lapse, specifically as an example of a phenomenon where textbooks tried to "capitalize on the situation of the moment without really enunciating any new methods" (Connors "Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 212-213). Connors ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 213) and K. Miller (116) both see *Writing* (1972) as a simpler version of its forerunners where the student was seen as less motivated, less hardworking, less apt than previous batches of freshman, and not as critically attuned to the text. Ohmann also felt that the traditional roles that *Writing* furthered were problematic (qtd. in K. Miller 58). K. Miller on the other hand disagrees with Ohmann as he saw the student of *Writing* (1972) as reflective and capable of critical thought, reflection, and writing (91).

The value of *Writing* (1972) is note-worthy in the way it reflected the moment of student *power* in the writing classroom (Murray; Fleming). *Writing* (1972) is also important for the traces of *multi-media* it fossilized in its own contents, including the focus on student-as-writer perspectives and a more defined focus on critical reflection. Yet, the concerns that Connors and Ohmann had do warrant consideration in this analysis of *Writing* (1972). In the 1969 panel discussion, Allen et al. discussed the difference between meaningful textbook revisions as opposed to superficial textbook revisions. They defined superficial revision in a way that reads very similarly not only to Connors' perception of *Writing* (1972), but also to how *Writing* as a series embodies McCrimmon's changing intentions over the years, from 1950 to 1972. Allen described a superficial textbook revision as follows:

> While new material may be added, assumptions may be left unexamined, perhaps because the book has been successful, or the new material may be inadequately integrated into the text, or the changes may be so superficial that the only real alterations are in the type face, or the jacket, or the updating of a bibliography. (2)

It is true that *Writing* (1972) was simplified, and several of the changes were grafted on without really being integrated into the main philosophy that defined *Writing* as a series. However, I would argue that while *Writing* (1972) only adopted the new approach partially, the changes must be seen from two perspectives:

- McCrimmon's intentions that motivated choices, even though the implementation did not carry the same momentum as his intentions did; and
- The fact that *Writing* was, at the heart of it, a well-known traditional textbook.

McCrimmon's stated intentions bore a resemblance to the multi-media textbook authors' intentions, whether it was his acknowledging the frustrations of the students or his efforts to engage student interest. As an instructor of writing, my experience has taught me that sometimes less is more. When it comes to engaging students sometimes the simpler the delivery of instruction, the greater the functional success of the instructional material. So, the observations that Connors and Ohmann make regarding the simplification of *Writing* (1972) are hard to deny. I argue that this was not a dumbing down of instructional content. Rather, as seen with other multi-media textbook authors, it showed McCrimmon's effort to engage the students on their own terms. Weiner's study found a continued and widespread use of *Writing* (1972) even in the 80s, and this finding would indicate that the book was effective, even if it was simple. *Writing* (1972) may be a simplification, but the impact of a simplified content implementation must be accounted for when deciding on the value of *Writing* (1976).

Writing with a Purpose, Sixth Edition (1976)

(Author) Intention of *Writing* (1976)

The visibility of the multi-media approach of the late 1960s and early 70s had left its mark on *Writing* (1972). With it McCrimmon had stepped into the expressivist approach in a way that was similar to the multi-media textbook authors' approach to writing pedagogy, particularly in authorial intent. By the time *Writing* (1976) appeared, the multi-media approach had significantly receded, and McCrimmon's focus also reversed to a more pre-1967 form of *Writing*. However, despite McCrimmon's reversal, the changes that were seen in *Writing* (1972) remained. McCrimmon's resolve to maintain the elements of *Writing* (1972) were stated in the preface of *Writing* (1976). McCrimmon clearly articulated his

intention "to strengthen individual chapters while retaining the basic theme and structure of the fifth edition" (ix). I believe that McCrimmon was defending the choices he made in the *Writing* (1972) and *Writing* (1976)'s stated goals echo this resolve. In the preface of *Writing* (1976), McCrimmon stated that *Writing* (1976) wanted to:

- Make it easier for a student to apply the concept of purpose to his or her writing at all stages from prewriting to rewriting;
- Heighten "the continuity [to] tighten [the] cumulative approach" that connects the instruction in successive chapters; and
- Create "an increased emphasis on revisions as a normal and necessary part of writing" (ix).

McCrimmon made it clear that he wished to continue focusing on purpose as the defining feature of writing, yet he emphasized rhetorical focus, particularly the importance of persuading the audience, the relationship between the reader and writer and finally, the processes of analyzing and inference-making (ix-x). McCrimmon believed that one way to make the instructional material easier for the student was to give the student an "explicit procedure for interpreting information obtained from observation and reading" (ix). Also, in *Writing* (1976), McCrimmon distinguished between two levels of purpose: immediate and subsequent. The immediate purpose, McCrimmon suggests, was teaching students to evaluate experience, while the "subsequent" or more long-term purpose was to introduce the student to "a method of analysis and inference-making that he or she will use repeatedly" (ix). All the changes, McCrimmon argued ,would make *Writing* (1976) more attuned to the needs of the students (x).

There is another significant shift in *Writing* (1976), particularly in how McCrimmon acknowledged the growing consciousness of the diversity in the writing classroom. Previously McCrimmon referred to the student through the use of "he" and "his" throughout the textbook. In *Writing* 1976 McCrimmon shifted from the use of the masculine pronouns to more gender-neutral choices of words, while he actively included female pronouns as well. For example, in the textbook's front matter, he explained that he wanted "to make it easier for a student to apply the concept of purpose to *his or her* writing at all stages from prewriting to rewriting" (ix; emphasis added). McCrimmon continued to present the intent of *Writing* (1976) from the perspective of student needs, rather than based on knowledge of convention issues expected of the students.

However, despite these changes, there was a fall back into older, more traditional ways. McCrimmon's style went back to being more academic in tone, particularly seen the connection he tried to establish with the students. In *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972) McCrimmon presented himself as a very encouraging and understanding teacher who saw his students as more than just students. However, in the preface of *Writing* (1976), McCrimmon attempted to connect with the student in a very to-the-point, official, perhaps somewhat conversational manner. The tone he adopted was like *listening* to a teacher talking to students in a traditional classroom.

(Instructional Content) Implementation for *Writing* (1976)

In *Writing* (1972) McCrimmon attempted to engage and encourage the student by presenting them (to themselves) as professional writers. Instead of opening in a similarly informal, conversational tone as he did in *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972), McCrimmon

began the instructional section of *Writing* (1976) using Literature, specifically the poet John Donne. This opening, within the strict confines of Literature, reinstated in no uncertain terms the formal approach to the instruction that was to follow. McCrimmon maintained this tone and relationship throughout *Writing* (1976).

McCrimmon's abundant use of selected readings in *Writing* (1976) is visually evident as he used color to differentiate instructional theory and selected readings. All the examples of writing were a brown- or marron-colored font, while the teaching instruction was black. This choice of color is important when seen in relation to his previous use of color and typography. For example, McCrimmon used a bright rust shade of orange to highlight important sections of text in *Writing* (1972), while in *Writing* (1976) McCrimmon chose more subdued colors like olive-green and a deep reddish-brown. This difference in color, as minor a point as it might seem to be, is further evidence of the differences between *Writing* (1972) and *Writing* (1976). The use of a brighter color in *Writing* (1972) was a step towards a more visually articulated textbook. *Writing* (1976) was a reiteration of this use of typography (visual-alphabetic as a hybrid mode) through the greater use of colored font. But, on the other hand, *Writing* (1976) was also a pull back from the bright of visibility of *Writing* (1972) in the use of a darker, more subdued color that is closer to the black of traditional print than the orange of *Writing* (1972) was.

McCrimmon's use of margin titles, akin to sub-headings, that ran alongside important paragraphs of *Writing* (1972) were now eliminated, and this also suggests a reversal of *Writing* to a more traditional format. The in-chapter exercises that marked the conclusion of each sub-heading were still demarcated from the rest of the instructional text through the use of dividers, but now these dividers were in the margins of the text. Aside from "Exercise"

mentioned in the margins, this instructional apparatus was not as clearly demarcated as it was in *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972). It is for these reasons that McCrimmon's new format, language, and tone seemed to revert back to a more traditional and academically oriented format. *Writing* (1972) was perceived as being oversimplified and McCrimmon's reversal to a more serious, academic appearance with *Writing* (1976) might have been a response to this perception. *Writing* (1976) had a form that exuded an academic seriousness as *multi-media* was fading to the background, and *Writing* (1976) revived the many prominent characteristics of its previous form for which it was always known.

The deployment of the visual mode continues in the assignments that functionally focus on creating rhetorical awareness and the writing process through reflective assignments. These assignments appear throughout parts one, two, and three, and these assignments continue to be enhanced by the visual mode as in *Writing* (1972). However, the number of visuals included in *Writing* (1976) was marginally reduced. Older exercises in *Writing*'s (1976) "Getting and Using Materials" chapter were retained that uses two illustrations from which to draw inferences and write thesis statements (36-37) are retained. However, in other assignments that use visuals, McCrimmon either reduced or even eliminated some visuals. The choice of visuals in *Writing* (1976) indicates a more deliberate move towards focusing on the assignments and instructional content per se rather than on critically engaging the students. Of the visuals included, advertisements were the most frequent, followed by a continued use of the mind-maps from the *Writing* (1972) edition. Along with visuals, McCrimmon used words like "puzzles" to describe some assignments, but these are few and are not designed for entertainment as in *Montage*. *Writing* (1976), once

again, demonstrated writing revision using handwritten font akin to a teacher's corrections, but this time McCrimmon replaced the red ink with black ink.

The critically oriented assignments are far and few between, while most of the assignments are reflective and reading-based. Even its few examples are firmly located within the boundaries of Literature. For example, whereas *Writing*'s (1972) "The Critical Essay" section incorporated a TV series as a prompt, *Writing* (1976) now focused on topics from Literature. Even *Writing*'s (1972) long-standing aural assignments on pages 52 and 199 were eliminated in *Writing* (1976). This indicates to me a revised functional aspect where McCrimmon intended to engage the student, focusing only on writing when implementing this material.

This return to academic seriousness is also evident in the level of some of the assignments included. For example, in *Writing*'s (1976) assignment in Part two, "Writing and Rewriting," chapter four "Paragraphs: Units of Development," includes a three-page data table along with the following prompt:

> Study the data in table 4.1, pages 108-111. Make any inference you please from the data and express it as a thesis. Then select the pertinent items and use them to develop your thesis. (109)

In *Writing* (1976) the tone of the instructional content indicates that the work was serious and was located firmly within the walls of the pages of the textbook. Research-based assignments are few, but class discussion is frequently encouraged in *Writing* (1976). However, revisions based on this collaboration were not yet formalized in these collaborative assignments.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1976)

What I had noted as McCrimmon's return to the academic style in *Writing* (1976) Connors sees as the textbook taking on a conservative tone that reflected the general trend of how writing was evolving overall ("Shaping Tools" 108). Here Connors argued that the Current-Traditional was more "traditional" than "current" ("Current-Traditional Rhetoric" 214) and Connors's commentary on the *Writing* (1976) summed up the general perception of it.

I would argue that once touched by the multi-media approach, the form that *Writing* (1976) assumed by this time became the forerunner to the modern composition textbooks that we know and use today. Technology, particularly mechanization in publishing of textbooks, has influenced the extent to which the visual and the alphabetic modes are deployed in textbooks today. Nonetheless, as I see it, the essence of the composition textbook today closely resembles *Writing* (1976).

Writing with a Purpose, Seventh Edition (1980)

(Author) Intention in *Writing* (1980)

In the preface of *Writing* (1980), McCrimmon reiterated the philosophy that defined the previous editions, which was "the theme of purpose, the emphasis on prewriting and revision" (xii). Here McCrimmon drew greater attention to the process of writing as being viewed as a "set of interrelated decisions about what the author wants to say about a subject in a given situation and how that best can be said for the kind of reader being addressed" (xii). In *Writing* (1980) McCrimmon continued to state his intention of wanting to engage the student in the processes of writing, from start to end, from getting the students to discover basic concepts inductively, which in turn involved students analyzing writings and discussing

their opinions among themselves, to highlighting the importance of these observations and inferences.

Writing (1976) had shown a shift from the *multi-media* inspired approach that began in *Writing* (1967) and continued in *Writing* (1972), to a more conservatively academic format of its earlier days while retaining a bit of its past. The changes that McCrimmon made in *Writing* (1980) align with this overall idea of a new type of traditional textbook format and each chapter shows McCrimmon's stated purpose in different ways. These shifts focus on the mechanics of writing, and the related challenges that emerge in the classroom. For example, McCrimmon pointed to chapter three where a new section on thesis statements was added. McCrimmon saw the developing of thesis statements as, "probably the most difficult to teach to a composition class, chiefly because each thesis is a unique discovery and can be discussed only in relation to the information from which it emerges" (xiii). Thesis writing is something that is challenge in even today's writing class and by devoting an entire chapter to it, McCrimmon has shown that not only is *Writing* (1980) is again for the teacher (as well as the student), but that *Writing* (1980) defined the role of textbooks, in general, in no uncertain terms. McCrimmon was giving the teachers an instructional text so that they could *teach* the students what the students needed to learn in the academic setting.

The dividing of the chapter on style into "tone" and "style" is again a modification that seems aimed at making the teaching of writers' attitudes on subjects and the readers "more convenient" (xiii). McCrimmon, for the first time, displayed the struggles that author intention faces when it meets other forces that act upon textbook content implementation. One such reluctant shift was replacing "informal" with "moderate" in the section on style. McCrimmon clarified:

> [*I*]*nformal* sometimes evokes a negative reaction leading to the assumption that only a formal style is appropriate in an English class. Since such an unjustifiable assumption undermines any sensitive approach to stylistic choices, I have attempted to by-pass it by inviting more favorable connotation of *moderate*. (xiii)

This shows that the shift to the academic, while acknowledging the shifting realities of the writing classroom as seen in the *Writing* (1976), continued in *Writing* (1980). Through *Writing* (1980), McCrimmon continued to present the intent of *Writing with a Purpose* as academic and located this firmly in the reality of the writing classroom.

(Instructional Content) Implementation of *Writing* (1980)

In the opening lines of *Writing* (1980), McCrimmon once again addressed the student from the vantage point of the understanding instructor who is concerned with the development of the students' critical thinking as the purpose of writing (3). These five lines are the start of the instructional material in *Writing* (1980). McCrimmon then began the instructional content with excerpts from an interview with a writer, and the assignments that followed focused on reading and on reflection-based assignments. A typical exercise question is formatted in the following format: [Step A: Consider the reading or some aspect of the reading] + [Step B: some action that must be done by the student on the reading] + [Step C: discuss the result of Step B].

The level of student engagement in *Writing* (1980) is marginally maintained; overall McCrimmon used a more formal approach. The high volume of selected readings continued in *Writing* (1980), and the previous use of multicolored inks to differentiate between the

theoretical inputs and the readings, was done away with. The use of multiple colored ink was only retained to differentiate among instructional content, the exercise prompts, and discussion prompts. The use of other visual modes in instructional material continued, and aside from the visuals that marked the opening of each new chapter, all other images had a specific instructional function. As in previous editions that used images as an important accompaniment to the assignments, McCrimmon used cartoons, advertisements, and diagrams to illustrate the lesson.

As in the previous editions, *Writing* (1980) focuses its critical essay section on Literature because McCrimmon believed that "the favorite subject for critical essays in an English class is literature, this chapter will be limited to that subject" (269). McCrimmon does not explain how he came to this assumption, but his meaning is clear. McCrimmon retained the inclusion of critical thinking, reading, and writing, but approached these functions from a clearly academic perspective. Student engagement as a means to this critical reflection was no longer as important as it previously was.

(External) Perception of *Writing* (1980)

Writing (1980) had pretty much established *Writing* as a textbook series that belonged to an academic and somewhat traditional approach to writing pedagogy. By this time, *Writing* had a place of universal agreement or at the very least, a place for institutional respect as a long-standing textbook. Connors pointed to *Writing*'s (1980) physical brilliance along with the "classical severity" of *Writing*'s (1980) cover, making this textbook seem that it had indeed weathered, survived, and thrived in the face of all these shifts. This is what Connors described as this edition of *Writing*'s (1980) "magisterial place" among other

textbooks ("Shaping Tools" 109). Adding to Connors' summary of *Writing* (1980), I add that *Writing* (1980) not only proved its longevity, but also cemented the form that several conservative writing textbooks were to take on in the succeeding decades until our own time. In that sense, *Writing* (1980) is a link that on the one end connects the beginnings of the shift from product- to process-based writing pedagogy back in the 50s and 60s, while at the other end it connects to the modern forms of instructional content in modern-day composition textbooks. In that sense, *Writing* (1980) is an important link in this evolutionary trajectory.

Framework Analysis of *Writing,* 1950 (Appendix 4.1):

Given that *Writing* (1950) was a noticeable part of the shifting paradigm in the 1950s, the parallels between the approach of the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973 and *Writing* (1950) is not hard to see. However, this similarity has more to do with the degrees of significance *Writing* (1950) had on its time just as the multi-media textbooks of the 60s and 70s impacted their moment. Functionally, *Writing* (1950) focused on knowledge convention, rhetorical knowledge, and the writing process. Almost all the content in *Writing* (1950) is reading-based, and even in the few instances where assignments ask students to reflect, these reflections are based on the textbook's in-text readings. In terms of the media deployed as modes, *Writing* (1950) stays within the alphabetic mode and the presence of any other modes like the visual and the aural are restricted to a few diagrams and one implied reference to the aural mode. All in all, *Writing* (1950) is a radical textbook for its time, and *Writing*'s (1950) nature and degree of modality does reflect the shifts that McCrimmon perceived as paradigmatic then. However, despite this close alignment between author intention and

content implementation, *Writing* (1950) is not highly modal, nor does it show a variation in its modality.

Framework Analysis of *Writing* (1957) (Appendix 4.2):

The Framework analysis of *Writing* (1957) illustrates how little this edition had shifted away from *Writing* (1950) when it comes to the larger scheme of *Writing*. There are hints to the use of multiple modalities like the aural mode and as with the first edition this mode was called upon once throughout *Writing* (1957) (212), making the impact of multiple modes of little pedagogical consequence to the instructional content. As in the first edition, *Writing* (1957) varied marginally on the form dimensions. It remained static on the Functional dimension as the critical thinking, reading, and writing functions are negligible, as well as largely implied in *Writing* (1957). This translates into an almost similar Framework spread for both *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957).

Framework Analysis of *Writing* (1963) (Appendix 4.3):

The textbook analysis of *Writing* (1963) indicates that not only did McCrimmon intend to move away from the previous formats of *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957), but that he also tried to realize this shift by reorganizing *Writing*'s (1963) instructional matter. This McCrimmon did in content and structure, making *Writing* (1963) more direct in the functions it fulfilled and in the forms it revised for the ease of use. However, while such was McCrimmon's stated intention, the shifts were once again very marginal. Therefore, analyzing *Writing* (1963) using the Function & Form Framework shows that McCrimmon's

cautious shifts away from the previous patterns fail to register against the function and form paradigms of the Framework as different from *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957).

