

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii

- 1 Introduction 1
- 2 Reading in Contemporary First-Year Composition
Classes: A National Survey 21
- 3 Historical Contexts 45
- 4 Reading in Composition Research and
Teaching, 1980–1993 74
- 5 Transfer of Learning Scholarship and Reading
Instruction in First-Year Composition 102
- 6 Teaching Mindful Reading To Promote the Transfer
of Reading Knowledge 117
- 7 Epilogue: A Changing Landscape 143

Appendix A: Annotated Bibliography 153

*Appendix B: Handouts from Professional Development
Workshops on Integrating Attention to Reading into
Courses across the Curriculum* 173

*Appendix C: Supporting Materials from National Survey of
First-Year Composition Instructors and Their Students* 176

References 182

About the Author 191

Index 192

1

INTRODUCTION

In the final months of 2009, the WPA listserv (WPA-L) saw an onslaught of detailed responses to an initial post with the deceptively simple subject line: “How well do your students read . . . ?” The complete question, posted in the body of the email, sent to the listserv on October 27 by Bob Schwegler (2009) from the University of Rhode Island read: “How well do your students read complex texts—other than literary texts?” With more than fifty responses in just a few days, it became clear that this was an issue that interested a range of subscribers, many of whom responded to the question by drawing on their classroom teaching practices. Some listed useful assignments and methods (e.g., rhetorical analyses, annotation) while others wrote about textbooks that encourage the teaching of reading in composition such as Bartholomae and Petrosky’s *Ways of Reading* and Rosenwasser and Stephen’s *Writing Analytically*.

The majority of the respondents, however, went outside of composition to think about reading. Some encouraged those in composition to turn to the Education Departments at their schools. Others such as Jennifer Wells (2009) shared websites for high school English teachers and names of speakers and other scholars (e.g., Frank Smith) working within K–12 whose work might be adapted for use by post-secondary instructors. Arguing, on the other hand, that literature instructors are especially well-equipped to teach reading, Ryan Skinnell (2009) looked to the New Critics as exemplars of literature instructors committed to the teaching of reading, which he defines as “comprehension, close reading, critical assessment. I will not, can not, shall not claim that literature specialists are the best reading teachers in the world,” writes Skinnell, “But

I will, can, and shall claim that they are expert readers with the potential for teaching reading as a valuable function of what English departments claim to do.” Overall, the posts are best characterized by Patricia Donahue’s (2009) post wherein she writes: “It is curious to me that when the subject of reading comes up those of us in rhetoric/composition veer in one of two directions: towards literature, saying that’s what those people teach; or towards developmental reading specialists, trained in more qualitative methods. But we don’t refer to the substantial body of work done on reading in our own field (especially in the late eighties to early nineties)—particularly on the interrelationship of reading and writing. Why not?” Interestingly, although subscribers continued to respond to this thread for days after Donahue posted her provocative question, no one addressed or answered it except Bill Thelin (2009b) who suggested “an online study/reading group to discuss the research Patricia talks about” in order to “help us implement it and perhaps contribute to the body of knowledge by creating new applications.”

WPA-L subscribers are not the only ones in the field for whom the 1980s and 1990s is not a reference point for scholarship on reading. Histories of the field such as Stephen North’s *The Making of Knowledge in Composition* do not include a discussion of those scholars within composition for whom reading pedagogy was as important as writing pedagogy. More recently, Susan Miller’s 1,760-page *The Norton Book of Composition Studies* and Villanueva and Arola’s (2011) 899-page *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, two anthologies that are often used in graduate courses in rhetoric and composition, neglect to include essays on reading despite the overwhelming presence of these in the field during the 1980s and 1990s. This moment wherein attention to reading flourished within composition is simply not a part of standard accounts of composition’s history. Neither is it represented in texts used to educate scholars new to the field. Why didn’t the subject of reading become integral to how composition defined itself as a field since compositionists were studying reading and developing reading pedagogies at this