Once again, as with the Framework analysis for *Writing* (1950) and *Writing* (1957), the aural mode is included once similar to *Writing* (1957). In a textbook that has almost consistently hovered around the 500 pages, one instance of using a mode does not register on my analysis using the Framework because innovative as it is, such an assignment does risk getting overlooked. That is why, as with the previous editions, *Writing* (1963) has a low spread that in turn means a low degree and nature of modality incorporated in the implementation of the textbook.

Framework Analysis of *Writing* (1967) (Appendix 4.4):

Mapping *Writing* (1967) on the Function & Form Framework shows the first move away from the previous patterns established by the editions from 1950, 1957, and 1963. *Writing* (1967) edition used multiple modes and had a more varied form of instructional content. These shifts in modes and instructional content correspond to a perceptible increase in the functional goals of the textbook. This is evident in the increase in the assignments that deploy multiple modes and forms from 1-2 to 7-10 occurrences. As an example, the number of visuals in *Writing* (1963) was four. In *Writing* (1967) these became seven, excluding the use of difference in print and fonts to highlight different sources of sample texts.

These shifts, however, must not be seen as a sweeping change across *all* modalities in *Writing* (1967). For example, the occurrence of the aural assignment continued with only one prompt focused on pronunciation. Overall, *Writing*'s (1967) degree and nature of modality is not very different from previous editions, but as slight as these changes are, they *are* there,

and, as I argued in the analysis section, their inclusion is important. The approach that incorporated the use of multiple modalities as seen in the multi-media moment was influencing a traditionally defined, successfully running textbook like *Writing.* Therefore, I have marked these changes in white dots.

Framework Analysis of *Writing* (1972) (Appendix 4.5):

As I examined the instructional content of *Writing* (1972), I found that the parallels between the multi-media textbooks and *Writing* as a series of textbooks were clear. These similarities were in the author intention that aimed for student engagement and in a greater focus on reflective, critical, and meaningful engagement. There seems to be stated and unstated acknowledgements by McCrimmon, in *Writing* (1972), of these changes. Yet, *Writing* (1972) does not redefine itself in a way that matches the truly multi-media textbooks like *Montage* or *Here and Now.* This is why I believe that *Writing* remained firmly in the conservative group of textbooks.

Writing (1972) was seen as simplified, yet despite this perception, the analysis of its instructional content through the Function & Form Framework shows that the function and form dimensions were greatly enhanced. To reiterate, these shifts are not so much in their greater frequency, but in the role that these inclusions play in the textbook's overall instructional goals. A whole row of visually delivered reading-based content that addresses the entire range of functions, from knowledge of convention to critical reading, thinking, and writing, are now additionally addressed in sufficient measure along with the alphabetic modes.

To sum up, there is an effect of the multi-media moment on *Writing* (1972), yet to say that this textbook was on par on a multi-media genre of textbooks would be pushing the limits of what this textbook could achieve in the hands of the inexperienced instructor wanting to teach a multi-media writing course. I believe that while *Writing* (1972) definitely responded to the shifts in the multi-media moment if only to keep up and remain in circulation, *Writing* (1972) stayed within the boundaries of a traditional textbook. This *Writing* (1972) was innovative by its own standards and defined what was to come in its own way.

Framework analysis of *Writing* (1976) (Appendix 4.6):

Writing (1976) was to a large extent a return to the academic and traditional format from where it had departed starting with *Writing* (1963). Yet, there is an unmistakable shift towards the same influences that would shape the modern-day manifestation of composition studies. *Writing* as a textbook series had retained a sense of the tradition it by the 70s was well-known for while it redefined that tradition in textbooks just enough to retain its old flavor, pushing the boundary of the traditional textbook outward.

Mapping *Writing* (1976) on the Function & Form Framework shows that *Writing* (1976) addressed the range of functions that the more traditional textbooks focused on knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, and writing processes in particular. Even concerning the forms of instructional content, *Writing* (1976) focused on reading-based and, to a lesser extent, reflective assignments. These readings came largely from Literature and even the few examples of critically oriented assignments drew from the discipline, not from the experiences of the students or the world at large. *Writing* (1976) deployed the alphabetic

and visual modes, but entirely did away with the aural modes of previous editions. *Writing* (1976) returned to the past, but, I would argue, redefined the past in its own subtle way.

Framework Analysis of *Writing* (1980) (Appendix 4.7):

Writing (1980) cemented a return to the traditional that had begun with *Writing* (1976). The shifts in *Writing* (1980) seem to me to be more a formality and therefore do not impact the mapping of *Writing* (1980) on the Function and Form Framework in terms of its spread. *Writing* (1980) addressed the same range of functions as *Writing* (1976) did. These were knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, and writing process functions. *Writing* (1980) used the alphabetic and visual modes while once again largely focusing on reading-based instructional content along with a significant, perhaps lesser, presence of reflective content. As *Writing* (1976) did, *Writing* (1980) also kept the modes deployed to the alphabetic and the visual.

Conclusion of the Textbook Analysis III:

The purpose of this textbook analysis was to trace the evolution of *Writing with a Purpose* from 1950-1980 to track the effect of the multi-media moment of the late 60s and early 70s on the intention, implementation, and perception of a traditional textbook. *Writing with a Purpose* under McCrimmon was a paradox. As a textbook series, *Writing* was recognized as a traditional textbook, but one that began by establishing a new orientation to writing instruction. It marked the move of writing pedagogy from being entirely product based to acknowledging the new purpose approach to writing in *Writing* (1950). In that sense *Writing with a Purpose* (1950) marked the beginnings of the composition textbook today.

Even though the editions show an overall "rigidification" in their form, *Writing with a Purpose* recorded the impact of the multi-media moment of the late 60s and early 70s.

In terms of the intention, perception, and implementation aligning across the seven editions of *Writing*, the picture is complex, so I begin with intention. In a speech given by McCrimmon in 1971 that was documented in the 1977 *CCC* February issue, McCrimmon stated that students need to be able to reflect on a subject "before and after it is developed into an essay" (94). McCrimmon's views as recorded through interviews, speeches, and presentations echo his desire to understand the student and more importantly in this context, to represent the textbook as second to the texts produced by the students (K. Miller 61). At the same time McCrimmon expressed his concern at the instructor's dependency on the textbook (Connors, 103; K. Miller 69). K. Miller gives several examples of McCrimmon's voicing of these concerns where McCrimmon referred specifically to the "untrained graduate students without experience" who, according to McCrimmon, "had no idea what besides the textbook to teach" (K. Miller 113). McCrimmon's acts of trying to directly engage the student sympathetically, as seen in the preface of *Writing* (1967), or demystifying the writing process of the professional writer, as he did in *Writing* (1972), speak directly to this intention. Further, McCrimmon added student essays with their imperfections in an effort to reconcile heavily theoretical scholarship with the idea that the textbook was an effective teaching aid in a writing class. However, the alignment is not quite as straightforward between intention and implementation on the one side and how it was perceived on the other side.

Perception was, for the most part, restricted to what those outside the production of the textbook had to say about the instructional content of the textbook. The trajectory of *Writing*'s instructional content implementation is an illustration of the contrary forces that act

on a textbook author. For instance, McCrimmon claimed and attempted to redefine composition textbook instruction to "move the student through the freshman course with credit and honor" (Ohmann 145). Yet, McCrimmon was criticized by Wiener in 1975 for using vocabulary, syntax, and content that were not in keeping with either the abilities of the average writing student, or the then-current interests of the student (28-29). Connors later criticized *Writing* for what he saw as the simplification of the later editions of this 30-year period as a lowering of standards ("Shaping Tools" 107). Others saw *Writing with a Purpose*'s increasingly direct approach as a strength. Irrespective of the varied perceptions, *Writing with a Purpose* was a textbook that was noticed, even if by its absence. Scholars like Shannon Burns et al. and Larson noted the absence of the *Writing with a Purpose*'s latest edition in *An Annotated Bibliography of Texts on Writing Skills*, making Burns' bibliography suspect because of it (97). Such was the presence of *Writing* as a textbook series.

Regarding the shifts in instructional content implementation in *Writing* over the three decades, the trajectory that emerges is one that begins with implementation meeting intention. But as the influences from without impact McCrimmon's intentions and implementation differently, the alignment between intention and implementation move apart. These intentions and implementations have been further examined against the external perceptions of those who analyzed *Writing* during and after their time of publication. Based on the analysis, I propose that the multi-media moment of the 60s and 70s not only impacted the implementation of *Writing,* but in a sense separated McCrimmon's intention and his implementation into parallel paths. In the 1976 and 1980 editions of *Writing,* McCrimmon held on to the ideas that defined the editions during the multi-media moment, as seen in *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972). As McCrimmon held on to these intentions, he also

reverted to the more traditional implementation when putting together these later editions of *Writing with a Purpose*.

To present an illustration of this recorded impact, I refer to the Function & Form Framework analysis where all the seven tables are mapped together (table 14). As the Framework shows, *Writing* (1972) ventured deepest into uncharted multi-media territory, for *Writing* as a series, until that point. The function of *Writing* (1972) now expanded to not only focus on knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, and writing processes but to also include critical thinking, reading, and writing. Additionally, on the form side, *Writing* (1972) had instructional content that alphabetically covered the entire spectrum of reading, reflecting, research, and collaborative or feedback-based content. Before *Writing* (1967), instructional content was primarily reading-based and reflective in its content. *Writing* (1972) was bolder with its enhanced use of the visual mode along with the use of the aural mode as they increased in quantity and relevance to the instructional content. Even though this was a marginal increase, it suggests McCrimmon's attempt, however cautious, to incorporate multiple modes to teach writing. Some of these changes in the 1967 and 1972 editions stayed in the 1976 and 1980 editions like student engagement and reflection-based assignments along with the use of visual and alphabetic modes remained. However, the return of tradition in *Writing* was dominant enough to keep the textbook from committing to a multi-media approach wholeheartedly. This moment of *impact* between tradition and the multi-media, as seen in *Writing*'s 30-year trajectory, resulted in a hybridity that ensured *Writing*'s lasting presence as a textbook for composition.

Table 14 : Consolidated Framework Mapping of *Writing with a Purpose*, 1950-1980.

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		✓	✓	
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	✓	○	✓	
	Reading Centered	✓	●	●	✓
Alphabetic	Feedback	✓		✓	
	Research	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Reflective	●	●	●	✓
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	✓
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

✓ Additions in the 1967 and 1972 editions

● Significant evidence available to validate in all editions

○ Partial evidence available to validate in all seven editions

The formalization of tone, style, and language that reverted *Writing* (1980) to a more formal, student-teacher relationship giving *Writing* (1980) a traditional *feel* that would remain. This would, in part, drown out the critical engagement functions that McCrimmon wanted to retain. McCrimmon's continued use of Literature throughout the editions is according to Sharon Crowley, symbolic of the traditional essence of *Writing* that in turn makes it come across as a predominantly reading-based textbook, rather than reflective or critically motivated. This is why even though McCrimmon's intentions kept pace with the larger forces that were defining, or at the very least influencing, writing pedagogy of the late 60s and early 70s, *Writing with a Purpose* expressed itself in a manner that was mostly reading-based, with some reflective-based content thrown in. All of these instructional forms were articulated through alphabetic and visual modes and were centered mostly on functions other than critical thinking, reading, and writing.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

The essence of my argument is that the concept of *multimodality* must be understood as the use of media as multiple modes that work towards pedagogical value-addition, as opposed to the use of media as mechanical conveniences. Furthermore, the decisions that pertain to the *multimodality* of a course, a textbook, or even an assignment critically depends the following factors:

- The intentions of the creators of the materials,
- The implementations of these *multimodal* intentions in the context within which these intentions must operate, and
- The perception of users of these materials, that is, teachers and students alike.

While this has been the theoretical focus of this dissertation, the functional goal is empowering teachers of writing so they may make these distinctions independently in order to effectively use media as modes. This dissertation aims to do this by giving the teachers a means to enable this process.

The importance of this dissertation is probably best understood in the absence of both the theoretical definition of *multimodality* as a concept as I have established here, as well as the Framework that I have designed to allow instructors to apply this theory in the reality of their pedagogical workings. I believe ignoring these will lead the *casualties* of a misinformed, or at the very least, intellectually outdated approach to *multimodality* in composition. Other risks include a general inability among students to comprehend the affordances of the various modes available to them. I believe that as a consequence of this inability both students and teachers will eventually become demotivated. Asides from this

loss in motivation, there are other possible repercussions that I believe are far more serious like the silencing of student voices that fail to find articulation through the mainstream modes of instruction. I return to Yumani Davis's 2005 study that focused on student voices that are silenced when the *normalization cues*, or the tendency to accept a singular, western notion of *multimodality* without consciousness or question as Davis termed them, drown out the non-western, non-mainstream multimodalities that could otherwise give voice to those outside of the mainstream culture (ii). I would argue that when we understand *multimodality* as function and form, particularly as constructed, articulated, and translated through intention, implementation, and perception, we, as teachers of instruction, begin to notice, even seek out, modalities that would otherwise escape us.

The Framework also works to enable such an inclusion, provided the instructor re-adjusts the function and form dimensions according to a clear function and form vision that the instructor has for the course. The Framework can be, actually it must be, customized based on the requirements of the students, the teachers, and the course. When our theoretical approach to *multimodality* is redefined, then our ability to define our own media as modes also becomes a possibility.

If this understanding of *multimodality* is ignored, it is not just the students, but even writing instructors wishing to engage multimodally with the students who lose out. In their edited collection, Betty Pytlik and Sarah Liggett examine the process of training writing teachers. In this collection is an essay by Kathleen Blake Yancy where she refers to Raymond Williams as he talked about the role of key words in defining our pedagogical approaches to writing and their significance in the professional development *and* empowerment of writing teachers (73). Along with this theoretical understanding, Michael C.

Flanigan saw the need to "work actively with ideas, concepts, and strategies" that will help in the training process for teachers (243). I propose that the significance of key words and concepts, as well as the ideas, concepts, and strategies that William and Flanigan call for, are addressed through the theoretical and analytical approaches of this dissertation.

This focus on theoretical clarity and pragmatic ability, when adopting a multimodal approach to teaching writing, applies to multiple levels of composition studies, from designing multimodal composition courses at large to the selection process of the composition textbook that must accompany multimodal courses. In 1981, Smith William Howard reiterated NCTE's call that "a written policy concerning textbook procedures be developed and promulgated to the public" (6) to enable easier textbook selection processes. To do this, a textbook and a course must be matched based on a core function that can be conveyed in ways best suited to the instructor's vision. Currently there is no written procedure or set of criteria that instructors can refer to while selecting a textbook, leaving many instructors at a loss (Smith i). I believe that the greatest risk of not acknowledging the ideas I present are distorted expectations from multimodal composition courses that are based on such textbooks. For those who would like to use a multimodal textbook in their writing class, as conceptually defined here, they must first understand a multimodal composition textbook in these terms of the media used as modes versus media used as media. This will enable instructors to distinguish between forms of content and the function of these forms as distinct from mode(s) of implementation.

In a 2010 interview conducted by Brian Bailie, Selfe argued that if teachers did not distinguish between *multimodality* and *multimedia*, this could result in teachers avoiding multimodality, which is a loss for both students and teachers. Instructors who are unable to

understand *multimodality* as a concept, which is distinct from the digital technologies that have come to define it, are unable to see *multimodality* as anything other than these digital technologies. Such a perspective, as I see it, is prohibitive in some crucial ways. Selfe pointed out that such a misconception would push teachers to consider *multimodality* as outside of their responsibilities as teachers of the alphabetic mode and stay away from it. Such an outlook, according to Selfe, is due to the "fear of the task of learning technologies" that puts instructors off the whole concept of *multimodality* in the composition classroom (qtd. in Bailie). Selfe imagines a scenario where a teacher who does not realize that *multimodality* is the use of multiple modes, even non-digital ones, will close the door to non-Western and non-mainstream modalities that instructors could have ready access to in their classrooms. Such teachers who are

> [S]tymied by the realization that they will never master technology, and that they'll never get to where they're comfortable with it because they recognize the pace of technological change is so fast that they don't have enough time in the day to become expert in it, and they don't see how they could teach it without becoming expert in it. (Selfe qtd. in Bailie)

This causes such teachers to lose out on possibilities that could very well define our notions of *multimodalities* in ways as yet unimagined.

The second risk of being unable to understand *multimodality* as conceptually distinct from the digital technologies is, as I see it, the opposite of the previous one. Here an instructor who has a flair for technology is so dazzled by the medium itself that he or she fails to incorporate the intention that defines the use of multiple modes in the implementation of the material. The danger, in my opinion, is greater here because without a clear

understanding of how *multimodality* is defined by more than the use of digital technologies, the perception that the course is a multimodal one will be faulty. The student and the teacher remain under the false notion that what they are sharing is a multimodal pedagogical approach, just as the teacher intends. However, when such a course is implemented, the skills inculcated in such a course will fail to inculcate the ability to critically engage with the *texts* that are the real-life experiences of these students. The intention that defines the reason for *multimodality* is therefore lost.

Selfe herself admits to such moments and by including herself she opens the question to all of us. She reflects,

> I sometimes fail to understand that my focus on technology – *in and of itself* - sometimes blinds me to a critical understanding, of how that technology functions within our culture, and in the material lives of real students, and real teachers. We can all lose sight of that in our own enthusiasm. (qtd. in Bailie)

Y. David's concern is just one example of how both these scenarios can play out with the same result, where silencing the possibilities of modalities that are rich but that are outside of the present western notions of *multimodality* happen. Therefore, like the New London Group and Selfe, I too argue that there are many ways to make meaning and to be *multimodal.* This, I argue, will open us up to seeing the affordance in all kinds of resources easily accessible to us in our classrooms. However, it is *only* when we understand the concept of *multimodality* in those terms that such a shift can really begin to occur, and we present means through which such distinctions can be illustrated. Selfe, Kress, Leeuwen, and Lemke, to name a few, have all made the point that I reiterate here: if we are to be effective teachers of composition,

which means inculcating critical thinking, careful reading, and context-driven, clear writing, we must know the tools with which we are working.

Each of these multiple media that have the potential to become modes, have their own affordances, and reveal capabilities that shape expression in unique ways. In the interview Selfe articulated an idea that value the affordances of various camouflaged modes around us. Selfe argued, "it doesn't matter how important your rhetorical purpose is or how focused your rhetorical intent is or how keen your rhetorical understanding is, you have to know how to work with the tools" (qtd. in Bailie). I interpret Selfe's logic as that unless we know the affordances of the media, expertly, we will not be able to deploy these media as modes effectively. In essence, if we are to foster critical thought, and help *all* our students find a voice, then we must be able to distinguish between our forms from our functions. Also, we must be creative and *open-minded* when considering which modes are available *outside* of digital and Western notions of technologies as possible modes.

My research explains the concepts of *multimodality* as distinct from the use of multimedia, particularly in the composition textbook. Using terms from Cheryl Ball, this dissertation is "*scholarship about new media,* which uses print conventions such as written text as the main mode of argument" to talk about "*new media scholarship,* which uses modes other than only written text to form an argument" (404). I use *multi-media*, as it was used in the late 60s and early 70s, as more akin to our modern-day notion of the *multimodal*. Further, I see the relationship between *multi-media* and *multimedia* as akin to that of the *multimodal* and multimedia (technologies). I argue that in the case of the writing textbooks, as evidenced in the first new genre of multi-media writing textbooks that emerged between 1968-1973, the notion of *multi-media* was based on a composite of intention, implementation, and

perception. These come together to address multiple functions in different forms of modes used and instructional content included in the textbooks. This dissertation:

- Educates the writing instructor about *multimodality* as distinct from *multimedia,* where the multiple uses of media as modes are defined by author/teacher intention, implementation of the instructional content, and the external perception of the user and/or the reviewer.
- Empowers the writing instructor, through facilitating an independent and relatively quick assessment of the degree and the nature of a teaching resource's modality, which in this case is the composition textbook.

The three textbook analysis chapters each dealt with one aspect of understanding *multimodality* in multimodal writing textbooks. Textbook Analysis I examined author intention and implementation, as it defined the range of multimodality in the familiar genre of the writing textbook. (Author) intention of a multi-media textbook showed common characteristics, like focus on meaningful, critical consciousness based on real-life experiences, and a stated movement away from knowledge of convention functions. This intention remained constant, but what defined a multi-media textbook as modally "high" or "low" and "varied" or "uniform" was how these authors implemented the instructional content. Textbook Analysis II showed that this common intention resulted in the emergence of several texts that challenged the conventions that we recognize as a textbook along with challenging traditional writing pedagogy. It is significant that, despite a variety of interpretations of *multimodality* in an instructional text, the external perception that defined these texts *as textbooks* speaks back to our modern sense of textbooks, multimodal or otherwise. Textbook Analysis III showed how such shifts towards the multimodal approach

to teaching writing, slight as they might have been in the 60s and 70s, was palpable enough to influence successful traditional textbooks like *Writing with a Purpose.* The take away from Textbook Analysis III, besides reiterating the ideas of this project, is that the modern-day composition textbook in its most common form is very similar to the hybrid version of the traditional and non-traditional textbooks of the 60s and 70s as manifested in *Writing* 1967 and 1972.

The three textbook analyses began with three questions in chapter two:

- ***Question #1:*** *If the use of multiple (digital) modes to teach composition happened before the introduction of the term* multimodal *in writing in the 60s and 70s, then how was the intentionality of this use of multiple modes to fulfill a pedagogical purpose articulated in the late 60s and early 70s writing classroom? Also, how did this intention manifest in writing textbooks from 1968-1973?*
- ***Question #2****: If the use of multiple modes was seen in the writing textbooks of 1968-1973 (Palmeri; Jasken), then what role did the period of the late 60s and early 70s play in defining how multiple modes were used in textbooks? Also, how did the very concept of the writing textbook as a set of conventions for a writing class get challenged?*
- ***Question #3****: If the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973 were perceived as motivating and engaging to the students, then how did this perception influence the successful yet traditional textbooks of the 60s and 70s?*

Responding to the Questions from the Textbook Analyses:

Before responding to these questions, I must mention that my responses bear in mind the reflections from the 60s and 70s, as seen chapter two, but also contextualize the main take-aways towards the future, where this study is oriented. Another important point that must be kept in mind, going forward, is that the Framework analyses that informed my perception of the instructional content in these chapters came from my vantage point as a writing instructor. I used the Framework to do two things:

- Illustrate modality in the instructional content implementation of these textbooks as a composite of form and function from the vantage point of the 60s and 70s, which is why the dimensions of the Framework are based on parameters largely defined by notions that defined writing in the 60s and 70s.
- Demonstrate how an instructor of writing may use the Framework to assess and evaluate any writing textbook, based on how they envision the functions as well as the forms they would like to deploy.

Question #1: *If the use of multiple (digital) modes to teach composition happened before the introduction of the term* multimodal *in writing in the 60s and 70s, then how was the intentionality of this use of multiple modes to fulfill a pedagogical purpose articulated in the late 60s and early 70s writing classroom? Also, how did this intention manifest in writing textbooks from 1968-1973?*

Response #1: In light of a still developing vocabulary to articulate these shifting trends towards the use of multiple modes in the 60s and 70s writing classroom, the term *multi-media* from the 60s and 70s is akin to the term *multimodal*. This kinship is based on a similar intention that seeks to engage and empower the students.

In the 1971 textbook review issue of *CCC,* Ebbitt summarized the multimodal course as one where the student-teacher relationship was redefined so that the teacher was no longer the source of all, the possessor of absolute knowledge. Instead the teacher was now a resource that students could look to as they collaborated with each other as fellow writers. The readings upon which the instructional content focused shifted, from being almost entirely canonical works of Literature, to readings that were based on the real-life experiences of the students outside the classrooms. Functionally, the goal moved away from enhancing knowledge of convention to critical thinking, where answers were neither ready-made, nor easy to find.

This idea of engaging the student and of inculcating critically inspired writing motivated the authors of these multi-media textbooks. The shift in instructional content implementation in traditional textbooks showed signs of the *multi-media* influenced on them, particularly in author intent. This is seen in *Writing with a Purpose* (1967) and *Writing with a Purpose* (1972) where we find McCrimmon's efforts to engage with the students in ways that are oriented towards a multi-media approach. While the intention of the multi-media textbook authors remained steady, through the reiteration of common words like "motivation," "engagement," "awareness," and "reflection," the instructional implementation of these articulated intentions varied. The nature and degree of the textbook's modality varied from both within the conventions of a textbook and from outside of these conventions. Several textbooks from 1968-1973 that were analyzed and mapped on to the Framework and a range of modalities emerged. Of all these textbooks from 1968-1973 *Montage* and *Here and Now* most clearly varied in their multimodality, while *Words, Self, Reality* and *Student Voices* were textbooks that interpreted their multi-media intentions in relatively lower

degrees of multimodality. Other textbooks that were analyzed, but not included in this analysis (Appendix 1), hovered around these ends or scattered themselves along a spectrum.

To be sure, all of these textbooks were multimodal in that they incorporated the use of multiple modes and forms of instructional contents to fulfill a range of functions. Yet, the difference is in how these authors chose to stimulate their students, either visibly through the textbooks as seen in *Montage,* or through a more visually understated textbook like *Student Voices* that persuaded the student to move outside the textbook. Of note here is that function, as articulated by author intention, defined the *multi-media* impetus in textbooks like *Mixed Bag, Course X, Ways of Seeing* and *The Comp Box.* These textbooks stood out even amongst multi-media textbooks because in them innovation extended into form of convention of textbooks, as a concept, as well.

It is important to recall the distinction between technology as a medium and technology as a mode as it manifested in these multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973. Technology as *multi-media* (where the medium is the mode) as everything from the introduction of visuals and images in textbooks to the use of typography where print *was* art; it could consist of prompts using the television and movies to the use of the Xerox machine. These multi-media textbooks of 1968 to 1973 demonstrated that technology was a mode when it opened up new possibilities for students and teachers in the process of writing. As the Framework illustrates, the multi-media textbook was *not* defined only by the technology (as medium) it employed alone, but by the functions towards which the textbook used technology (as mode). In the late 60s and early 70s, *multimodal* as a term did not exist, and it was author intention that not only connected all these textbooks, but author intention also connects *multi-media* to our notion of *multimodality* today.

This textbook analysis further informs our concepts of *multimodality* and *multimedia* at any scale. This means that irrespective of our roles as compositionists, our understanding of *multimodality* and *multimedia* will ensure that multimodality in the classroom is not disguised or sacrificed to the multiple (digital) media that we may have access to, particularly at the cost of becoming unreceptive to alternative, non-western modalities, which might be ours to use.

Question #2*: If the use of multiple modes was seen in the writing textbooks of 1968-1973 (Palmeri; Jasken), then what role did the period of the late 60s and early 70s play in defining how multiple modes were used in textbooks? Also, how did the very concept of the writing textbook as a set of conventions for a writing class get challenged?*

Response #2: The larger social, cultural and political movements of the 60s and 70s resulted in author intention pushing the boundaries of textbook instruction implementation**.** These movements redefined the perception of what a writing textbook could be, rather than should be.

Chapter two articulated the impact of the forces of the late 60s and early 70s on writing pedagogy at the time. The Dartmouth Conference of 1969 acknowledged the push for language as a means of personal growth even if it was not a dominant paradigm. Kress (*The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom; Multimodal Discourse*) believed that pedagogy must always be seen in the light of participatory action. Murray pointed out that it was an undeniable reality that student power and the presence of politics had found their way into the classroom in the 60s and 70s. This action of teaching and learning redefined the role of the student from a submissive consumer to an active producer of texts, and indicated that the text must be created for the student, by the student. This text must be derived from the life, experiences, and voices of the student. Even the textbook reviews and advertisements in the

journals between 1968-1973 showed an increasing visibility of the multi-media approach in writing textbooks, irrespective of the textbooks' dominant mode.

The significance of the multi-media moment of the 60s and 70s is significant to our own present moment. Scholars like Etlinger pointed to the technological shifts that are redefining reading and writing today, particularly in how technology is altering our understanding of form and function in the composition textbook. She questioned the changes in our notions of composition pedagogy in the wake of all these shifts. Etlinger argued that irrespective of the forms of media, composition textbooks are defined by their functions. I add that a multi-media textbook is defined by its intentionality (imagined function), implementation (form that realizes the functions), and perception (how effectively these functions have been articulated).

Sego noted the emergence of this new genre of multi-media textbooks, and, along with Briand, Sego named this new genre of textbooks in recognition of the technologies used to articulate the approach. As Briand and Sego pointed out, technology *was* becoming increasingly visible as the means through which multiple and nontraditional approaches were being brought in the writing classroom. Technology was a defining feature of the multi-media approach, but it was not the only feature. A redefined student-teacher relationship along with the impetus to engage, motivate, stimulate, all except *instruct* the student were the real defining features of the multi-media approach.

The result of this approach was innovative pedagogical instruction that manifested in unusual textbooks redefining the larger notion of how instruction could be delivered. As Sego pointed out the medium of the text(book) itself came to be seen as the message, and, as Palmeri noted, the in terms of the potential for what technology can create. This perspective

can only be truly understood when students experience the affordances of each modality for themselves. These multi-media texts were designed to be experiences that not only claimed a renewed relationship with the students, but enacted this redefined relationship differently.

Kress et al. argued in 2001 that as the use of multiple modes enhances the affordances of each mode used, and this enhanced affordance of each mode in turn has a redefined purpose in the teaching and learning of writing. Consequently, the process is not only altered for the participants of the pedagogical act, students and teachers, but also for teacher and scholars who are reflecting on the process. This enhanced affordance of each mode was to address the "reciprocity of perspectives" (*The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom*), that is, giving the student complete or at the very least a significantly higher degree of control. These multi-media textbooks embodied the participatory action that was a necessity given the presence of the student power at the time. These textbooks served to stimulate students so they could incorporate their own experiences to create critically motivated and socially engaged texts rather than be submissive receptacles of pre-prepared, decontextualized, and (perhaps) irrelevant knowledge.

Question #3: *If the multi-media textbooks of 1968-1973 were perceived as motivating and engaging to the students, then how did this perception influence the successful yet traditional textbooks of the 60s and 70s?*

Response #3: Long-standing, successful traditional textbooks like *Writing with a Purpose* were caught between the push and pull of the conservative versus the avant-garde approach to writing in the 60s and 70s. This push and pull resulted in a hybridity that bears close resemblance to the modern concept of the composition textbook.

Along with the significance of the multi-media textbook as artifacts by themselves, their significance is also measured by their impact on the long-standing, successful traditional textbooks that ran concurrently. *Writing with a Purpose* by McCrimmon was a well-known, traditionally oriented, writing textbook, yet McCrimmon expressed these multi-media influences in 1967 and 1972 editions. However, despite the multi-media leanings of McCrimmon's intentions, he moved *Writing* to the common boundaries of the traditional and *multi-media* but no further. What is important is that multi-media impacted *Writing with a Purpose*'s trajectory as it passed through 1968-1973.

Writing (1950) had already broken new ground by shifting the focus from product to process. Over the next two editions *Writing* (1957) and *Writing* (1963) saw the "rigidification" of *Writing*'s format. *Writing*'s progression through the multi-media moment manifested in clearer articulation of a multi-media authorial intention and an enhanced use of modes other than the alphabetic. As the multi-media moment of the late 60s and early 70s was losing momentum, *Writing* (1976) and *Writing* (1980) returned to the traditional format but with a difference. The return towards the conservative tone of the pre-1963 editions did not go all the way back. There was a return to a formal teacher-student dynamic, but the teacher was no longer authoritarian. The content went back to more reading-based and reflective instructional materials, but the topics included a generous mix of contemporary issues along with the long-running use of Literature in the "Critical Essay" sections. Also, visuals, including photographs, mind-map diagrams, and art/illustrations were cut to the minimum, but were more relevant to the instructional content than in *Writing's* earlier editions.

The fluctuations that *Writing* (1967) and *Writing* (1972) displayed, along with *Writing*'s reversal to a traditional approach in *Writing* (1976) and *Writing* (1980), showed the *multi-media* impact on *Writing*. As a consequence of *Writing*'s tryst with *multi-media* in the late 60s and early 70s, I propose that *Writing* as a textbook became a link between the past and the present, particularly in how it manifested in mainstream writing and composition textbooks.

These textbook analyses show that the idea of *multimodality*, when seen through author intention, intention is just an intention. The implementation of the textbook is what gets tested in the classroom, for that is when form of instructional content and mode must work to realize the author's intention. In other words, when forms of implementation recognize the functions outlined by author intention, the variety defines the multimodality of the textbook. I believe that it is when intention and implementation align, and when various medium become modes, that *multimodality* truly happens. For example, in the case of a textbook, the author's intention to engage the student or move the teacher outside the textbook to critically engage the student does not guarantee *multimodality*. What matters is when this intention is realized in the physical reality of a textbook. For example, McCrimmon displayed an overwhelmingly multimodal intention, yet the seven editions of *Writing* from 1950 to 1980 remained within the cast of a traditional approach *Writing* had set for itself.

These three textbook analyses are located in textbooks of the past, yet they point us in the direction of where we are headed. By understanding *multimodality* as the use of multiple modes, we begin to review pedagogical resources in ways that are defined by the affordances of these resources, and not by what we take as concepts simply handed down to us. The

textbook is a perfect example of such a resource. We need continue to see it as the physical object that we have come to accept it as, but rather in terms a concept that allows for unimaginable redefinition.

Implications:

We have to understand the concept of the multi-media textbook from 1968-1973 from author intention, instructional content implementation, and external perceptions of forms and functions. To be able to appreciate the takeaway of this study, I go back to Journet's experiences and to Selfe's observations of the risks of not understanding *multimodality* as explained here. I believe that the most significant implication of this study is a more nuanced understanding of not just the multimodal composition textbook today, but of composition pedagogy overall. This is particularly relevant at a time when issues of technology have become more palpable either by their abundance or their absence.

Some modern textbooks restrict their use of medium to the liberal use of colored textboxes and multiple images. On the other hand, there are electronic texts that claim to help students pass the course. The point here is that while some of these textbooks may very well be close to what some instructors need and look for, there will be some that do little beyond reiterating a traditional pedagogical paradigm, promising a critical approach to teaching writing through more technologically advanced media. I propose that this analytical approach will greatly filter and therefore differentiate the multimodal composition textbooks from those that are reiterating the conventions, albeit digitally, *under* the misconception of being multimodal.

This study gives us compositionists two things: a critical understanding of *multimodality* in composition pedagogy, particularly in textbooks, and a means that will articulate the concept of *multimodality* in terms of its elements so that we are empowered to harness the possibilities of *true multimodality* for our students. This study lists questions that can guide us when we encounter new media in composition textbooks:

- How innovative is this composition textbook in terms of incorporating modalities from other contexts? How does this textbook push the pedagogical paradigm further?
- How much of the world beyond the classroom, including the students' experiences and lives, does this textbook allow? Are students' experiences merely anecdotal and superficially incorporated in the apparatus of the textbook, or does the book *urge* the student to become critical thinkers by inviting them into the discussion?
- How does this textbook challenge the notion of communication as a means to exchanging ideas? Does this textbook suggest, outline and present various means of communicating so that the students can find the best way to get their ideas out into the world? In other words, does this textbook address the affordances of multiple and perhaps untapped, resources?
- How distracting is the use of technology in the presentation of instructional content of this textbook? In other words, if the glamor of the technological medium is stripped away from this textbook, what are the functions and/or forms left behind?

By seeing *multimodality* as many forms coming together to fulfill many functions, defined by the intention and implementation that engage the students in critical and meaningful ways, *multimodality* as a notion becomes more accessible to many more instructors irrespective of experience, gender, location, and even the extent of the classroom's access to technology. The Framework, on the other hand, enables this realization on a more pragmatic level when an instructor has to make decisions that pertain to choosing multimodal text(books). For instance, imagine an instructor who wishes to teach composition multimodally but is confused by the choices of textbooks available. By using the Framework, the instructor can map some prospective options of textbooks on this Framework to ascertain the degree and nature of a textbook's *multimodality*. Or, for example, an instructor who is faced with the prospect of wanting to teach a multimodal course and is handed a textbook that does not leave much scope or room for the incorporation of multimodality as envisioned by them. Here, the instructor can map the textbook handed to them on the Framework and then mark what the assigned textbook cannot do. The instructor can not only ascertain the textbook's multimodal abilities, but also plan for how to make the course more multimodal.

By understanding *multimodality* in this way and using the Framework to assess the modalities that the instructor is faced with, the instructor is not restricted to any one resource. Instead, by going back to the *concept* of a textbook, rather than the physical object that we understand as the textbook, the instructor can now create their own compilations of variously sourced texts chosen for a function it must fulfill. In short, the multi-sourced conceptual textbook's implementation matches the teacher's intention. Here the teacher is the author of this multimodal course and of this *multimodal textbook*. This concept of a *textbook* is the

cause and effect to the instructors' understanding of *multimodality* as well as the perceived end to which *multimodality* must, and will, be used.

Applications:

The applications of this project are:

- Understanding that technology is not only digital and therefore gauging the affordances of the various non-western and/or non-mainstream modalities that lie outside our current pre-conditioned understanding of *multimodality;* and
- Using the Framework as records of successfully articulated multimodal courses and conceptual *textbooks*, as well as documentation of a nuanced pedagogically relevant skill that adds professional value to our resumes.