disciplinary-defining moment? Over the years, hypotheses have been offered as to why reading did not establish itself as one of the field's primary subjects. The first holds the "great divorce" (also called the "great divide") responsible, noting that as composition worked hard to define itself against literary studies in the 1980s it held especially tight to writing instruction since that was the one element that separated these fields from each other. Related to this first hypothesis is the theory that a struggle over disciplinary identity may have been the cause, a struggle that was marked by composition's investment in separating itself not only from literary theory, but also from reading instruction as it was defined by education (particularly K-12). Another hypothesis is that reading as a *subject* of inquiry has not disappeared, but that the term "reading" has been subsumed by the broader term "literacy" in much the same way Paul Butler found that attention to style never disappeared from composition, but simply migrated to other areas within composition, including genre studies among others. A final hypothesis has to do with the "social turn," wherein the field's attention turned toward writing's social dimensions and situated the writer as a social being affected by cultural, political, and social forces. While these are viable hypotheses, I am not convinced that they tell the entire story.

Each of these hypotheses looks *outside* of what I will call "the reading movement"¹ in order to account for reading's inability to take hold in the field. And, while Chapter 4 details the aspects of the discussions from the 1980s and early 1990s that are worth recovering, this book also contends that one contributing factor may actually lie *within* the scholarship from that movement. This project recovers that scholarship to explore precisely how scholars articulated their theories of reading and how the conflation of the terms "reading" and "literature," as well as differing goals of the scholars, were obstacles that prevented reading from securing its place as a primary focus of the field. These dissonances reigned, and as Kathleen McCormick (1994, 5) points out, in the "absence of such dialogue, work in reading remains fragmented and its transformative capacities limited."

Looking closely at the proliferation of scholarship on reading from the 1980s and 1990s both to imagine what went wrong, as well as to describe what seems recoverable and useful from that moment, this book considers what might be involved in reanimating discussions about reading within composition. Studying this moment provides access to how it was that these scholars managed to redefine reading instruction as something other than remedial and expand the intellectual and pedagogical sphere of rhetoric and composition—even for just a short period—to include theories and pedagogies of reading.

As I make the final edits on this introductory chapter, initially drafted a few years ago, I am excited to point out that we may again be entering a period like the 1980s and 1990s wherein compositionists are starting to (re)turn to questions surrounding the teaching of reading in composition. As Salvatori and Donahue (2012) note in their most recent *College English* piece, “Stories about Reading: Appearance, Disappearance, Morphing, and Revival,” there seems to be a revival of interest in reading in the field of composition. I imagine this book contributing to this revival by offering an account of reading’s demise, some historical antecedents that may help explain it, as well as some recommendations for reintroducing discussions of reading. Taking into consideration how and why, historically, reading has been neglected by composition and pairing that history with a current, qualitative study of the place of reading in contemporary first-year composition classrooms (Chapter 2) allows me to make recommendations for effectively reanimating discussions of reading in composition and productively integrating attention to reading into first-year composition classrooms.

READING AND WRITING: COUNTERPARTS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF MEANING

The term “reading” throughout this book is not simply referring to the scanning of words on a page. Although the term “composition” has, for years, been used synonymously with the term “writing” in curricula and scholarship, this study—like

the scholarship from the 1980s and 1990s—is founded on the idea that both practices of reading and writing involve the construction—or *composition*—of meaning. In defining reading as an active enterprise, this study follows the lead of Ann E. Berthoff, David Bartholomae, Anthony Petrosky, Alice Horning, Mariolina Salvatori, Patricia Donahue, Donna Qualley, Linda Flower, and James R. Squire, among others, whose scholarship and teaching locate reading and writing as forms of inquiry and ways of making meaning. Berthoff (1982) has argued that “at the heart of both reading and writing is interpretation, which is a matter of seeing what goes with what, how this goes with that. Interpretation,” she writes, “has survival value. We and all of our fellow creatures must interpret in order to stay alive. The difference between them and us is language: It is language that enables us to go beyond interpreting to interpret our interpretations. This spiraling circularity empowers all the activities of mind involved in meaning making” (85). Squire (1983, 581) sees reading and writing as two operations that “actively engag[e] the learner in constructing meaning, in developing ideas, in relating ideas, in expressing ideas.” Bartholomae and Petrosky (1986, 14) locate reading as an activity that “centers itself on a general inquiry into the possible relations between a reader and a text, something that can be represented by studying the specific written responses of specific readers.” In “From Story to Essay: Reading and Writing,” Petrosky (1982, 20) describes reading in terms of understanding: “Reading, responding, and composing are aspects of understanding, and theories that attempt to account for them outside of their interactions with each other run the serious risk of building reductive models of human understanding.” Qualley’s (1997) “essayistic reading” also assumes that reading is a form of inquiry that is transactional in nature, but she argues that her approach has a wider application in that it may be used by students and teachers alike and offers a “both/and” stance that she believes is lacking in Bartholomae and Petrosky’s method. A “form of hermeneutic inquiry into texts,” Qualley’s approach “is not a way of reading (or writing) that many students have