"Technology" is not only "Digital"

Any user of composition resources must consider the local realties of each writing class and recognize that the distribution and accessibility to digital technologies in writing courses is not uniform. In situations where teachers do have access to the latest technologies, some teachers could become blinded by the razzle-dazzle of their resources, while teachers without as much access may feel underconfident due to their perceived sense of restricted digital resources and abilities. Conceptually understanding the distinction between *multimedia* and *multimodal* imbues a sense of confidence, as well as humility, in these instructors. This distinction between *multimodal* and *multimedia* will demonstrate that the creative use of various medium as modes widens the scope of the available possibilities through which the teaching and learning of critical writing may be approached in a variety of

local contexts of each writing class, anywhere. When a teacher realizes that media only become mode when media are used for pedagogical value addition, then the focus on digital technologies, or multimedia in a limited sense is gone. When instructors and students begin to see the affordances of the resources they have access to, *all* media, from a pencil to a culturally imbued sound, become potential modes for a *multimodal* approach. Those who have access to the latest technology will realize that just the presence and/or use of media does not indicate a multimodal composition course. And those classes without digital technologies will find that a creative use of an ordinary, non-digital medium can make for a highly multimodal pedagogical experience if the affordances are recognized and harnessed. This understanding makes the teachers and students approach the issue of a multimodal education with a greater sense of reality, irrespective of the degree of access to the latest digital media, or lack thereof.

The challenges of training the TAs who form the main workforce that is assigned the job of teaching first-year writing are not new. Pytlik outlined some strategies that the English departments were resorting to in the 70s as they scrambled to prepare a cohort of TAs to teach first-year writing. Some of these well-received strategies were "class visitations, mentors, apprenticeships, rhetoric courses, group grading of papers, reading assignments from professional journals, student-instructor conferences, and writing about teaching" (Pytlik and Ligget 14). In *Preparing College Teachers* Christine Hult and Lynn Meeks further examined this issue of training teachers specifically in a Web-based classroom for distance learning courses. They found that in order to ensure a successful technology-based teacher education program, one important factor was that teachers had to realize that the medium is not the pedagogy. In as early as 1999 when the term *multimodal* was only about to

make its debut, Paul Privateer urged that the teachers must be able to distinguish between technology that is "focused on the production of intelligence rather than on the storage and recall of random and quickly outmoded information." (60). Privateer examined the role of technology in terms of its influence on "shaping the destiny of higher education" from the perspective of dispelling the notion that teaching with technology involves a new way of teaching and learning. This indicates a growing realization of a conceptual difference, and my project articulates this conceptual difference critically. By applying the ideas as well as the tools towards instructor training, I believe that important steps can be taken towards realizing *multimodality* in composition in a way that incorporates the students' voices but also acknowledges the many local classroom realities.

The Framework as a part of the Teaching Portfolio:

Often the issue of professional development gets little attention in the daily routine of course-related activities and responsibilities. In our focus as teachers, whose primary aim is often our students, finding ways to take care of our own professional development can be challenging and do sometimes get overlooked. Nonetheless, this part of an instructor's persona exercises significant influence over much of what they do and must be addressed as well (Ohmann, *English in America*). This study allows writing teachers to benefit as professionals in two ways:

- By displaying that they have this understanding, particularly in how it translates to analyzing and designing course resources, the teachers can professionally upgrade their skills. This indicates not only a nuanced, critical understanding of a relevant

issue, but also indicates an ability to customize the design of a multimodal course based on the specific requirements of the situation,

- By including Framework analysis of their multimodal courses or textbook analyses in their teaching portfolios, these teachers can visually display their understanding of these concepts and their ability to customize their writing courses across various functional requirements and form constraints. This will make the Framework an immensely attractive feature in their professional resumes, one that works to show case the skills and talents they now possess.

Addressing the Limitation of the Project:

Not only does this dissertation aim to conceptually distinguish between the *multimodal* and *multimedia*, but it also provides the Framework that visually illustrates multimodality as defined by function and form. This Framework's domain elements were based on three studies, which were the WPA Outcomes Statements of 2008, Downs & Wardle's 2007 study, and NLG's 2000 report on *multiliteracy* and *multimodality.* Each of these studies fulfilled a specific function:

- The WPA Outcomes Statement was selected because it accommodated the terms that the textbook and the textbook review analysis presented;
- The NLG report was selected because it was a seminal report on *multimodality* in composition studies that is still relevant; and
- Downs &Wardle's study was selected because this study was also conceptual in its vision.

The limitation of this project is that these studies are in no way final in terms of their scope, particularly when addressing something like *multimodality* in composition studies, nor in terms of how an instructor may envision their multimodal course. The elements along the dimensions of the Framework are within the context of my study. The Framework as an idea is strong in the context of this study, but now it needs testing. I open the field to all who may wish to improve the Framework so that the intent of *multimodality* as a composite of function and form is realized, but in unique and individual ways. The limitation of the Framework is that it is not designed as one-size-fits-all when it comes to how many of us may wish to approach the teaching of a multimodal composition course. Neither does this Framework dictate how instructors should teach their courses, so in that sense it is like the multi-media textbook that provides the resource but leave the instructor free to interpret the use of this resource. At the same time this Framework, with these elements in their dimensional axes, is not designed to accommodate the uniqueness that every instructor brings in the fold of the Framework. To make his Framework adaptable to all kinds of Framework analyses, first, the instructor must understand the concept of *multimodality* as defined by function and form; specifically, the instructor must understand that medium must be mode as defined by intention, implementation, and perception. From this point on every instructor will have the freedom to replace the elements along the function and form dimensions according to their own visions, making this Framework their own.

Another limitation is correlating the Framework as a tangible reality to the intangibility of how new modes will define our process of composition in the future. The Framework was designed by me, in this moment in time. I am limited by what I know and see as possible modes today. This could mean changes in unrecognizable ways in the future.

It is not possible to incorporate these unforeseeable changes in modes, which could potentially make themselves available, into the Framework so that instructors can incorporate them going forward. Once again, the *only* way around this is to find grounding in the core of the argument that *multimodality* is function and form defined through intent, implementation, and perception using media as modes. Once instructors understand this at a fundamental level, they will be able to revise and rework the Framework to create a more relevant tool for their own time, contexts, and spaces.

Going Forward:

Here understanding *multimodality* as distinct from *multimedia* was examined at from the point of view of writing textbooks from 1968-1973, when *multimodality* as a concept first manifested in multi-media textbooks. This study lays the foundations to creating tools that empower instructors to evaluate and measure the degree and type of multimodality of a composition textbook, as well as custom design multimodal courses using this Framework. This Framework is a concept and has proved itself in the context of this study. However, the true measure of any tool's acceptability and longevity lies in the extent to which it is applicable. To this end, it is important to test this Framework in multiple, real-life pedagogical contexts. Connected to this is the idea of using this Framework to reinterpret the idea of a textbook as a concept that involves texts that are put together to collectively meet the needs of a writing course.

Thinking along the lines of the "open-source textbooks" now being actively examined as an effective, financially friendly, and pedagogically more relevant option to the older idea of a formal text*book*, the Framework would work well to explore what binds this conceptual

textbook together. To illustrate this idea, I present a scenario that I believe some instructors might relate to. I found from my own personal experience and from sharing experiences with my colleagues that often a textbook does not decide how we teach our classes; rather it is more of a guide to the topics that we are expected to cover. For some of us, the textbooks are a repository of assignments and readings that have been pre-selected and are if nothing else indicative of the readings we could assign either from within the textbook or from elsewhere. In my experience no textbook has been a one-stop shop for a teacher looking for suitable, exciting, and thought-provoking materials. At best, the textbook gives some readings, discussion topics, and strategies, but for the most part the instructor must look elsewhere. In either scenario, the Framework articulates the functions and their most suitable forms. For example, using a movie clip or a documentary as a visual and aural text that aims to fulfill multiple functions will be noted in the coordinates of the Framework. The name of the movie would be included in the Framework, and similarly other resources could be added. At the end of the process the Framework would embody the *notion* of a collective of texts that form the conceptual *textbook* for the course.

The step forward is to test this Framework in a multitude of course planning scenarios like writing centers, with other writing instructors, course directors, even students who wish to plan their own trajectories. To reiterate, the primary goal of the Framework is to empower, to enable an independent realization of the *truly* multimodal course. Once this Framework, in conjunction with a strong theoretical understanding, has been used by many and across multiple realties, it could be readjusted and customized so that it truly serves the purpose(s) it was created for and, perhaps, for much more.

WORKS CITED

Adler-Kassner, Linda. *The Activist WPA: Changing Stories About Writing and Writers.* Utah State UP, 2008.

Alexander, Jonathan, and Jacqueline Rhodes. *On Multimodality: New Media in Composition Studies*. Conference on College Composition and Communication/National Council of Teachers of English NCTE, 2014.

Anderson, Daniel. "The Low Bridge to High Benefits: Entry-Level Multimedia, Literacies, and Motivation." *Computers and Composition,* 25, 2008, pp. 40-60. www.sciencedirect.com. June 13, 2018.

- et al. "Integrating Multimodality into Composition Curricula: Survey Methodology and Results from a *CCCC* Research Grant." *Composition Studies,* vol. 34, no. 2, Fall 2006, pp. 50-83. techstyle.lmc.gatech.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Anderson-et-al.-2006.pdf. Oct. 29, 2018.

Anderson, David, ed. *Sunshine and Smoke: American Writers and the American Environment.* J.B.Lippincott Company, 1971.

Angell, C. F. 'Response to Richard Williamson, "The Case for Filmmaking as English Composition.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 3, 1971, pp. 256–259. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356452. June 13, 2018.

Bailie, Brian. "'If You Don't Believe That You're Doing Some Good with the Work That You Do, Then You Shouldn't Be Doing It": An Interview with Cindy Selfe.' *Composition Forum*, vol. 21, 2010, compositionforum.com/issue/21/cindy-selfe-interview.php. Feb.15, 2019.

Ball, Cheryl E. “Show, Not Tell: The Value of New Media Scholarship.” *Computers and Composition,* 21, 2004, pp. 403-425. www.sciencedirect.com. June 13, 2018.

Barton, Robert. “What Should the Writer Read?” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1972, pp. 59–64. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356229. March 21, 2018.

Bateman, J. *Multimodality and Genre: A Foundation for the Systematic Analysis of Multimodal Documents*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Baylor, Robert. *Detail & Pattern: Essays for Composition.* McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Beard, Jeannie Parker. *Composing on the Screen: Students Perceptions of Traditional and Multimodal Composition.* 2012. Georgia State University, Ph.D. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing.* BBC and Penguin Books, 1972.

Berlin, James A. “Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories.” *College English*, vol. 44, no. 8, 1982, pp. 765–777. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/377329. Accessed Nov. 15, 2017.

- “Current-Traditional Rhetoric: Paradigm and Practice.” *Freshman English News* vol. 8, no. 3, Winter 1980, pp. 1-4 and 13-14 (pages not concurrent). www.jstor.org/stable/43519330. Accessed March 15, 2019.
- *Rhetoric and Reality Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985.* Carbondale and Edwardsville, Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

Bloom, Lynn Z., Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. *Composition Studies in the New Millennium: Rereading the Past, Rewriting the Future*. Carbondale, Southern Illinois Press, 2003.

Blum, Irving D. Review of *New Rhetorics* by Martin Steinmann, Jr. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 42–43. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355234. Accessed Nov. 10, 2017.

Booth, Wayne. "The Rhetorical Stance" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1963, pp. 139-145. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/355048. Accessed Feb. 10, 2019.

Bowen, Tracey, and Carl Whithaus, eds. *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres.* '"What Else is Possible": Multimodal Composing and Genre in the Teaching of Writing.' UP Pittsburgh, 2013. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wrbkn.

Briand, Paul. "Turned on: Multi-Media and Advanced Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1970, pp. 267–269. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357330. Accessed March 10, 2017.

Bunn, Michael. "Motivation and Connection: Teaching Reading (and Writing) in the Composition Classroom." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 64, no. 3, 2013, pp. 496–516. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43490768. Accessed Nov. 27, 2017.

Burke, Phyllis Brown. "Texts on Composition or Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1970, pp. 59–67. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354592. Accessed August 10, 2018.

Burks, Don M. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 67–69. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356536. Accessed April 20, 2018.

Burnett, Esther, and Sandra Thomason. "The Cassette-Slide Show in Required Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 25, no. 5, 1974, pp. 426–430. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356969. Accessed May 01, 2018.

Caverly, Ernest R., Mary Hargrave, et al. "Evaluation of Composition Textbooks: Report of National Council Committee." *The English Journal*, vol. 21, no. 4, April 1932, pp. 280-294. NCTE/JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/804153. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

Cazden, Courtney et al. A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Features." *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 66, no. 1, Spring 1996, pp. 60-92. newarcproject.pbworks.com/f/Pedagogy+of+Multiliteracies_New+London+Group.pdf . Accessed Dec. 20, 2018.

Clark, Irene L. *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*, 2nd ed. Routledge, 2012.

Cohen, B. Bernard. Review of *The Theme of the Hero* by Roy Pickett; *The Theme of Justice* by William Gillis, Patricia Ingle Gillis; *The Theme of the Machine* Patricia Ingle Gillis; *The Theme of the Machine* by Allan Danzig. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1970, pp. 69–71. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354594. Accessed Aug. 10, 2018.

Cohn, Jan. Review of "Selling Culture: Magazine, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century" by Richard Ohmann. *The Radical Teacher,* 55, Spring 1999, pp. 40-41.

Coles, W. E. "The Sense of Nonsense as a Design for Sequential Writing Assignments." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1970, pp. 27–34. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354586. Accessed May 08, 2018.

Comprone, Joseph. 'Response to Richard Williamson ("The Case for Filmmaking as English Composition, (CCC, May 1971, 131-136) and to C. F. Angell ("Counterstatement," CCC, October 1971, 256-259).' *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 23, no. 3, 1972, pp. 55-58. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/356228. June 13, 2018.

Connors, Robert J. "Current-Traditional Rhetoric: Thirty Years of Writing with a Purpose." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly,* vol. 11, no. 4, Autumn 1981, pp. 208-221. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/3885599. Accessed June 16, 2018.

- "Mechanical Correctness as a Focus in Composition Instruction." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 36, no. 1, 1985, pp. 61–72. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357607. Accessed June 13, 2018.
- "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1981, pp. 444–455. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356607. Accessed March 05, 2018.
- "Shaping Tools." *Composition - Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy,* UP Pittsburg, 1997, pp. 69-111.
- *A Study of Rhetorical Theories for College Writing Teachers.* 1980. Ohio State University. PhD dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Cope, Bill, and Mary Kalantzis, eds. *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Routledge, 2000.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 20, no. 5, 1969, pp. 288–296. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355032. Accessed June 13, 2018.

Davis, Yumani. *The Normalization Process of Multimodal Composition: The "Unseeing" People of Color.* 2015. Florida State University. Masters thesis. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Deemer, Charles. "English Composition as a Happening." *College English*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1967, pp. 121–126. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/374049. Accessed March 10, 2018.

Dena, Christy. "Beyond Multimedia, Narrative, and Game: The Contributions of Multimodality and Polymorphic Fictions." *New Perspectives on Narrative and Multimodality.* Ed. by Ruth Page. Routledge, 2010.

Dent, Galin, Tara Lockhart and Jennifer Saltmarsh. "Between the Classroom, the Page, and the Profession: The Value of the Hybrid Essay in Graduate-Level Learning." *Enculturation*, November 5, 2013. enculturation.net/between-the-classroom. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

Desmond, Roger. *Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy Through the Communicative and Visual Arts.* "TV Viewing, Reading and Media Literacy." Ed. by James Flood, Shirley Brice Heath, and Diane Lapp. Routledge, 2014.

Donker, Marjorie. "Four for Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1973, pp. 47–48., www.jstor.org/stable/357268. March 15, 2018.

Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 58, no. 4, June 2007, pp. 552-584. JSTOR. dougdownsteaching.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/downs-and-wardle-fyc-as-writing-studies.pdf. Accessed April 11, 2017.

Dunn, Patricia A. *Talking, Sketching, Moving: Multiple Literacies in the Teaching of Writing.* Boynton/Cook, 2001.

Dunstan, Maryjane, and Patricia W. Garlan. *Worlds in the Making: Probes for Students of the Future.* Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.

Dutch, William L. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1972, pp. 64–67. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356230. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

Ebbitt, Wilma. Review of *Uptaught* by Ken Macrorie; *On Writing* by Roger Sale; *Course X: A Left Field Guide to Freshman English* by Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 62-65. NCTE.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing Without Teachers.* Oxford UP, 1973.

Elgin, Don D. "Freshman Composition Texts." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1973, pp. 45–46. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357267. Accessed Oct. 15, 2017.

Emig, Janet. *The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders.* NCTE, 1971.

Etlinger, Sarah. *Writing on the Threshold: Investigating New Media Concerns in Composition Textbooks.* 2012. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Ph.D. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Faigley, Lester, Diana George et al. *Picturing Texts.* W.W.Norton & Company, 2004.

Flannigan, Michael. C. "From Discomfort, Isolation, and Fear to Comfort, Community, and Confidence: Using Reflection, Role Playing, and Classroom Observation to Prepare New Teachers of College Writing." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories,*

Theories, Programs, Practices. Ed. by Betty P. Pytlik, and Sarah Liggett. Oxford UP, 2002. Pp. 242-253.

Fleming, David. *From Form to Meaning: Freshman Composition and the Long Sixties, 1957-1974*. UP Pittsburgh, 2011.

Flood, James; Shirley Brice Heath and Diane Lapp, eds. *Handbook Research on Teaching Literacy Through the Communicative and Visual Arts.* Routledge, 2014.

"Form Follows Function." *Guggenheim*, 17 Nov. 2016, www.guggenheim.org/arts-curriculum/topic/form-follows-function. Accessed Oct. 15, 2018.

Foss, Sonja K. "Framing the Study of Visual Rhetoric: Towards a Transformation of Rhetorical Theory." *Defining Visual Rhetorics.* Ed. by Charles A. Hill and Marguerite Helmers. Routledge, 2009. Pp. 303-13.

Freire, Paulo, and Ira Shor. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education.* Macmillan, 1987.

- *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Bloomsbury, 1970.

"Front matter." *College English*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1970. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/374274. Accessed March 10, 2019.

Gale, Xin Liu, and Fredric G. Gale, eds. *(Re)Visioning Composition Textbooks: Conflicts of Culture, Ideology, and Pedagogy*. State U of New York P, 1999.

Garey, Doris. "Teaching Students to Write" Review of *Writing with a Purpose: A First Course in College Composition* by James M. McCrimmon. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, vol. 8, no.1, Fall 1950. search.proquest.com/openview/b62017bb07b8067d6a8b13e0b60eb0c7/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1816771. Accessed Nov. 11, 2018.

Gebhardt, Richard C. Review of *Emblems of Reality: Discovering Experience in Language* by Melvin B. Ralston and Don Richard Cox; *Experimental English* by Sandra Fluck; *Expansion* by Billie Hobart; *SOS: A Communications Text with a Message* by Marlene Ahne and Sara Burgess; *Struggles with Bears: Experience in Writing* by Smokey Wilson; and *Creative Responses for Composition* by Mary I. Schuster. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1974, pp. 83–87. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357249. Accessed Feb. 12, 2018.