experienced. . . . In essayistic reading and writing, readers and writers put themselves at risk by opening themselves to multiple and contrasting perspectives of others. At the same time, however, they reflexively monitor their own beliefs and reactions to the process,” since “readers need to be both the subject and object of their reading (they read themselves as they read the text).” This “ensures that their encounter with ideas will be dialogic and bidirectional rather than unidirectional” (62).

None of these scholars defines reading and writing as mechanical or instrumental processes. Instead, they highlight the hermeneutical nature of reading and writing (some, drawing directly from Wolfgang Iser and Hans-Georg Gadamer) and how these practices can be used to foster understanding and self-reflexivity. Adopting this formulation, this study also posits that reading is a deliberate intellectual practice that helps us make sense of—interpret—that which surrounds us. And, that which surrounds us includes so much more than published texts. We also read our own writing, our own and others’ belief systems, as well as everything from ideological and social structures to political and advertising campaigns to each other’s expressions and our personal interactions. The range of activities that falls under what might be called “reading” demands a more complex practice than a one-size-fits-all mechanical process of decoding. The emphasis that the scholars writing in the 1980s and 1990s place on self-reflexivity and (meta)cognition acknowledges the complexity of reading and its many manifestations, and, thus, becomes crucial to my recommendations for renewing discussions about reading in composition.

READING IN COMPOSITION: THE LAST TWO DECADES

Prior to a 2012 change in the Conference on College Composition and Communication’s (CCCC) call for proposals, it had been almost two decades since composition’s professional organization encouraged panels and presentations on reading. Salvatori and Donahue (2012, 210) found that although in the 1980s several subject clusters on the CCCC’s call for proposals

invited panels and presentations about reading or reading-writing connections, more recently and for roughly “seventeen years the word ‘reading’ was completely invisible.” Others have conducted similar studies: David Jolliffe (2003, 128) notes that the word “reading” only appeared in the titles of two sessions at the 2003 CCCC’s meeting where there were 574 concurrent sessions, special interest groups, and workshops. Moreover, Debrah Huffman (2007, 5) found that “combined, the number of sessions and individual presentations devoted to either reading or analytical reading comprises scarcely one percent of the total presentations in any given year.”

Certainly, tracing the presence of the word “reading” in the CCCC’s call for proposals does not outright prove anything. But, these studies suggest, along with the range of other evidence I offer in this introductory chapter and beyond, that reading has seemingly disappeared from composition’s disciplinary landscape. It is worth noting that Salvatori and Donahue (2012) offer an alternate hypothesis—namely that reading is omnipresent in composition, “suffusing” all that we do in the discipline, and is thus taken for granted and unexplored. Despite our differing perspectives, though, our conclusions remain the same: To neglect reading altogether (my position) or “reduce reading to a kind of pervasive background influence and to push it to the borderlines” (211) is problematic because composition loses the opportunity to increase its knowledge about writing’s counterpart in the construction of meaning and to imagine the implications of this knowledge for the teaching of writing.