- and James E. Miller. Review of *Writing in Reality* by James E. Miller, Jr., Stephen N. Judy. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1979, pp. 65–66. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356755. Accessed Feb. 12, 2018.

George, Diana. "From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2002, pp. 11–39. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1512100. Accessed June 02, 2018.

Goswami Dixie, and Peter R. Stillman, eds. *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change.* Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc., 1987.

Graham-White, Anthony. Review of *Ways of Seeing* by John Berger; *African Art in Motion: Icon and Act* by Robert Ferris Thompson. *Educational Theatre Journal*, vol. 27, no. 3, Oct., 1975, pp. 439. JSTOR www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/3206490. Accessed July 17, 2018.

Greenbaum, Leonard A., and Rudolf Schmerl. *Course X: A Left Field Guide to Freshman English*. J. B. Lippincott Company, 1970.

Gunaratnam, Yamini, and Vikki Bell. "How John Berger Changed Our Ways of Seeing Art: He Taught Us that Photographs Always Need Language, and Require a Narrative to

Make Sense." *Independent*, January 10, 2017. www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/features/john-berger-ways-of-seeing-a7518001.html. Accessed April 10, 2018.

Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 33, no. 1, 1982, pp. 76–88. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357846. Accessed May 02, 2016.

Hammond, Heidi Kay. *Graphic Novels and Multimodal Literacy: A Reader Response Study*. 2009. University of Minnesota. PhD dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Harrington, David V., Phillip M. Keith, et al. "A Critical Survey of Resources for Teaching Rhetorical Invention." *College English*, vol. 40, no. 6, 1979, pp. 641–662. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/375967. Accessed Nov. 11, 2018.

Harrington, Susanmarie, Rita Malencyzk, et al. "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." *College English,* vol. 63, no. 3, 2001, pp. 321–325. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/378996. Accessed Oct. 7, 2018.

Hawhee, Debra. "Composition History and the *Harbrace College Handbook*." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1999, pp. 504–523. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/358863. Accessed March 05, 2017.

Hawisher, Gail E., Cynthia L. Selfe, et al. "Becoming Literate in the Information Age: Cultural Ecologies and the Literacies of Technology." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2004, pp. 642–692. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4140666. Accessed Feb. 12, 2018.

Heale, M. J. "The Sixties as History: A Review of the Political Historiography." *Reviews in American History*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2005, pp. 133–152. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/30031497. Accessed Nov. 15, 2018.

Higgins, David M. Review of *Rhetoric and Composition: A Sourcebook for Teachers* by Richard L. Graves. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 28, no.1, 1977, pp. 94-96. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356924. Accessed March 10, 2019.

Hill, Charles A., and Marguerite H. Helmers, eds. *Defining Visual Rhetorics*, Routledge, 2009.

Hoover, Regina M. "College Writing Texts: The Rhetorical Approach." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1970, pp. 55–59. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354591. Accessed Nov. 11, 2018.

- Review of *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* by Richard E. Young, Alton L. Becker, Kenneth Pike. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 65–67. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356535. Accessed Nov. 11, 2018.

Horadan, Ryan. *A Composition of First-Year Composition Textbooks in Four-Year and Technical Colleges in the University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia*. 2014. Kennesaw State University. Masters Thesis. digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/etd. Accessed Feb. 17, 2018.

Hult, Christine, and Lynn Meeks. "Preparing College Teachers of Writing to Teach in a Web-Based Classroom: *History, Theoretical Base, Web Base, and Current Practices.*" *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. Ed. by Betty P. Pytlik, and Sarah Liggett. Oxford UP, 2002, pp. 184-193.

Hundley, Jean S. Review of *Notes Towards a New Rhetoric* by Francis Christensen. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 39–41. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355233. Accessed March Dec. 10, 2018.

Hutchinson, Helen. *Mixed Bag: Artifacts from Contemporary Culture*. Scott, Forman and Company, 1970.

Irmscher, William F. *The Holt Guide to English: A Contemporary Handbook of Rhetoric, Language, and Literature.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Jasken, Julia. *Designing Composition: Textbooks, Teaching, and Identity in the Digital Age*. 2004. Michigan Technological University. Ph.D. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Johnson-Eilola, Johndan, and Stuart A. Selber. "Plagiarism, Originality, Assemblage." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2007, pp. 375-403. www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/science/article/pii/S8755461507000709. Accessed Jan. 15, 2019.

Journet, Debra. "Inventing Myself in Multimodality: Encouraging Senior Faculty to Use Digital Media." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2007, pp. 107-120. www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/science/article/pii/S8755461507000230. Accessed Jan. 15, 2019.

Judy, Stephen. Review of A Contemporary Rhetoric by Robert W. Daniel. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 37–38. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355231. Accessed Dec. 19, 2018.

- Review of *Writing Step by Step: Exercises in Structured Creativity* by Audrey J. Roth, Thelma C. Altschuler. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1970, pp. 67–69. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354593. Accessed Dec. 15, 2018.

Karrfalt, David H. Review of *Contemporary Rhetoric* by Niel K. Snortum. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 38–39. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355232. Accessed Nov. 11, 2018

Kelly-Riley, Diane, and Norbert Elliot. "The WPA Outcomes Statement, Validation, and the Pursuit of Localism." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 21, 2014, pp. 89-103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2014.03.004. Accessed Dec. 12, 2018.

Kitzhaber, Albert Raymond. *Rhetoric in American Colleges 1850-1900.* Southern Methodist UP, 1990.

- *Rhetoric in American Colleges 1850-1900.* 1953. University of Washington. PhD. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Kligerman, Jack. "Photography, Perception, and Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1977, pp. 174–178. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/356109. Accessed June 13, 2018.

Knoblauch, Abby. A. "A Textbook Argument: Definitions of Argument in Leading Composition Textbooks." *College Composition and Communication* vol. 63, no. 2, Dec. 2011, pp. 244-268. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/23131584. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

Kress, Gunther, Carey Jewitt, et al. *English in Urban Classrooms: A Multimodal Perspective on Teaching and Learning.* Routledge, 2004.

- *Literacy in the New Media Age.* Routledge. 2003.

- *Multimodality: A Social Approach to Contemporary Communication.* Routledge, 2009.
- and Theo Van Leeuwen. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* Oxford UP. 2001.
- et al. *The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom: A Multimodal Approach*. Ed. by Christopher N. Candlin and Srikant Sarangi. Economic and Social Research Council, 2001.

Kytle, Ray. *The Comp Box: Composition as Assemblage.* Aspen Communication Inc., 1972.

Larson, Richard L. "Anthologies of Essays." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1969, pp. 51–58. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/354114. Accessed June 5, 2018.

Lauer, Claire. 'Contending with Terms: "Multimodal" and "Multimedia" in the Academic and Public Spheres." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2009, pp. 225-239. Oct. 29, 2018. www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/science/article/pii/S8755461509000607. March 8, 2018.

Lawson, Nora Dawson. *A Study of the Relationship of Academic Achievement in College Courses to the Readability of Course Textbooks and the Reading Ability of Students Enrolled in Selected Classes at Iowa State University.* 1978. Iowa State University. Ph.D. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Lemke, J.L. "Multiplying Meaning: Literacy in a Multimedia World." *Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference*, Dec. 1993. Conference Paper. manoftheword.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/feeling_and_meaning_extended_version.pdf. Accessed Feb. 27, 2018.

- "Multiplying Meaning: Visual and Verbal Semiotics in Scientific Text." Ed. by J.R. Martin and R. Veel. *Reading Science*, Routledge. n.d. academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/papers/mxm-syd.htm

Livingstone, Josephine. "Beyond John Berger's ways of Seeing." *The New Republic*, January 4, 2017. newrepublic.com/article/139615/beyond-joh-bergers-ways-seeing. Accessed April 10, 2018.

Love, Glen A. Review of *The Strategy of Style* by Winston Weathers, Otis Winchester. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 35–36. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/355229. Accessed April 10, 2018.

Lutkewitte, Claire. *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford/St Martin's, 2014.

Marchetti, Lorena, & Peter Cullen. "A Multimodal Approach in the Classroom for Creative Learning and Teaching." *CASALC Review: Psychological and Creative Approaches to Language Teaching,* Jan. 2015 -2016, pp. 39-51. drive.google.com/file/d/1tlWQwYf1MXmL1W6nPP-ArGW94qi3Wfej/view. Accessed Dec. 20, 2017.

Martins, David. Review of *Talking, Sketching, Moving: Multiple Literacies in the Teaching of Writing* by Patricia A. Dunn. Boynton/Cook, 2001.

Mays, Chris. "Writing Complexity, One Stability at a Time: Teaching Writing as a Complex System." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 68, no. 3, Feb. 2017, pp. 559-585. NCTE. www.ncte.org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CCC/0683-feb2017/CCC0683Writing.pdf. Accessed June 10, 2018

McCorkle, Ben, and Jason Palmeri. "Lessons from History: Teaching with Technology in 100 Years of *English Journal*." *The English Journal,* vol. 105, no. 6, 2016, pp. 18-24. NCTE www.ncte.org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/EJ/1056-jul2016/EJ1056Lessons.pdf. Accessed May 08, 2018.

McCrimmon, James, M, & Joseph Trimmer. *Writing with a Purpose*, 9th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1988.

- Nancy Sommers and Joseph Trimmer. *Writing with a Purpose* 8th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 7th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 6th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 5th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 2nd ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.
- *Writing with a Purpose* 1st ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950.

Mead, David, et al. "The Textbook Industry and the Profession." *The Bulletin of the Midwest Language Association*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 1-26. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/1314877 Accessed March 11, 2018.

Miekley, Joshua. "ESL Textbook Evaluation List." *The Reading Matrix,* vol. 5, no. 2, September 2005. www.readingmatrix.com/reading_projects/miekley/project Accessed Oct. 15, 2018.

Miles, Elizabeth. *Building Rhetorics of Production: An Institutional Critique of Composition Textbook Publishing.* 1999. Purdue University. Ph.D. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Miller, Jr., James E. *Word, Self, Reality: The Rhetoric of Imagination.* Dodd, Mead & Company, 1972.

Miller, Susan. *Writing: Process and Product.* Winthrop Publishers Inc*.,* 1976.

Miller, Kevin. *One of Ours: James McCrimmon and Composition Studies.* 2002. The Florida State University. PhD dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Mohammadi, Mohammad, and Heidar Abdi. "Textbook Evaluation: A Case Study." *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* vol. 98, May 06, 2014, pp. 1148-1155. www.sciencedirect.com. Accessed Oct. 10, 2016.

Morgan, Fred. *Here and Now: An Approach to Writing Through Perception.* Harcourt, 1968.

Murray, Donald M. "Finding Your Own Voice: Teaching Composition in an Age of Dissent." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1969, pp. 118–123. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/354178. Accessed June 16, 2018.

- *Write to Learn.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Norris, Sigrid editor. *Multimodality in Practice: Investigating Theory-in-Practice-Through-Methodology.* Routledge, 2012.

North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Boynton/Cook, 1987.

Ohmann, Richard. *English in America: A Radical View of the Profession.* Wesleyan UP, 1976.

Page, Ruth, editor. *New Perspectives on Narrative and Multimodality*. Routledge, 2010.

Palmeri, Jason. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy.* Southern Illinois UP, 2012.

- *Multimodality and Composition Studies, 1960- Present.* 2007. Ohio State University. PhD dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Perl, Sondra. "Understanding Composing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1980, pp. 363–369. JSTOR, jstor.org/stable/356586. Accessed Nov. 3, 2017.

Perrin, Carl. "Teaching Composition to the 'Now' Generation." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 3, 1971, pp. 261–262. JSTOR, jstor.org/stable/356454. Accessed July 5, 2018.

Pett, Dennis, and Trudy Wilson. "Color Research and Its Application to the Design of Instructional Materials." *Educational Technology Research and Development*, vol. 44, no. 3, 1996, pp. 19–35. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/30221033. Accessed June 16, 2018.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. *Composition as a Human Science: Contributions to the Self-Understanding of a Discipline*. Oxford UP, 1998.

- "Practical Wisdom and the Geography of Knowledge in Composition." *College English*, vol. 53, no. 8, 1991, pp. 863–885. JSTOR, jstor.org/stable/377691. Oct. 11, 2017.

Pickett, Nell Ann. "Four Composition Texts." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1973, pp. 48–50., www.jstor.org/stable/357269. Accessed Sept. 15, 2017.

Privateer, Paul Michael. "Academic Technology and the Future of Higher Education: Strategic Paths Taken and Not Taken." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 70, no. 1, 1999, pp. 60–79. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2649118. Accessed March 1, 2019.

Pytlik, Betty P., and Sarah Liggett, eds. *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices.* Oxford UP, 2002.

Rai, Pratibha. "Review of *Ways of Seeing.*" *The Oxford Cultural Review*, April 4, 2017. theoxfordculturereview.com/2017/04/04/review-ways-of-seeing/. Accessed April 10, 2018.

Ray, Ruth E. *The Practice of Theory: Teacher Research in Composition.* NCTE, 1993.

Reaske, Christopher R., and Robert F. Willson Jr., eds. *Student Voices/One: On Political Action, Culture, and the University.* Random House, 1971.

Richardson, John Adkins. "Cultures and the Radical Conscience" Review of *Ways of Seeing* by John Berger. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, vol. 8, no. 4, 1974, pp. 111–113. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3332035. Accessed Nov. 7, 2018.

Rowland, J. Carter. Review of *Rhetoric: A Synthesis* by W. Ross Winterowd. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1969, pp. 75–76. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/354121 Accessed Aug. 9, 2018.

Ryerson, Rachael. *Why Teach Digital Writing? Changed Contexts for Writing* "Multimodal Composition in Kairos: A Rhizomatic Retrospective." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*. 1 Jan. 2016. technorhetoric.net/20.2/reviews/ryerson/. Accessed Feb. 11, 2018.

Sandhu, Sukhdev. “Ways of Seeing Opened Our Eyes to Visual Culture.” *The Guardian*, 7 Sept. 2012.https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2012/sep/07/ways-seeing-berger-tv-programme-british. Accessed Jan. 5, 2018.

Sanders, Charles, Robin R. Rice and Watt J. Cantillon, eds. *Writer & Persona: Character into Prose.* McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Sanders, Thomas E. and Franklin Hester. *The Now Reader.* Scott, Foreman and Company, 1969.

Schiappa, Edward. *Defining Reality: Definitions and the Politics of Meaning.* Southern Illinois UP, 2003.

Schwartz, Joseph. “From the Viewpoint of a University Professor” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1968, pp. 41-42. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/355233. Accessed March 10, 2018.

Scroggins, Helen P. “‘Radical’ Readers.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 57–59. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/356531. Accessed March 10, 2017.

Sego, Lewis Paige, and Gerald A. Bryant. “‘Multi-Media’ Textbooks.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 54–57. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/356530. Accessed Feb. 14, 2017.

Selfe, Cynthia L. “The Movement of Air, the Breath of Meaning: Aurality and Multimodal Composing.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2009, pp. 616–663. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/40593423. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

- Editor. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers.* Hampton Press, 2007.

Shaughnessy, Mina P. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing.* Oxford UP, 1977.

Siddens, James M. Review of *Ideas for English 101* by Richard Ohmann. *College Composition and Communication*, 27.1, 1976, pp. 84-85. JSTOR. www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/356172. Accessed April 3, 2018.

Silverstein, Michael. "Discourse and the No-thing-ness of Culture." *Signs and Society,* vol.1, no. 2, Sept. 2013, pp. 327-366. UP Chicago Journals. www-journals-uchicago-edu.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/doi/full/10.1086/673252. Accessed Jan. 29, 2016.

Smith, Nancy. "Richard Ohmann Oral History Interview, Apr. 15, 2014." *Wesleyan University Oral History Project*. Paper 21, Wesleyan University, 2014. wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/oralhistory/21. Accessed Sept. 15, 2018.

Smith, William Howard. *A Study of Textbook Selection Processes in English Departments of Twenty-Five Selected Colleges and Universities.* 1981. University of Pittsburgh. Ph.D. dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Smitherman-Donaldson, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America.* Wayne State UP, 1986.

Sparke, William, and Clark McKowen. *Montage: Investigations in Language.* Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1970.

- *"*Teacher's Manual to Accompany *Montage: Investigations in Language.*" Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1970.

Stewart, Donald C. "Composition Textbooks and the Assault on Tradition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1978, pp. 171–176. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/357306. Accessed Nov. 10, 2017.

- and William R. Seat. “Rhetoric Readers.” Review of *Rhetoric: Then and Now* by James T. Hayes; *Strategies in Prose* by Wilfred A. Ferrell, Nicholas A. Salerno; *Writer and Audience: Forms of Non-Fiction Prose* by Wilson Currin Snipes; *Purpose and Function* by Nicholas P. Barker; *The Strategy of Prose* by William R. Seat, III, Paul S. Burtness; *Prose: A Systematic Approach to Writing* by Eva M. Burkett; *Phase Blue: A Systems Approach to College English* by James Hogins, Robert Yarber; *The Attitudes of Rhetoric* by Winston Weathers, Otis Winchester; *Writer and Persona: Character into Prose* by Charles Sanders, Robin Rice, Watt Cantillon. *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1971, pp. 49–54. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/356529. Accessed Nov. 10, 2017.
- “A ‘Real’ Audience for Composition Students.’ “Staffroom Interchange,” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1965, pp.35-37. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/355803. Nov. 20, 2017.

Stock, Patricia L., editor. *Composition's Roots in English Education*. Heinemann, 2012.

Takayoshi, Pamela, and Cynthia Selfe. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers.* “Thinking About Multimodality.” Hampton Press, 2007. Pp. 1-12.

Varnum, Robin. “The History of Composition: Reclaiming Our Lost Generations.” *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 12, no. 1, Winter 1992, pp. 39-55. JAC/JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/20865827. Accessed Nov. 28, 2017.

Vesterman, William. *Juxtapositions.* Mayfield Publishing Company, 1996.

Warfel, Harry R. “Structural Linguistics and Composition.” *College English* vol. 20, no. 5, 1959, pp. 205-213. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/372686. Accessed July 10, 2018.

Welch, Kathleen E. “Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production: The Place of Theory in Writing Pedagogy.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 38, no. 3, 1987, pp. 269–282. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/357747. Accessed Feb. 15, 2017.

Wiener, Harvey S. “Media Compositions: Preludes to Writing.” *College English*, 35.5, 1974, pp. 566 -574. JSTOR. www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/375501. Accessed June 15, 2017.

Williamson, Richard. “The Case for Filmmaking as English Composition.” “Staffroom Interchange,” *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 22, no. 2, May 1971, pp. 31-136. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/356828?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents. Accessed June 13, 2018.

Winchester, Otis. *The Sound of Your Voice.* Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Woods, William F. “Composition Textbooks and Pedagogical Theory 1960-80.” *College English,* vol. 43, no. 4, 1981, pp. 393–409. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/377128. Accessed Oct. 11, 2017.

“WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition.” July 2008. comppile.org/archives/WPAoutcomes/continue.html. Accessed Nov. 30, 2018.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. “The Professionalization of TA Development Programs: A Heuristic For Curriculum Design.” *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories,*

Theories, Programs, Practices. Ed. by Betty P. Pytlik, and Sarah Liggett. Oxford UP, 2002.

Zebroski, James Thomas. "Hidden from History: English Education and the Multiple Origins of Contemporary Composition Studies, 1960-2000." *Composition's Roots in English Education*, Ed. by Patricia Lambert Stock, Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2012, pp. 26-50.

Zoellner, Robert. "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition." *College English,* vol. 30, no.4, Jan. 1969, pp. 267-320. JSTOR, www-jstor-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/stable/374179?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents. Accessed Nov. 15, 2017.

APPENDIX 1 : FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL SELECTED TEXTBOOKS FROM 1968-1973

The Function & Form Framework : *The Now Reader* (1969) by Thomas E. Sanders and Franklin Hester

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	●	●	●	○
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	●	●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis explanation:

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Present throughout the textbook, with a greater focus in Chapter 5.
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Present throughout the textbook
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Present throughout the textbook
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	Present throughout the textbook

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Content	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Content	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	
Reflective Content	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	Present throughout the textbook, but marginally fewer than text-based assignments.
Reading-centered Content	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Present throughout the textbook

Rough notes for mapping:

There are several genres that are included in the alphabetic texts selected including poems (Chapter 2), short stories (Chapter 3), plays (Chapter 4), and essays (Chapter 5).

The visuals are used frequently, completely, and are interspersed in the instructional content of the chapter (1, 2, 11). These visuals include comic strips (1, 11, 18, 20, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 40-41, 45), photographs (2,7 58), diagrams (5, 9, 162), and paintings (59, 66-67, 100,119, 122-123, 156-157). Visuals, particularly diagrams play an interesting role in this textbook, where they illustrate pictorially the conventions of alphabetic composition (6,7, 9), as well as the semiotics that are embedded within complex visuals like photographs (5).

Instruction is reading/text-based, in that the textbook uses readings and visuals to teach knowledge of convention, rhetorical knowledge, and writing process in fair measure throughout the textbook. In the case of the alphabetic readings, each section is explained in detail and these explanations are inserted into the main body of the text. There is an abundant use of visuals, particularly comic strips to illustrate the choices that are made to either convey a certain message (knowledge of convention), or highlight a particular written situation

(rhetorical knowledge) in the process of writing. Visuals, in all its types that feature in this textbook are used in conjunction with the various forms of writings included. For example, instructional text and visuals (1, 11, 18, 20, 23, 24 to name just a few); poems, and visuals (58-59, 66-67); short stories, comics, and images (95-98, 100,119,122-123, 156-157); plays, and diagrams (162); and comics (182); and essays and comics (189). Visuals are even used in predominantly theoretical sections like "Definition" (192), "Example and Illustration" (196), "Compare and Contrast" (197), "Cause and Effect" (200), and "Description: An Aid to Exposition" (205).

Interspersed in the chapter are assignments titled "Expressing Yourself # [ ]," and as the label suggests, are reading-based and reflective. The assignments also focus on revising (and testing) knowledge of convention ("Expressing Yourself # 1") and rhetorical knowledge by breaking down the assignment into steps. By forcing the student to walk through these steps the textbook illustrates the writing process that would help the student fulfill the required assignment (31). The chapters also have interspersed "Suggested Assignments" that work to supplement the "Expressing Yourself" exercises (89). For the most part the assignments encourage reflective assignments and teach/test by getting the students to work on prompts that invite opinions and ideas of the student. However, "Expressing Yourself # 3" is an exception, because it teaches value through an entirely reading-based assignment, and has no writing/ composing being done actively, by the student (146). The final assignment "Expressing Yourself #5" is the culmination of the writing process as it brings together both reading and writing, "It is as much a writing section as a reading one" (225). The assignment is reading based and tests analytical, reflective, and writing skills through a set of 4-5 questions after each essay. The textbook ends with a reference to a photograph at the beginning of the textbook and asks students to write a detailed description of the object, an assignment that is based on observation and literacy skills (visual and alphabetic).

The Function & Form Framework : *Writer and Persona: Character into Prose* (1970)

Ed. by Charles Sanders, Robin R. Rice and Watt J. Cantillon

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●		
	Reading Centered		●		
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis explanation

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Present throughout the textbook
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Content	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Content	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	
Reflective Content	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	
Reading-centered Content	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Present throughout the textbook

Rough notes for mapping:

This is a textbook firmly located in Literature and literary cannons. The sections are arranged by time periods embodied in the persona of a noted literary figure, starting at the mid-sixteenth century, all the way into present times. Each section is comprised of a short introduction to the author, who embodied the period in question, and tries to connect their writing samples with the personalities of these writers. This introduction is an overview of the person, the times and the background responsible for the works that follow in each section, and that points to rhetorical knowledge. However, outside of this there is no instruction on writing conventions or processes, neither are there any specific prompts that direct the class towards reflective, research or feedback/reviewed based content.

The Function & Form Framework : ***Worlds in the Making: Probes for Students of the Future*** **(1970)** by Maryjane Dunstan and Patricia W, Garlan

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	○	●	●	●
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●	●	●
	Reading Centered	○	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis Notes:

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Present throughout the textbook
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Present throughout the textbook
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	Present throughout the textbook

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	Present throughout the textbook

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Content	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Content	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	
Reflective Content	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	Present throughout the textbook
Reading-centered Content	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Present throughout the textbook

Rough notes for mapping:

This textbook is designed to challenge every convention of writing pedagogy and textbooks that there have been prior to this. The chapters are titled with a theme that itself requires a critical thought process, one that questions, and attempts to explore man, machine, and civilization. The larger question is around the evolution, past, present and future, of mankind.

There are seven main sections, each with chapters within each of these sections. Each section is introduced with a visual. These visuals are for the most part, art that invites discussion and speculation. The only exception is the visual opening Part III "Exploring Spaceship Earth," which is an outright photograph of the Earth taken from outer space.

Within these chapters the use of visual elements plays a part along with the use of comics, photographs, and diagrams to explain and highlight the instructional content. For example, the use of different colored text-boxes to highlight and illustrate the definition of "grokking" as presented in a scenario presented by Don Fabun's "The Dynamics of Change" (5), or to highlight excerpts of the main text as in the selection from Alvin Toffler's "The Future as a Way of Life" (7). The use of such visual highlighting of text is frequent throughout the

textbook (as is the use of cartoons and comics to (light-heartedly) underscore the main message of the chapter (11, 120-121, 164) or the use of diagrams to visually represent the concepts that the textbooks is aiming to convey (16, 27).

Reflection that moves into the realm of critical thinking is the mainstay of this textbook, and this is found most noticeably in the "point of departure" sections that are sprinkled throughout the chapters amid the instructional/textual contents. These are discussion topics, and questions that are based off the readings but push the conversation outside of the readings into the students' lives and often even beyond that (examples on 46-47). Along with this critical content, knowledge of convention is also included. As is evident in "ways and meanings" section on page 51, the textbook outlines certain techniques the author used to create a desired effect in the writing. However, this knowledge of convention is not the same as that of a grammar handbook, but is more process based.

Assignments are not demarcated or labeled as such, but are in the instructional content of the textbook, which gives the flow of content, an informal, almost conversational feel to it.

The Function & Form Framework : ***Sunshine and Smoke: American Writers and the American Environment*** **(1970)** Ed. by David Anderson

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Alphabetic	Feedback	○	○	○	○
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	○	○	○	○
	Reading Centered	○	○	○	○
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate (in this case this indicates potential)

○ Partial evidence available to validate/ Present throughout the textbook

Study Analysis Notes

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Potential to instruct is present throughout the textbook
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Potential to instruct is present throughout the textbook
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Potential to instruct is present throughout the textbook
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	Potential to instruct is present throughout the textbook

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Content	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	Potential to structure assignments is present throughout the textbook
Research Content	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	Potential to structure assignments is present throughout the textbook
Reflective Content	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	Potential to structure assignments is present throughout the textbook
Reading-centered Content	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Potential to structure assignments is present throughout the textbook

The Function & Form Framework : *Detail and Pattern: Essays for Composition* (1972),

by Robert Baylor

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis Notes

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Present throughout the textbook.
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Present throughout the textbook.
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Present throughout the textbook.
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	Present throughout the textbook.

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook.
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	Present throughout the textbook.

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Assignments	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Assignments	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	
Reflective Assignments	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	Present throughout the textbook.
Reading-centered assignments	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Present throughout the textbook.

Rough notes for mapping:

This textbook is fixed and repetitive in the units that comprise it, but aims to include a variety of experiences within it. Looked at as a whole, the textbook deals with aspects of observation (Chapters 1-6) and reflection (Chapters 7–10). Each chapter is also structured in the similar manner: the chapter opens with black-and-white photograph on the left and a short description of the contents of the chapter on the left. This description explains the main function of the chapter as well as the theory that underlines that section.

The visuals are photographs that are mostly from everyday life and are deceptively simple because they are left open to the interpretation of the viewer. With no information alongside, the images become a springboard to conversation that would center around the chapter introductions that accompany them. The images are what are superficially a cobbled pathway, a night-watchman, a laborer's hat, a child in a men's barber's chair, and so on. The writings on the other-hand, capture rare moments from the world outside, and around the classroom, from President Kennedy's assassination report (192-203), to short and sharp prose by well-known authors like Ernest Hemingway (12), the textbook tries to include them all.

At the end of each reading selection is “Discussion/ Application,” which are questions that are aimed to get the students thinking, talking and writing on the readings. At the end of almost all readings, is a list of vocabulary words as well as a “Theme Assignment” that pushes the writer to move through the reading and beyond it. “Vocabulary” supplies knowledge of convention, “Discussion/ Application” encourage reflection and the “Theme Assignment” introduces critical reading, thinking and writing.

The textbook ends with an Appendix of photographs presumably as additional “free-floating” instructional materials that can be used. The introduction to the section states that to understand details and patterns, pictures work most effectively because “Experiencing a photograph involves recognition of the pattern the picture makes, study of thee details male up the pattern, and the personal response of each viewer based on the associations evoked by the picture” (213). By tapping into the mind of the student through images and stating this function outright, the textbook gives visuals a heightened level of significance.

In terms of the genres of the medium used – the visuals restricted themselves to black and white photographs, while the alphabetic texts had more variety: poems (2), word lists (7), reports (9-10, 192-203), essays (26-28, 30-31, 39, 41-42, 44-46, 53-55), mail (13-14, 24-25), short stories (15-16) and a Nobel-prize award speech (33-34).

The Function & Form Framework : ***The Holt Guide to English: A Contemporary Handbook of Rhetoric, Language, and Literature*** **(1972)**, by William F. Irmscher

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis Notes

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Present throughout the textbook
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Present throughout the textbook
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Present throughout the textbook
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	Present throughout the textbook
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons,	

	posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Assignments	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Assignments	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	
Reflective Assignments	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	
Reading-centered assignments	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	Present throughout the textbook

Rough notes for mapping:

Each of the chapters in this textbook is themed on a part of the writing process, from the basic mechanics of grammar, and sentence construction, to the process of revision. Each of the chapters is structured closely around the topic being studied. There is little to no reference to reflective content, and critical thinking, reading, and writing is not a main focus of the textbook.

APPENDIX 2 : TERMS FROM THE *CCC* REVIEWS (1968-1973)

1968:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewers
The Complete Stylist	Comprehensive text Creating connections to previously known texts	365 pages $4.50 Chapter focus on alternate methods
The Strategy of Style 262	Emphasis on studying style – syntax, metaphor, sound, rhythm, emphasis, punctuation	$2.95
A Contemporary Rhetoric	Teaching invention Chapter and exercises that show how concrete material – color movement, figures of speech, quotations, supporting details lend "objective reality"	466 pages $4.00
Contemporary Rhetoric	Exposing the student to revolutionary perspectives on language and communication	285 pages $2.95

1969:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewers
America Changing	Dealing with problems, processes, or characteristics of writing. Discriminate between fact and judgment Introductory essays that give varying interpretations of social and cultural phenomena Language is formal and tone is serious	Published in 1968 Edited by Patrick Gleeson No other apparatus.
In Pursuit of Awareness	Understand themselves, their families and their society Only introductory essays Language is formal, tone is serious	Published in 1967 Edited by Esther Kronovet and Evelyn Shirk No Instructional apparatus
Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric	Stimulate thought about social, spiritual and cultural problems Conventions of the rhetoric of exposition	Published 1967 Edited by J. Burl Hogins and Robert E. Yarber Collections are 20th century pieces Organized by themes that address cultural aspects Included a rhetorical table of contents Questions on substance and rhetoric of each essay General topics for writing Subjects for library investigation

Conditions of Man	Stimulate thought about social, spiritual and cultural problems Conventions of the rhetoric of exposition Use of informal language and satire	Published 1968 Edited by Johnson and Dale E. Bonnette Essays on Man and the various aspects of being human Use of brief introductions for each section General headnotes for important sections
Content and Organization	Teach rhetorical patterns and emphases Hybrid: Traditional function, unusual forms	Published in 1968 Edited by James Corey and John Blodgett Uses art to illustrate persuasion Uses writing controversies for topics on research
From Source to Statement	Focus on discovery and development through examining of patterns Reduced emphasis on analysis	Published in 1968 By James McCrimmon Essays arranged according to the area being studied: illustration, definition, analysis, argument, persuasion A concise preface for each section explaining the rhetorical element under study

		Questions following each section on substance, technique
The Prevalent Forms of Prose	The steps in the process of composition. Analysis is de-emphasized	Published in 1968 By Otis Winchester and Winston Weathers 5 classes of prose pieces. Generalizations for each section. Detailed suggestion for each section.
The Strategy of Composition	Different ways of designing complete essays. Methods of development. Length of the textbook	Published in 1968 By Clarence Brown and Robert Zoellner Chapters have essays that illuminate each aspect. Types of essays-mostly formal. Few rare humorous, satiric and ironic. Each chapter concludes with "writing-situations" for student practice.
Rhetoric: A Synthesis	Bring together the various fragments in a new rhetoric. Putting theory into practice. For a course that emphasizes rhetoric.	Published in 1968 By W. Ross Winterowd 228 pages, $5.95 Chapters discussing "basic assumptions"

1970:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewers
Success: A Search for Values	Focus on specific and concrete Higher level of abstraction Moral content	Published in 1969 By Audrey J. Roth Readings with exercises. Vocabulary section and writing assignments Illustration - Inclusion of cartoons, speeches, ads
The College Writer: Essays for Composition	Grammar, punctuation, spelling, theme writing. Exposition, Argument, persuasion, description, narration, characterization and style.	Published in 1969 By William Pratt Each section has an introduction. Illustrative essays Questions on substance, structure and style. Writing assignments for each section.
Focus on Prose	Rhetorical emphasis Teach through short essays that are examples that students can follow.	Published in 1969 By William D. Baker Numerous short essays. Each essay is followed by suggestions for study, focus on language, discussion and writing topics.
Discourse: An Illustrative Reader	Rhetorical emphasis	Published in 1969

	Author's point of view is emphasized	By Daniel Knapp Illustrative essays; Long thorough introduction; Multiple suggestions- Lines of inquiry and lines of Experiment Begins with description and narrative instead of expository essays
Style and Substance: Reading and Writing	The importance of essay writing and its importance as a form of literature.	Published in 1969 By Travis Merritt Introductions: thorough and unique; Varied choice of essays.
Details and Pattern: Essays for Composition	Examining detail and extracting patterns from these details Hybrid Focus on Substance over style and student motivation	Published in 1969 By Robert Baylor Varied materials used: Visual, multiple genres of text (poems, song lyrics, essays) Choice of essays are varied
Controversy: Prose for Analysis	Rhetorical emphasis Capture student interest Promote a worldview – noted as an unintentional consequence	Published in 1969 By Robert S. Gold and Sanford R. Radner Essays arranged thematically in 7 categories. Each section has a varied collection of essays that

		deal with contemporary and relevant topics.
Response in Reading: Readings for Understanding, Evaluation and Application	Reading for evaluation, and application. References sources	Published in 1969 By Samuel Weingarten Essays are connected to the particular section. Numbered paragraphs.
Speaking Into Writing	Research and discussion are the focus.	Published in 1969 By John Nist 20 chapters that appear ungrouped.
Patterns for Composition	Language (engaging the student) Importance of sound Audience and market awareness are noted	Published in 1969 By Joseph P. Collignon Use of the pronoun – "you" of the student. Listening to sentences to "hear" which sounds more correct/"better of the two sentences. Vocabulary, logic and organization exercises
Writing to be Read	Definition and Analysis; Description; Narration; Compare and contrast Level of student is noted, and recognizes that the student as someone who "dislikes English" Clear organization Repetition	Published in 1969 By Alex Ross Chapters with questions for titles. Exercises in the chapters.

		A tone of "fatherly benevolence."
Writing to be Read	Looking for patterns and responding Interpreting; Arguing; Reconciliation; Clarity and convenience considered Student competence level noted	Published in 1969 By Eleanor Newman Hutchens Illustration and connection through sample essays Focus on literature Author's comments
Clear Thinking for Composition	Clear thinking is the main event in the writing process. Analysis and teach logic.	Published in 1969 By Ray Kytle
Craft of Writing	Clear thinking and argument Movement and thesis statement Style Argument	Published in 1969 By Robert Beloof, Leonard Nathan and Carroll E. Selph Introduction to the writing environment. Listening to stylistic defects Sample argument with a thesis. Step-by -step process.
Persona: A Style Study for Readers and Writers (	Style Persona of the writer Persona Student agency/student collaborator/servile relationship. Tone and Attitude Self-discovery	Published in 1969 By Walker Gibson Use of metaphor Use of literature Voice (reader and writer) Analysis of passages Writing exercises on style.

		Illustration to explain.
Writing Step by Step: Exercises in Structured Creativity	Prewriting warm-up Common writing errors Confidence building Encourage relaxation; building confidence Point of view and focus Selection and development of ideas Making comparisons Challenging popular beliefs Making judgments Overly simplified, "canned" structural thinking Demystifies writing and relocates the "mystery" in the student	Published in 1969 By Audrey J. Roth and Thelma C. Altschuler Exercises and analysis. Expressivist writing that must come from students. Perception centered texts. Exercises Visual observation and description Exercising perception (the exercises are word association games). Exercises asking students to create personal and impersonal sentences Activities recalling details (from everyday activities and not from textual sources) Example, What do a shark and a snake have in common? Example, I do not believe blondes have more fun Unusual topics Defined answers and reactions (?)
Tendency of oversimplification Writing is demystified but student is made a "dependent" thinker.		