For the most part, discussions of reading as it relates to composition focus on *which* texts one should teach in the composition classroom (if any at all) rather than the practice of reading itself. In other words, composition scholars spend time focusing on reading(s) as a noun—rather than on reading as a verb, as a practice or process. For example, in what has come to be called the Lindemann-Tate debate, compositionists Erika Lindemann and Gary Tate discussed the role of literature in first-year composition courses. In the pages of *College English*, Lindemann

(1993) details her position that literature should not be taught in first-year composition because literary texts don't adequately represent the type of writing students will be expected to complete in the academy. Still, she notes that the course should pay attention to reading. In fact, she insists that paying attention to reading is an integral part of first-year composition, noting that "we need to join students in exploring these sites of composing" (316). Tate and others who entered the discussion, however, conflated the teaching of reading with the teaching of literature without recognizing the distinction upon which Lindemann's argument depends. Tate (1993), for example, focuses exclusively on text selection noting that "we should not deny our students the pleasure and profit of reading literature" (319) since this "excellent writing" helps students improve as writers, a point he does not develop except to say that his vision "excludes no texts" (321) in the composition classroom.

More recently, in *Profession 2009*, which focuses on "The Way We Teach Now," many scholars address the status of reading within English studies. While David Steiner's (2009) "Reading" and Mark Edmundson's (2009) "Against Readings" take the usual approach to discussing reading as a noun rather than a verb, Gerald Graff (2009) approaches the issue differently, contending that it matters more *how* we read than what we read in "Why How We Read Trumps What We Read." Still, this focus on the very process of reading compels him to explore an implication of his argument that ultimately has more to do with the substance of the readings (noun) rather than the process the title suggests he may pursue. He admits that his argument may seem to lead to the following "untenable conclusion": "If how we read trumps what we read, if any text can be made hard by the way students are asked to read and talk about it, then it would seem to follow logically that it makes no difference which texts a teacher assigns. A syllabus consisting entirely of texts on the *Vanna Speaks* level (or of nothing but comic books or VCR programming manuals) could presumably be as intellectually challenging and possess as much educational value as a syllabus consisting of established classics" (72). The remainder of Graff's

essay explores this implication until he arrives at the conclusion that “the kinds of texts we assign do matter” (73), thereby shifting his focus from the process of reading to what *types* of readings to teach.

Until about a year ago when we began to see a smattering of articles attending to reading-writing connections, the most consistent scholarship on reading came not from composition, but from education, and it rarely addresses the post-secondary level. The 2009 edition of *Open Words: Access and English Studies*, a journal dedicated to post-secondary teaching, challenges this trend and offers a model of collaboration across disciplinary boundaries. The journal focuses on “political, professional, and pedagogical issues related to teaching composition, reading, creative writing, ESL, and literature to open admissions and non-mainstream student populations.” Editor William Thelin describes the special issue as one that explores the ways in which reading research from K–12 educators and educational theorists can and should inform college-level teaching, and describes his own need to “strengthen [his] relationship with ideas drawn from K–12 educators, educational theorists, and researchers in both secondary and post-secondary institutions” (Thelin 2009a, 3). “If reading matters—and most of us think it does,” writes Thelin, “we have to teach students how to do it . . . we all must become reading teachers” (4). It is that very idea—that we must all become reading teachers—that is partially responsible for post-secondary instructors’ choice not to teach reading in their classrooms, despite their overwhelming sense that students need help in this area. For *professors* to teach reading would be to “lower” themselves to do work that should have been done by K–12 *teachers*. Yet, as Kathleen McCormick (1994) points out, plenty of literature instructors are already teaching reading, but refuse to identify themselves as doing so: “Many literary theorists who specifically teach students new reading practices, and who ask students to read from particular perspectives with new sets of concerns—from perspectives of gender, race, or cultural politics, for instance—do not represent themselves as teachers of reading, and consequently miss

an important opportunity both to locate the practices they are encouraging within students' own educational reading history and to develop connections with others in the field who may share many of their goals" (McCormick 1994, 6).

Because to teach reading is considered remedial work by many in English studies, the teaching that they do does not strike them as reading instruction at all. Certainly students do know how to read—as in decode language—when they get to college, but most are not prepared to deliberately engage in sophisticated forms of reading that are defined by inquiry. Jeanne Henry (2009, 64) has described this issue as follows: "My freshmen were very much *able* to read; they were simply disinclined *to* read. As a result, they lacked experience with different genres, writing styles, and degrees of difficulty." Not everyone in English studies—or in composition for that matter—is willing to recognize the nuances that Henry does, and are quick, instead, as McCormick points out, to describe reading instruction as remedial and relevant to K–12 *teachers* rather than post-secondary English *professors*. I experienced this first-hand when looking for a publisher for this manuscript. Reviewers and the editor at a well-known composition publishing house concluded that this project was not relevant to their book series in composition. One reviewer wrote: "Since most of reading research is done at K–12 and [our] series usually publishes about adult writing, I'm wondering how that fits into the project." The other reviewer agreed, "If students reaching us in college cannot 'read' as in decipher writing, then maybe they shouldn't be there." The series editor concurred with these comments and suggested that Columbia Teachers College Press, which publishes scholarship almost exclusively relevant to K–12, "might be a good fit." Not only do both reviewers and the editor reify the false binary opposition between reading and writing, locating the former in K–12 research and pedagogy, but the second reviewer also oversimplifies what it means to read, noting that "if students reaching us in college cannot 'read' as in decipher writing, then maybe they shouldn't be there." While I wouldn't go so far as to say these are representative responses to this

project, unfortunately they are not rare, either. Ultimately, they underscore the uphill battle of reanimating discussions about reading in composition.

Of course, this book is not about teaching students how to “decipher writing,” but rather about the importance of opening up discussions, once again, about reading’s connection to writing and how composition as a field can enrich its research and scholarship in this area and, ultimately, better support the teaching of writing. Despite the complexity of the act of reading itself, as suggested by compositionists’ research on reading that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, attending to reading often continues to be framed as remedial work. If we continue to allow reading instruction to be defined in this way, then there will continue to be a lack of interest in pursuing the subject. Composition instructors will be deprived of resources for teaching and the field as a whole will be deprived of new knowledge that might be developed from reading research conducted within the context of methods of composing.

Reanimating discussions about reading might mean synthesizing (1) what we know about composition’s historically vexed relationship to reading, (2) the problems, as well as the potential that characterize the wealth of scholarship on reading from the 1980s and 1990s, and (3) any information we might be able to cull about the current place of reading in first-year composition courses. This book takes on that challenge.

THE IMPORTANCE AND URGENCY OF THIS WORK

To leave the work of defining reading to other fields, even related fields like literary studies and education, means that composition is forfeiting the right to define reading and its relationship to writing. Related to this is the urgency of this work for the teaching of first-year composition. Since the majority of scholarship on reading is almost 20 years old, instructors are at a loss for current research and scholarship to support their teaching of writing. David Jolliffe (2007, 478) has noted the problems this poses: “Because the topic of reading

lies outside the critical discourse of composition studies, these instructors would not have access to ample resources to help them think about a model of active constructive reading in their courses or about strategies for putting that model into play.” Adler-Kassner and Estrem (2007, 36) explain similarly that “at the same time as instructors ask for more explicit guidance with reading pedagogy, that pedagogy is rarely included in composition research, graduate composition course, or first-year writing programs’ developmental materials.” Abandoning reading as a subject worthy of sustained attention and research in the field puts composition instructors in an untenable position wherein, although reading undeniably plays some role in first-year composition, these instructors lack the resources to develop reading pedagogies that will complement their writing pedagogies. The first-year composition instructors I interviewed as part of a qualitative study, detailed in Chapter 2, regularly described their commitment to, but also their discomfort attending to reading in the classroom. These instructors largely believe that they lack the training and the theoretical framework to teach reading effectively. Without professional discourse that addresses the role that reading might play in the field broadly, and in the first-year composition classroom, specifically, instructors do not have the tools necessary to support the development of reading pedagogies that would allow for more comprehensive literacy instruction in first-year composition.