The Theme of the Hero, ed. Roy Pickett *The Theme of Justice,* ed. William Gillis and Patricia Ingle Gillis, *The Theme of the Machine,* ed. Allan Danzig	Considered a set that work together To study the complexities Over-riding topic that cut across various disciplines Gives teacher choice of topic Chance for teacher to become the expert Language is simple	Published in 1969 $3.75/text Single topic textbooks Topic relevant, but potentially outdated selections Uneven introductions and selections Series of questions included
Preparing Effective Reports	Thickness	Published in 1967 By Lionel D. Wyld 9 chapters each less than 20 pages per chapter.

1971:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewers
Rhetoric: Then and Now -	Definition of a traditional textbook Definitions of the forms is traditional Order in which headings appear Pedagogical assumptions Analysis of essay	Published in 1970 By James T. Hayes 41 selections Arrangement: Exposition, Argumentation, Narration and Description. Predictable questions at the end of each essay. Inclusion of writers who are outside of the usual anthology contributors.
Strategies in Prose Second edition	Learn to write by writing stimulation through reading and discussion Inculcate style through emulation	Published in 1970 By Wilfred A. Ferrell and Nicholas A. Salerno 85 selections, some of which were controversial. Inclusion of multiple works by the same author (to demonstrate authors adapting to different needs of particular writing situations) 6 topic headings- these headings are double-labeled with issue + rhetoric– example, “the Individual” and “Persuasion” Brief questions

Writer and Audience	Analysis of multiple forms of writing critically Create by experimenting with multiple forms when used in self-expression. Author's intention	Published in 1970 By Wilson Currin Snipes 33 selections 4 topic headings: focus on writing and people/understanding General introductions to large sections. Fully developed questions Writing suggestions included.
Purpose and Function	Rhetorical orientation. Linguistic orientation Length of readings Whose writings are included	Published in 1970 By Nicholas P. Barker Author distinguishes between "expressivist, informative, directive and performative prose" rhetorically. Examining the function of language and the "act of speech or writing." Short selections that exemplify "expressivist, informative, directive and performative prose" Anonymous selections.
Strategy of Prose	Analysis of structure, purpose and style	Published in 1970

	Focus on with how to improve student writing Number of times an essay is repeated for different functions. For example, Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" used 3 times. In each section (structure, purpose, style) the essay is analyzed Explaining the process of composition	By William R. Seat, III, and Paul S. Burtness Using metaphor of form to function Different questions for different sections of the same essay. The use of a diagram.
Prose: A Systematic Approach to Writing	Presence of new scholarship Demonstrate the connection between critical analysis and writing ability.	Published in 1970 By Eva M. Burkett 7 chapters of which 3 chapters have essays under the traditional four forms of discourse Untouched by new ideas
Phase Blue: A Systems Approach to College English	The objectives of the course must be stated and defined objectively. Help student understand and reach these objectives through skill development. Empirical method to determine if these objectives have been accomplished. Provision for alternate paths to follow	Published in 1970 By James Hogins and Robert Yarber 10 chapters 64 selections (all contemporary) Each chapter and essay have brief summaries. Instructional apparatus has analytical thrust separate questions for discussion of content and rhetoric of each

		essay; separate vocabulary exercises.
Attitudes of Rhetoric	Personality of the writer and how the writer adapts	Published in 1970 By Winston Weathers and Otis Winchester 9 chapters based on author personality types. A useful preface preceding each chapter. Questions for analysis Writing assignments.
Writer and Persona	Why are essays not considered "creative" – "voice" is a more significant aspect.	Published in 1970 By Charles Sanders, Robin Rice, and Watt Cantillon Inclusion of classical selections Scholarly preface.
"MULTI-MEDIA" TEXTBOOKS		
Mixed Bag: Artifacts from Contemporary Culture	Generate an emotional response What does a textbook do? "Communicate to minds accustomed to thinking linearly" or "does it become an experience?" "the medium is the message" (Marshall McLuhan) Motivate the students	Published in 1970 Edited by Helene D. Hutchinson $6.25 6 emotionally laden, interconnected but distinct subjects. Unusual content – ads, cartoons, photographs, paintings, graffiti, street-

		song lyrics along with traditional genres (poems, stories, essays) Bright colors font Black and white pictures as a visual contrast.
Montage: Investigation in Language	To grab attention Awaken the senses. Element of shock Noted possible reactions of the textbook Making the form of the text the object of analysis Provoke investigations in language.	Published in 1970 Edited by William Sparke and Clark McKowen Use of bold and bright color (combinations) Typographical elements used as visuals/art No introduction No table of contents No adherence to the (legal) conventions of a textbook Questions and quizzes are interspersed in the text. Joycean "stream of consciousness atmosphere"
Reading for Insight	Between traditional and unusual	Published in 1970 Edited by J. Burl Hogins and Gerald A. Bryant, Jr. $5.95 (cloth) $4.95 (paper) Made of cloth and paper.

		Organization by topic. 11 units: the topics are from social issues that were addressed to the students' world/experience. Orderly juxtaposition of text (poems, quotations, essays) and visuals (graphs, cartoons) and a combination of both (photo-essays).
Worlds in the Making: Probes for Students of the Future	Motivate the student Control the tone and theme of the textbook. Modern yet traditional format. Interdisciplinary input Foster thinking from multiple perspectives.	Published in 1970 Edited by Mary Jane Dunstan and Patricia Garlan Excerpts from essays and novels. Linear, objective and analytical. 7 parts on topics that are located in the scientific/human – machine/human civilization topics. Thought provoking comments in blue colored boxes inserted in the reading material. Use of illustrations and full color paintings.
The Writer's Mind	Demonstrate that creativity can be taught.	Published in 1970

	Address the teacher as well as the student.	By William Kaufmann and William Powers $4.95 Their own prose is used as illustrative examples. 12 chapters that focus on people; language; the generation, development and application of ideas; and the writing process. Occasional photographs or diagrams. Teacher-jargon and student-lingo are both used.
RADICAL READERS		
The Age of Rock: Sounds of the American Cultural Revolution	Cultural analysis through one of the students' favorite media. Looking at other art forms and other eras in a similar way. Returning to literature through music. Teachers' knowledge of the mode being used.	Published in 1969 Edited by Jonathan Eisen $2.95 Song lyrics Poetry (folk music lyrics)
Breakthrough: Contemporary Reading and Writing	Level of the student/degree of competence of students is acknowledged	Published in 1969 Edited by Robert Yarber $3.95 Short selections No in-depth treatment of any topic.

		Timely content No standard, consistent form of the selections, but topics are centered around student issues and concerns.
Uptaught	Getting students to "write live." (the Third way) Hybrid between tract and textbook Questioning establishment	Published in 1970 By Ken Macrorie $2.50 Use of "lively" visuals. Pages "chopped up" by headlines.
Course X: A Left Filed Guide to Freshman English	Focus on the short-term goals. Ecological perspective General advice on how to navigate a very flawed system.	Published in 1970 By Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl $ 2.45 Address student directly. Topics from subject/discipline (Writing, Grammar, rhetoric, Sociology) Scandalous anecdotes
Rhetoric: Discovery and Change	Writing initiates a process that will alter the reader. Examine the relationship between reader and writer.	Published in 1970 By Richard E. Young, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth Pike $6.50

		Rhetorical strategies through the four philosophical images of man. Inclusion of traditional writing precepts.
Rhetoric of Argument	Improve the students' reading – more critical reading of argumentation. Showing how classical figures of speech may be used in analysis of argument.	Published in 1970 By William J. Brandt $ 6.00 Introduction – brief history of classical rhetoric. The apparatus has explanations and lists of classical terms.

1972:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewers
Prose in Practice- A Rhetorical Reader	"Writers are made, not born." Teaching writing through examination of other writers.	Published in 1971 By James William Johnson $ 4.25 56 reading selections. Questions and topics of discussion are focused at rhetorical matters.
The Design of Prose	Teaching writing through formal analysis of non-fiction prose. A teaching, "no-nonsense" approach text.	Published in 1971 Edited by Peter Gardiner and William Gibson 30 short, non-fiction prose selections by 19th and 20th century writers. Each selection has an almost equally long analysis of technique of classification and evaluation. Questions are both essay type questions and multiple choice.
The Rationale of the Essay	Stimulate the student through experience. Generate interest, reflection and discussion. Facilitate fruitful student reading.	Published in 1971 Edited by Alice Chandler and Marlene Fisher $5.95 30 essays on 10 subjects/themes that are

		"contemporary, yet "timeless." Introduction to each writer and selection. The 10 sections organized under inventions, organization or stylistics. Discuss topic, thesis and invention.
Now and Tomorrow: The Rhetoric of Culture in Transition	Counter and jolt the student out of "the limbo" of indifference	Published in 1971 Edited by Tom Kakonis and James Wilcox $4.95 Composite yet varied collection of essays.
The Oxford Reader: Varieties of Contemporary Discourse	Directly speak to/engage the student Studying rhetorical strategies and forms Topical engagement	Published in 1971 (Publisher is Oxford University Press) $6.95 Approx. 900 pages Essays (each 15-20 pages long); interviews and photographs scattered throughout. Traditional groupings. Each section includes introductions, interpretive and evaluative comments.

The Whole Idea Catalog: College Writing Projects	Teaching how to think and then write (on important subjects).	Published in 1971 By Idelle Sullens $3.95 Essays organized according to quality of human life, revolution, the inner man/woman. Use of commentary on each topic. "Projects" writing suggestion are provided – example, patterns; compare key assertions; etc.
How Many Roads to the 70s	Present to the student the many choices and directions available to them. Provoke discussion	Published in 1971 Edited by Herman Estrin and Esther Llyod-Jones $4.40 Essays of immediate concern. Friendly, student-directed introductions. Discussion questions included.
Ways of Communicating	"Activate students' senses" Strengthen students' "ability to read, listen, speak, and write."	Published in 1971 By Donald J. Tighe A wide variety of materials – newspapers, magazine articles, essays, cartoons,

		photographs, advertisements etc. Questions on the groups of selections.
Identity Through Prose	Use writing as a means to understand the self at any point in time. Voice of the text: energetic, interested, curious, candid, and continually urging. Connect with the student	Published in 1971 (Publishers Holt, Rinehart, Winston) 3 parts – "The Self," "The Self and the Others," and "The Self in Prose." Large number of exercises – directions, questions, possible pitfalls, coaxes, and always encourages. Colloquial/informal language. "gimmicky"
Mass Media and the Popular Arts	Understand mass media and popular art forms as information. Types of readings The role of antecedents of the authors/selections Informed and intelligent effort to present a comprehensive view.	Published in 1971 Edited by Frederic Rissover and David Birch Typography of the textbook as art. Short introductions and substantial essays. Selections on pornography, *Reader's Digest* and *Playboy.* Authors are from community colleges.
A Practical Rhetoric	Practical and easy to use.	Published in 1971

	Nothing fancy Teach basic writing situations. Teaching argument	By John Hurley $ 2.95 166 pages Discussions on process analysis.
First Principles of the Essay	Explaining the basics of essay writing – the paragraph, the short essay, the long or complex essay and prose style.	Published in 1971 By Robert Miles $4.50 318 pages Each section looks at one aspect through essays and explanation.
Writing: Fact and Imagination	Teach through repetition.	Published in 1971 By Eleanor C. Hibbs $4.95 321 pages Each section has an in-depth explanation, lots of examples and practice exercises. Step-by-step procedure explained.

1973:

Title of Textbook	Reviewer Evaluation of Content	Facts Noted by Reviewer
Fundamentals of Oral and written Communication	Corrective textbook "for the student who needs repair in understanding and in using effective communicative skills" or the student who needs "specific experiences in effective communication."	Published in 1972 By Margaret Allison Watkins Includes a wide variety of subjects, but lacks specialization. General and superficial discussion that are too short to be of use. No connection between topics and examples.
Handbook for Student Writing	Teaching the mechanics of writing Traditional writing handbook The reasons for any textbook to be different? How is it relevant? What gap does it fill? Is it even needed?	Published in 1972 By Nell Ann Pickett and Ann Laster 6 chapters – first 4 on the approaches to writing and last 2 on the library paper and letter forms. Focus on sentence, the paragraph, the whole theme. Focus on the mechanics, vocabulary, grammar and spelling.
Pace: A Procedural Approach to the Composition of Essays		Published in 1972 By Ann Marie Thames and Thomas H. Gripp

		Examples and tear-out exercise sheets Explanations and guidelines to the analysis of essays. Addition of chapters on labeling, persuasion and satire.
Making it as a Writer	Hybridity in a textbook: Traditional handbook but with a modern approach Teaches "essential things" like organization, grammar, and logical thought." Keep the content exciting and engaging to the students	Published in 1972 By Robert C. Bloesser Exercises are traditional, but sentences are quirky. No "educatorese."
Styles for Writing: A Brief Rhetoric	Teaching the basic mechanics of writing like "fused sentences, comma faults, and dangling modifiers"	Published in 1972 By Gerald Levin Chapters devoted to these topics. Essays as examples and illustrations.
Pre-writing: Strategies for Exploration and Discovery Pre-writing: Strategies for Exploration and Discovery	Draw attention to the pre-writing process – focus on analysis, analogy, brainstorming and systematic enquiry.	Published in 1972 By Ray Kytle Encouragement Examples and illustrations
The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing Approach to Student Writing	Stresses the process of writing rather than the finished product.	Published in 1972 By Donald Stewart

	Writing as self-discovery.	Ordered around the problems of inception (attitudes and perception), concept formation (abstractions) and composition (mediation and new ways of looking).
Letters from Roger	Understand language from the perspective of a foreigner The ethnicity of the student. How is the student "invited" to participate?	Published in 1972 By Russell N. Campbell and Maryruth Bracy 12 letters that mark the 12 divisions of the textbook. These letters give a chance to include diverse artifacts (want-ads, cartoons, club announcements, Christmas carols, photographs, and travel brochures). 6 points of view. No table of contents
The Freshman Writer	To help students get "high grades in college" Overcoming the "tribulations of their various writing assignments." This is a Self-help guide	Published in 1972 By Michele F. Cooper $ 1.95 205 pages 4 sections- College Essays; Reading, Taking Notes and Writing about Lit.; The Freshman Researcher; Writing on Examinations

APPENDIX 3 : LIST OF FUNCTIONAL AND FORM GROUPS

3a: List of Functional Groups

I used the terms below to determine the Functional Dimension terms for the Framework in this project.

1. Mechanics of writing.
    a. Syntax, metaphor, sound, rhythm, emphasis, punctuation, paragraph writing,
    b. Grammar, punctuation, spelling, theme writing.
    c. Logic and Organization
    d. Movement
    e. Writing Errors
    f. The focus on the grammar and mechanics of it is kept separate but accessible.
    g. Teaching the basic mechanics of writing like "fused sentences, comma faults, and dangling modifiers"

2. Theory of Rhetoric:
    a. Teach rhetorical patterns and emphases.
    b. Exposition, Argument, persuasion, description, narration, characterization.
    c. Thesis Statements
    d. Analysis of structure, purpose and style
    e. Study of tone and language.
    f. Development of the students (as a writer) keeping the perspective of the reader as primary.

3. Improving Reading and writing using essays:
    a. Short essays that are examples that students can follow.
    b. The importance of essay writing and its importance as a form of literature.
    c. Reading for evaluation, and application
    d. To study the complexities
    e. Stimulation through reading and discussion
    f. Analysis of multiple forms of writing critically
    g. Analysis of multiple forms of writing critically
    h. Making the form of the text the object of analysis
    i. Teach by emulation and application of sample writings by students and professional writers.
    j. It claims a focus on the consumption (reading) and production (writing) of texts.
    k. Learning to deal with complex texts.

4. Step-by-Step guide to writing/ As a teaching and learning aid***(structure/organization/procedural)
    a. The steps in the process of composition.
    b. "Notes" included as a part of the main text.
    c. Selection and development of ideas
    d. Demystifies writing and relocates the "mystery" in the student
    e. Learn to write by writing
    f. Inculcate style through emulation
    g. Explaining the process of composition
    h. Teach students how to successfully complete the assignments.
    i. Focus on the short-term goals.
    j. General advice on how to navigate a very flawed system.
    k. Address the teacher as well as the student.
    l. Teach basic writing situations.
    m. Explaining the basics of essay writing – the paragraph, the short essay, the long or complex essay and prose style.
    n. Teach through repetition.
    o. Corrective textbook "for the student who needs repair in understanding and in using effective communicative skills" or the student who needs "specific experiences in effective communication."
    p. To help students get "high grades in college."
    q. Overcoming the "tribulations of their various writing assignments." This is a Self-help guide.
    r. A writing guide for the student: unveil the mental processes of writers.
    s. Task- analysis approach that is seen in various chapters as "explanation and action," "explanatory and directive," illustrating the paradox of writing; explain writing by "differentiating and identifying its parts."
    t. A guide to the students on explaining every aspect of writing – from conception to final draft; from rhetorical focus to the mechanics; from application of tools to the genres of writing. The instruction has everything from sample essays to a handbook with rules of grammar.

5. Teaching students about the research process.
    a. References sources
    b. Research and discussion.

6. Study of Identity: Understand themselves, their families and their society
    a. Stimulate thought about social, spiritual and cultural problems.
    b. Development of point of view/perspective.
    c. Writing to understanding/explaining the world.
    d. Moral content
    e. Substance (issues outside of writing) over style (writing related concerns)
    f. Analysis and logic based on social and cultural factors
    g. Uses controversial news/topics from the real world.
    h. Challenging popular beliefs

i. Multiple forms of expressivism
j. Writing initiates a process that will alter the reader.
k. Use writing as a means to understand the self at any point in time.
l. To counter the "crisis in *being human* for the individual *human being*" in a "bewildering technological, electronic culture".
m. Juxtapose social and cultural issues with the rhetorical aspects like purpose, context, genre etc.

7. Writing as process/product
    a. Prewriting
    b. Strengthen students' "ability to read, listen, speak, and write." – a holistic process of learning to write.
    c. Draw attention to the pre-writing process – focus on analysis, analogy, brainstorming and systematic enquiry.
    d. Challenge the linearity of previous editions and show the thinking *while* writing process.

8. Looking for and Analyzing Patterns
    a. Focus on discovery and development through examining of patterns.
    b. Examining detail and extracting patterns from these details.
    c. Making comparisons

9. Critical reflection as the main event
    a. Clear thinking
    b. Discriminate between fact and judgment
    c. Making judgments
    d. Demonstrate the connection between critical analysis and writing ability.
    e. Foster thinking from multiple perspectives.
    f. Questioning establishment.
    g. Generate interest, reflection and discussion.
    h. Counter and jolt the student out of "the limbo" of indifference
    i. Present to the student the many choices and directions available to them.
    j. Provoke discussion.
    k. Start the process of questioning.
    l. Foster original thought from art *and* text.
    m. Explore the connection between language and imagination; and how that defines the individual.
    n. Thinking skills must underlie all the writing that will happen.
    o. Encourages creativity and originality
    p. Help student transfer what they learn through "[creation of] general principles based on their own experiences and learning," "self-reflect[ion]" to keep track of their learning and thinking and "mindful" of their surroundings.

10. Getting students aware of Language in writing
    a. Vocabulary

b. Provoke investigations in language.