Once we know more about reading, we can take steps to revise the mission and outcomes statements important to our field, including the Writing Program Administrators (WPA) Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition² and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Position Statements and Resolutions. Reopening discussions about reading has the potential to help organizations like WPA and CCCC articulate more concretely what they mean by “critical reading” when they list it as one of the elements of first-year composition instruction. Without defining this term and elaborating on how the course’s reading is connected to its writing

these statements remain incomplete. This book aims to provide a contemporary view of reading's place in first-year composition, as well as some history, both of which are potentially useful in revising these statements.

I should note that the connections this study draws between reading and writing are not supported unequivocally within the field. Sharon Crowley (1998, 13) asserts that "the act of composing differs appreciably from the act of reading." Crowley sees the humanist approach to the first-year composition course as detrimental because modern humanists privilege reading over writing. "The point of a humanist education, after all," writes Crowley, "is to become acquainted with the body of canonical texts that humanists envision as a repository of superior intellectual products of Western culture." A second problem that Crowley notes is that "humanism takes a respectful attitude toward already-completed texts, while composition is interested in texts currently in development as well as those that are yet to be written" (13). While Crowley is moving between first-year composition and the field of composition as a whole, she seems to say that to include reading in composition would be to undermine the teaching of writing since reading is always necessarily privileged.³ Crowley, however, is inconsistent in how she uses the very term "reading." Initially, she is concerned with the "*act* of reading," reading as a process or practice, but quickly moves to discuss reading as a noun as she describes humanism's "respectful attitude toward already-completed texts." In so doing, she shifts the conversation from one about the relationship between the "act of composing" and the "act of reading" to one about the content and value of the texts themselves. Her argument offers an example of this fairly common, but often unrecognized move in discussions about reading in composition. Moreover, it raises questions about why composition has consistently rejected reading. If, for example, composition has historically embraced literary texts as its primary documents, and reading falls within the purview of literature courses, then why hasn't reading become one aspect of the teaching of composition?

WHAT THIS BOOK DOES NOT ADDRESS

Although readers may expect a chapter on how the emergence of multi-modal and new media literacies affects discussions about reading (and writing) pedagogies, this book does not contain one. Patricia Harkin (2005) could not have anticipated the emergence of the field of new media literacies, yet she recognizes the risk this book takes by returning to earlier scholarship on (print-based) reading: “Unfortunately for those who wish to take up these challenges [by paying attention to reading in the writing classroom], the thinkers who could help us most have faded from the discussion. They taught us that accounts of reading acts need not dwindle into sets of restrictive instructions in what particular texts mean. From their work, a pedagogy is still recoverable. It might seem unlikely that a professionalized professoriate committed to the ‘new’ would voluntarily return to work that first appeared a quarter-century ago. To do so would require a confident professoriate, more committed to social action than to professional prominence, willing to take risks in order to teach better. Composition studies, historically, has so defined itself” (Harkin 2005, 422). As Harkin suggests, it is tempting to focus exclusively on the newly emerging areas of interest within composition rather than reconsidering subjects that may no longer seem relevant. While scholars such as Gail Hawisher, Cynthia Selfe, and Cheryl Ball, among others, are already doing important work in new media studies, some research suggests the new technologies these scholars are exploring are not quite making their way into classrooms. For example, Kathleen Blake Yancey (2004, 438) noted in her Chair’s address at the CCCC convention in San Antonio that despite great technological advances particularly in the area of literacy studies, composition instructors have yet to embrace these new approaches and “many of us continue to focus on print” (438). Daniel Anderson et al. (2006, 69) investigated “what composition teachers were doing with multimodal composing” and similarly concluded that “individual teachers who specialized in digital media studies were doing the majority of this work and that these efforts did not extend

to department-wide or program-wide curricula” (69). Although multimodal composition and other new media technology-based work has likely proliferated in the years since Yancey and Anderson spoke to this issue, print-based reading still plays a large role in classrooms, a point corroborated by the first-year writing instructors I spoke to during the qualitative study I detail in Chapter 2.

Moreover, the traditional elements of print-based literacy remain crucial to new literacies and will not be replaced by them. Reading scholar Donald Leu et al. (2004, 1590) and his colleagues at the University of Connecticut have described these new literacies as including “the skills, strategies, and disposition that allow us to use the Internet and other ICTs [information and communication technologies] effectively to identify important questions, locate information, critically evaluate the usefulness of that information, synthesize information to answer those questions, and then communicate the answers to others” (1590). These experts, however, are quick to point out the relationship between “foundational literacies” and emerging literacies:

It is essential, however, to keep in mind that new literacies, such as these, almost always build on foundational literacies rather than replace them. Foundational literacies include those traditional elements of literacy that have defined almost all our previous efforts in both research and practice. These include skill sets such as phonemic awareness, word recognition, decoding knowledge, vocabulary knowledge, comprehension, inferential reasoning, the writing process, spelling, response to literature, and others required for the literacies of the book and other printed material. Foundational literacies will continue to be important within the new literacies of the Internet and other ICTs. In fact, it could be argued that they will become even more essential because reading and writing become more important in an information age. (1590–91)

This study thus proceeds on the notion that digital literacies will not replace those more foundational print-based literacies, but will necessarily inform new literacies, making these foundations that much more important. Certainly there is important

work to be done, some of which is already underway,⁴ on how reading on screens and electronic devices necessarily affects our reading practices, but the scope of this book prohibits the sort of in-depth attention this subject requires.

CHAPTERS

Chapter 2 establishes the exigency for this project by discussing the data collected and conclusions drawn from “Reading in the First-Year Writing Classroom: A National Survey of Classroom Practices and Students’ Experiences,” a qualitative study funded by a CCCC’s Research Initiative Grant and conducted in the winter and spring of 2012. This qualitative study suggests the need to reanimate discussions of reading in the field because, although the writing instructors surveyed are committed to teaching reading, they are doing so—by their own admission—without adequate support or resources from their graduate training, professional development, or current research and scholarship from the field. The study consists of national surveys of first-year writing instructors and their students, as well as follow-up interviews with instructors and students. This chapter contends that focusing on first-year composition can provide insight into how the field—through the course that represents its pedagogical interests most widely in curricula—imagines the place of reading. Forty-eight percent of instructors interviewed used the term “rhetorical reading” and/or “rhetorical analysis” to describe the type of reading they teach. In the follow-up interviews, instructors spoke about how teaching rhetorical reading, and more specifically, the rhetorical reading of models, allows them to explicitly connect reading and writing in their classes. While committed to teaching these related interpretive practices simultaneously, more than half of the instructors interviewed were not secure in their abilities to teach reading. While one of their primary goals is to prepare students to read effectively beyond first-year composition, they frequently questioned the efficacy of their methods. This chapter thus argues that as the

field of composition renews its commitment to thinking about reading's place in writing instruction, it becomes crucial to reanimate reading research in order to better understand how instructors can prepare their students to effectively read beyond their first year, and to provide these instructors with the means for doing so. The final chapters of this book provide these resources.

Chapter 3 seeks to offer some possible historical antecedents that may help explain how and why current first-year composition instructors have experienced the separation between reading and writing in their own graduate education and professional training. As such, the chapter provides some historical context for the rest of the book by exploring the historical separation of reading from writing in the American education system. The chapter begins by looking at the early nineteenth century at which time American colleges were still requiring instruction in rhetorical theory over the course of four years. This study of rhetoric kept reading and writing together, “a center holding together the understanding of texts and the composing of texts” (Nelson 1998, 7). By the end of the century, though, with academia's growing emphasis on specialization and the sounding of the call of the literacy crisis, writing emerged as the most important aspect of human communication. Courses such as Harvard's English A were developed to focus exclusively on the teaching of writing. The artificial separation of the different domains of literacy thus began as rhetoric gave way to courses focused on writing. In addition to this early disciplinary-defining moment, this chapter considers other moments that provide insight into the field's relationship to reading. Specifically, the chapter addresses: the rise of the New Criticism and the effect of its close reading methodology on composition; the founding of the CCC and its professional journal *College Composition and Communication* and the presence in these venues of discussions of the place of reading in composition; the Dartmouth Seminar; and the rise of reader-response theory, an approach that foregrounds the importance of the reader in literary interpretation.