11. Stimulating the Senses
    a. Importance of sound/Using sound in teaching; Returning to literature through music.
    b. Generate an emotional response
    c. Awaken the senses/"Activate students' senses"

12. Creating a sense of empowerment through writing
    a. Voice/Student Agency
    b. Persona: "the voice, the created personality of the writer, the selective process in his own being that projects and propels a voice and personality, molds the writing."
    c. Development of point of view/perspective.
    d. Personality of the writer and how the writer adapts
    e. Examine the relationship between reader and writer.
    f. Give the student the control of being able to develop their own successful writing process.

13. Visual discourse and discourse communication.
    a. Uses images that include (but are not restricted to art work, cartoons, photographs)
    b. Visual perception exercises.
    c. Pictorial reinforcement within the customary format
    d. Looking at other art forms and other eras in a similar way.
    e. Understand the mass-media and popular art forms as information.
    f. Encourages mental and sensory stimulation using TV, movies, plays, magazines etc.
    g. Acknowledges the saturation of society in terms of information and the medium of the visual through which we receive it.
    h. Acknowledging the literacies of today (from literacy of yesteryear).
    i. Communication as a hybrid of the visual and alphabetic.

14. Student motivation/engagement:
    a. Confidence building
    b. Cultural analysis through one of the students' favorite media.
    c. Directly speak to the student.
    d. Explore the connection between language and motivation. Motivate through tapping into emotion, which in turn is expressed through language/words.
    e. Writing (learning) is a private process, but one that must come from the person. This is addressed separate ways to the student and the teacher
    f. Tries to contextualize writing from an overall academic perspective – how writing will help in all other courses.
    g. Teaching through an understanding of "*why people write.*"

*Additional category titles based on scholarship:

1981: dissertation:

1. Censorship – inclusion of objectionable materials.
2. The process of textbook selection is not being considered here.

1995: The professional essay/hybrid essay/student essay
Tara Lockhart: Arguing for the hybrid essays as an effective way to generate greater generic, stylistic and rhetorical awareness, strategies that can be employed by the student.

1. Writing the world
2. Writing the Self

1999: Miles:

1. How TBs work in the classroom and in junction with (or independent of) scholarship?
2. Students as co-constructors of meaning.
3. The context of the textbook – the mechanical focus discounts the aspect of socio-cultural, and expressivist context.
4. A self-sufficient textbook versus a textbook that needs the giving of guidance.
5. Transdisciplinary aspect of a textbook (pp. 60); The spaces the textbook occupies – personal/professional (pp. 62); diagram to explain these spaces (pp. 65), (pp. 108), – think of these spaces in terms of how they are included in the textbooks. Example, the mechanics-oriented textbooks only consider the disciplinary spaces, but the textbooks that are multimodal consider the personal and the disciplinary spaces.
6. The question of audience for the textbook (teachers and students) (pp. 86); teachers have their reasons for designing a course as they do and depending upon textbooks as they do (pp. 109)
7. [Used diagrammatic representations extensively in her dissertation]
8. The business side of textbooks – that seems to be the most dominant aspect and that is why the change is not as significant (supported by Kathleen Yancey)
9. "Author function" the sense of continuity in a textbook (pp. 116); the question of authority and expertise (117) – this is about the authors of particular anthologies.

3b: List of Form Groups

I used the following terms to design the Forms of Content and Forms of Media dimensions in the Function & Form Framework in this project.

1. Theme writing. Essays arranged thematically.
2. Each section has a varied collection of essays that deal with contemporary and relevant topics.
3. Types of essays-mostly formal.
4. Numerous short essays.
5. Each essay is followed by suggestions for study, focus on language, discussion and writing topics.
6. Illustrative essays;
7. Chapters that look at the various aspects of writing – from (pre)writing processes to the mechanics.
8. Chapters have essays that illuminate each aspect.
9. Going back to Aristotle and coming to "New Rhetoric" and "Pedagogy."
10. A table of common grammatical errors.
11. Inclusion of the handbook.
12. Chapter and exercises that show how concrete material – color movement, figures of speech, quotations, supporting details lend "objective reality."
13. Introductory essays that give varying interpretations of social and cultural phenomena.
14. Language is formal.
15. Tone is serious.
16. A tone of "fatherly benevolence."
17. Listening to stylistic defects
18. Use of metaphor
19. Introductory essays for each section.
20. Cultural themes.
21. Suggested subjects for library investigation.
22. Essays on human life.
23. Essays on illustration, definition, analysis, argument, persuasion.
24. Detailed suggestion for each section.
25. Use of informal language.
26. Headnotes for important sections.
27. Art to illustrate point being made.
28. Uses controversies for topics for research.
29. Readings with exercises.
30. Vocabulary section
31. Writing assignments
32. Detailed introductions.
33. Illustrative essays.
34. Long thorough introduction.

35. Multiple suggestions
36. Vocabulary exercises
37. Use of literature
38. Perception centered texts.
39. Activities recalling details
40. Unusual topics
41. Single topic textbooks
42. Predictable questions at the end of each essay.
43. Inclusion of writers who are outside of the usual anthology contributors.
44. Inclusion of multiple works by the same author (to demonstrate authors adapting to different needs of particular writing situations)
45. Writing suggestions included.
46. Author distinguishes between "expressivist, informative, directive and performative prose" rhetorically.
47. Different questions for different sections of the same essay.
48. A useful preface preceding each chapter.
49. Bright colors font/ Typographical elements used as visuals/art
50. Table of contents
51. Black and white pictures as a visual contrast.
52. Made of cloth and paper.
53. Orderly juxtaposition of text (poems, quotations, essays) and visuals (graphs, cartoons), combination of both (photo-essays).
54. Thought provoking comments in blue colored boxes inserted in the reading material.
55. Teacher-jargon and student-lingo are both used.
56. Song lyrics
57. Poetry (folk music lyrics)
58. Scandalous anecdotes/ Selections on pornography, *Reader's Digest* and *Playboy*
59. Introduction – brief history of classical rhetoric.
60. The cover is corrugate hard brown paper, similar to the packing box material.
61. Discussion and writing questions that invite the student to compare what they read and their own ideas, feelings and experiences.
62. Colloquial/informal language/"gimmicky"
63. Authors are from community colleges.
64. Step-by-step procedure explained.
65. Tear-out exercise sheets
66. Exposition, Argument, persuasion, description, narration, characterization.

Forms as a response to how to improve Critical Reading, Writing and Thinking

67. Short essays that are examples that students can follow.
68. The importance of essay writing and its importance as a form of literature.
69. Reading for evaluation, and application

70. To study the complexities
71. Stimulation through reading and discussion
72. Analysis of multiple forms of writing critically
73. Making the form of the text the object of analysis
74. Teach by emulation and application of sample writings by students and professional writers.
75. It claims a focus on the consumption (reading) and production (writing) of texts.
76. Learning to deal with complex texts.
77. Focus on discovery and development through examining of patterns.
78. Examining detail and extracting patterns from these details.
79. Making comparisons

Forms of trying to engage the student:

80. Study of Identity: Understand themselves, their families and their society
81. Stimulate thought about social, spiritual and cultural problems.
82. Development of point of view/perspective.
83. Writing to understanding/explaining the world.
84. Moral content
85. Substance (issues outside of writing) over style (writing related concerns)
86. Analysis and logic based on social and cultural factors
87. Uses controversial news/topics from the real world.
88. Challenging popular beliefs
89. Multiple forms of expressivist writings
90. Writing initiates a process that will alter the reader.
91. Use writing as a means to understand the self at any point in time.
92. To counter the "crisis in being human for the individual human being" in a "bewildering technological, electronic culture".
93. Juxtapose social and cultural issues with the rhetorical aspects like purpose, context, genre etc.
94. Help student transfer what they learn through "[creation of] general principles based on their own experiences and learning," "self-reflect[ion]" to keep track of their learning and thinking and "mindful" of their surroundings.
95. Cultural analysis through one of the students' favorite media.
96. Directly speak to the student.
97. This is addressed separate ways to the student and the teacher
98. Contextualize writing from an overall academic perspective – how writing will help in all other courses.
99. Persona: "the voice, the created personality of the writer, the selective process in his own being that projects and propels a voice and personality, molds the writing."
100. Development of point of view/perspective.
101. Personality of the writer and how the writer adapts
102. Examine the relationship between reader and writer.

Form for Multiple literacies function:

103. Uses images that include (but are not restricted to art work, cartoons, photographs)
104. Visual perception exercises.

105. Pictorial reinforcement within the customary format
106. Looking at other art forms and other eras in a similar way.

APPENDIX 4 : FRAMEWORK FOR *WRITING WITH A PURPOSE,* 1950-1980

4.1 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1950)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Alphabetic	Feedback		○		
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.2 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1957)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Alphabetic	Feedback			○	
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.3 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1963)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.4 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1967)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered	○			
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○		
	Reading Centered	○	○	○	
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research			○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	○
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.5 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1972)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○	○	
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	○	○	○	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback	○		○	
	Research	○	○	○	○
	Reflective	●	●	●	●
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.6 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1976)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○	○	○
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●	●	○
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

4.7 : *Writing with a Purpose* (1980)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		○	○	○
	Reading Centered		●	●	●
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective		●	●	○
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	●
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

APPENDIX 5 : FRAMEWORK FOR *WRITING WITH A PURPOSE*, 1984 AND 1988

The Function & Form Framework : *Writing with a Purpose* (1984)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective	○	○	○	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	○
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis Notes:

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: The Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: The Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: The Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: The Expression of Ideas

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	29, 44, 89, 105, 111-117, 189, 215, 228-229, 233, 238, 241-242, 244, 246-248, 249, 256-257, 259, 265, 275-276, 356-357, 372-374, 515-567

Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons, posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	15, 24, 57, 58, 77-78, 84, 118, 147-148, 156, 184, 192, 231, 254, 278, 315, 316, 317, 321, 340, 348, 384-385, 396, 399, 400, 412, 436,
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Assignments	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Assignments	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	75
Reflective Assignments	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	9, 17, 22, 37, 47-48, 62-63, 89, 147-148, 204, 287-288, 300, 374-377,
Reading-centered assignments	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	29, 44, 89, 105, 111-117, 189, 215, 228-229, 233, 238, 241-242, 244, 246-248, 249, 256-257, 259, 265, 275-276, 356-357, 372-374, 515-567

Rough notes for mapping:

The reflective assignments here are truly reflective in that they directly invite student experiences within the scope of what is being examined. An example is when the students are asked to list their writing habits as they prepare to begin the writing process with deliberation (9). This is seen even outside of discussion topics and review exercises, for example the textbook asks the students to first think about their own level of knowledge about a subject. Here, the sources of knowledge include "direct experience, observation, [and] reading" (17). Another example is asking the students to go back to memory as a valuable resource for information, the textbook writes, "Your own past is one of your best sources of information … You must remember on purpose, searching your past for impressions, events, and ideas you may want to use" (37). There is an exercise set that were reflective assignments based on student opinions and interests (47-48). This is points to the fact that the reflective

assignments that began in the early 1960s were now here to stay. This reflective aspect that incorporates the personal is seen in how some lessons are re-presented, for example drawing up everyday lists as a way to understand drafting of an essay (89-92). Other examples of such reflective exercises, discussion topics and lesson content can be seen on pages 204, Also, there is a direct reference to the audience (22).
There is a small number of research assignments, and of these ask the students to refer to personal situations that would involve the research process (75).

The use of visuals is extended to supporting assignments (57, 77-78, 236-237, 338-341, 348, 383-887) as parodies that light-heartedly illustrate the writing process (15, 24, 58, 184, 254, 277, 321, 412, 436), as well as section divisions between chapters (34, 84, 118, 156, 192, 231, 269, 300, 380, 400). These photographs that introduce each chapter seem to either literal or metaphorical expressions of the basic function of that chapter. I would argue that this inclusion would qualify as a visual medium that has can be used as a reflective assignment to highlight the process function. Connected to the added functionality of visuals is the emergence of new genres of visuals like illustrated maps (57), as well as the continued use of diagrams (278, 315, 316, 317, 455).

Previously in the 1967 and 1972 editions, the discussion topics and review exercises were interspersed in the lesson contents. Here the review exercises and the Questions for Discussions sections go back a separate section at the conclusion of the chapter. The chapters now show a format that is more reminiscent of the past: a beginning, the content of the chapter, a set of guidelines, the review exercises and finally a section that has the questions that test the students' knowledge of that particular section.

All of the WAP editions so far deal with Rhetorical knowledge, but now emerges a certain formality in how rhetorical knowledge is structured so it can be passed on in a systematic manner. This is evident in certain types of processes

The process of revision/feedback is now a separate chapter "Revising." This lesson is delivered through the use of visually aided, reflective assignments (147-148) along with the traditional, alphabetically structured, reflective assignments (148-153). Similarly, the writing process is taught through the strategies of narration (159-163), description (163-165), illustration (165-168), definition (183-188).

The Function & Form Framework : *Writing with a Purpose* (1988)

Form					
Media	Content				
Aural	Feedback				
	Research				
	Reflective				
	Reading Centered				
Visual	Feedback				
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	○	○	○	
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
Alphabetic	Feedback				
	Research	○	○	○	
	Reflective	●	●	●	○
	Reading Centered	●	●	●	
		Knowledge of Convention	Rhetorical Knowledge	Writing Processes	Critical Thinking
		Function			

LEGEND

● Significant evidence available to validate

○ Partial evidence available to validate

Study Analysis Notes

Functional Dimension

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Knowledge of Conventions	Vocabulary assignments that include grammar exercises, vocabulary/word lists, and format outlines. The use of directive language that tell the students what they must do in a particular assignment.	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments Handbook of Grammar and Usage
Rhetorical Knowledge	Assignments that ask students to examine the readings from characteristics of genres, function of the readings and ask students to think of audience awareness. The use of prescriptive language that guides the students to becoming aware of the rhetoric of the readings	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments
Processes	Assignments that show an incremental movement that begins at consuming a text, to producing a text through reflection, research and review. The assignments must build off of one another in an incremental manner. These steps could be all in one section/chapter or move incrementally throughout the entire textbook.	Part 1: The Writing Process Part 2: Expression of Ideas Part 3: Special Assignments
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	Assignments that ask the students to comment on the readings using reflections on primary and secondary sources, including their opinions based on their experiences. The language used is conversational and dialogic.	23, 57, 78, 120, 233

Forms of Delivery Mechanisms

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Alphabetic/ Linguistic	The use of printed, alphabetic texts across all forms of content includes genres like poems, essays, lyrics, plays, short stories, articles, books, etc.	20-22, 46-47, 52-56, 71, 76-78, 83,100, 123, 132, 134 -135, 137-138, 140-141,

		143, 147-148, 150, 151-154, 172-173, 185, 188, 194, 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 205, 206-209, 212, 215, 231, 287, 292-295
Visual	The use of all kinds of images and art, moving and stationary across all forms of content includes photographs, paintings, cartoons, posters, advertisements, typography and moving images	3, 5, 11, 24, 29, 38-39, 46-47, 53-55, 65, 75, 106, 111, 120, 145, 146, 166, 173, 189-190, 208, 210, 222, 228, 234, 239, 245, 252-253, 260-261, 270-271, 296, 303
Aural	The use of sound across all forms of content includes music, voice, dialect, tone etc.	

Forms-of-content

	Qualifying Criteria	Page numbers
Feedback/Review Content	Prompts that get the students to work with others on their drafts/research	
Research Content	Prompts that "get the students to "conduct primary research, however limited, on issues of interest to both themselves and the field of writing studies" (Downs & Wardle 562)	51, 118, 120, 122, 209
Reflective Content	prompts that "focuses more on students' reactions to [the readings] than on the readings themselves" (Downs & Wardle 561)	6, 12, 34-35, 51, 57, 100-103, 114, 118, 164, 187, 230, 233, 354-373
Reading-centered Content	These include the use of "texts" across the linguistic, visual, aural and beyond, that form the basis upon which assignments are based (Downs & Wardle 560). As assignments these involve just working on and revising these readings without any input from outside the text.	20-22, 46-47, 52-56, 71, 76-78, 83,100, 123, 132, 134 -135, 137-138, 140-141, 143, 147-148, 150, 151-154, 172-173, 185, 188, 194, 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 205, 206-209, 212, 215, 231, 287, 292-295

Rough notes for mapping:

The function of the edition comes across in the Research Paper: Student Model (354-373), as it outlines the processes of a "carefully drafted, compelling essay evolves from the complex

and often confusing attempts to discover a subject, audience, and purpose," and the techniques of "analyzing, paraphrasing, quoting, and documenting sources" (354).This edition takes into consideration the place of technology with an appendix titled "Writing with a Word Processor" (375-385).

As with the 1984 edition, the practice of introducing chapters with photographs continues (2, 24, 58, 80, 106, 130, 157, 182, 210, 234, 258, 272, 296, 324) as does the use of cartoons to parody and augment the main aim of the particular chapter (11, 36, 38-39, 228, 245, 323) and the use of diagrams to illustrate process or knowledge of Convention (29, 216, 245, 303). The use of maps (270-271) in this edition the diagrams that pertain to processes begin to look increasingly like mind-maps (29,) and the alphabetic exercises also show a similar shift (34-35). It is important to point out that the use of mind-maps brings a certain level of multiplicity in functions: it requires reflection but would also require a string understanding of convention and understanding the processes. This being said, the use of visuals, particularly photograph based assignments sees a huge increase. Aside from the introductory images, assignments, review exercises and discussion questions use images as either prompts or as significant additions to alphabetic prompts (46-47, 53-55, 65, 159, 166, 172-173, 184, 219, 222, 239, 252-253, 304)

In the area of visual and alphabetic hybrid assignments, an exercise that asks the students to read and "underline effective examples of specificity and imagery" (223). This is akin with copying a painting with words. The 1984 edition sees a marked increase in the proportion of reflective assignments that have the students bring in/actively consult their personal lives and experiences a source of information (6, 12, 145, 146). There is also a continuity in the assignments that enables the use of multiple modes, for example the assignment based on Jane's writing about a "significant experience in her life, her first whale watch" (110). This reading (110) and the accompanying photograph (111) and illustration (120). The Review Exercise in this section (122-128) are also based on this reading.

In this edition all the chapters conclude with an established assignments format: they are 5 prompts of 1 through 4 refer are reflective assignments based on the readings in the lessons. Prompt 5 is always a reflective analysis on the photograph that was used to open the chapter (23, 57, 78-79, 128-129, 154-155, 181, 233, 255, 373). Pages 292-295 has a Writing Assignment set that includes multiple genres of alphabetic readings.

Here are also a growing number of instances of critical thinking, that ask them to contemplate on multiple sources from within and without the student, on certain issues (23, 57, 78, 233). There are sections that begin to move beyond the textbook, and bring in the world at large through the student, for example the section on "Speculating" (39-43). Here, through multiple media the textbook guides the student to "broaden meaning and deepen your understanding" (42). Here the textbook gives an example of when it urges the student to go beyond their own personal experiences and consider outsider perspectives. The critical content is not as much as the reflective content.