Chapter 4 explores the surge of interest in reading pedagogy that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s within composition. Specifically, the chapter considers the years 1980–1993. The year 1980 marks the publication in *College English* of English and Education scholar Charles Bazerman’s groundbreaking article “A Relationship Between Reading and Writing: The Conversation Model” and 1993 marks the year of the Lindemann-Tate debate, which Marguerite Helmers (2002, 8) believes “defined the terms that were to endure: literature and writing, not reading and writing.” During this time, prolific scholars from composition such as David Bartholomae, Mariolina Salvatori, Wendy Bishop, Erika Lindemann, Linda Flower, Gary Tate, Deborah Brandt, and Donna Qualley led and helped sustain discussions about the relationship between reading and writing. These scholars produced (and some continue to produce) compelling theories and research on the place of reading in composition, the connections between the two practices, and the consequences of separating these practices from one another in curricula. This chapter argues that the scholarship ultimately indicates the extent to which attention to the reading process was supplanted by attention to literature and text selection. Still, this book imagines the moment as instructive and the chapter concludes by tracing the compelling tenets that scholars introduced, crucial ideas that can productively inform how we reanimate discussions of reading in the field today.

Chapter 5 argues for reanimating these discussions by thinking about the qualitative study’s conclusions in light of the scholarship from the 1980s and 1990s, as well as more recent work from the interdisciplinary field of “transfer of learning” studies. The first-year composition instructors I interviewed feel responsible for preparing their students to read effectively in other courses, but described their lack of a theoretical framework for both thinking more deeply about this and developing a reading pedagogy that would facilitate this preparation. Chapter 5 draws on scholarship from educational and cognitive psychology, as well as on research about how knowledge

transfers from general education courses, in order to explore how scholars in these related fields are thinking about the issue of transfer that so many first-year composition instructors raised during their interviews.

Chapter 6 uses the research and scholarship from transfer of learning studies to argue for the adoption by composition instructors of what I call a “mindful reading” framework as a means to support students’ positive transfer of reading knowledge to other courses. As the chapter explains, mindful reading is best understood as a framework within which various reading approaches fit, approaches such as rhetorical reading, close reading, and critical reading. Mindful reading is *not* another reading approach that might be added to this list. Mindful reading is, instead, a method of engagement characterized by rhetorical adaptability that supports students as they deliberate, reflect on, and practice a range of reading approaches that first-year instructors help students to cultivate. Chapter 6 also provides a brief discussion of assignments and course readings that support the teaching of mindful reading.

The epilogue summarizes the conclusions drawn from the chapters to make recommendations about how the field of composition might effectively attend to reading. It also discusses future avenues for reading research, the need to revise the field’s outcome statements to better reflect the connections between reading and writing, and the importance of redesigning graduate programs in rhetoric and composition to better prepare its scholar-teachers to integrate attention to reading into writing instruction.

Appendix A consists of an annotated bibliography of citations on reading from the field of composition and English studies from roughly the last three decades. Appendix B includes materials I use in professional development workshops to support faculty’s integration of attention to reading across the curriculum. Appendix C includes materials related to the qualitative study described in Chapter 2. These materials include the online survey that students and instructors completed, as well as the interview guide I used when speaking with both instructors

and students who consented to follow-up interviews. Appendix C also includes a more in-depth discussion of the study's analytical methods than is presented in Chapter 2.

NOTES

1. This phrase does not do justice to the diversity of perspectives that characterize the scholarship from the period, but will need to suffice as shorthand for the corpus of scholarship produced at this time.
2. The Role of Reading in Composition Studies Special Interest Group, which I co-lead, developed and submitted suggested revisions to this statement that would address reading in more substantial and consistent ways. At press time, the recommendations were being reviewed by the WPA Outcomes Statement Taskforce.
3. For an insightful exploration of how reading (as opposed to writing) continues to be privileged in curricula see Peter Elbow's (1993) "The War Between Reading and Writing and How to End It." Elbow also offers compelling ways to create a more productive and balanced relationship between reading and writing in curricula.
4. See Daniel Keller's (2013) *Chasing Literacy: Reading and Writing in an Age of Acceleration*.