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ABSTRACT

Some "postmodern" writing pedagogies have attempted to account for indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act. I argue that these attempts at "postmodern pedagogy" are unsuccessful and that indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act can be explained more clearly through the lens of interpretation.

The role of interpretation in the production of discourse (writing) has seldom been discussed; interpretation has been discussed more often in terms of the reception of discourse. I argue that interpretation in the writing act involves communicative interaction with others, and that indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act occur in the "third space" between writers and audiences during communicative interaction.

The third space is a theoretical concept that demonstrates the junction of interpretations between a writer and audience during the act of writing. I base the concept of third space primarily on Donald Davidson's concept of "passing theory"—a momentary, partial interpretation that occur between speakers. I argue that passing theories represent postmodern characteristics such as indeterminacy of meaning/situatedness in the reception as well as production of discourse.

The third space can be used as a tool to evaluate communicative interaction in the writing act. In this dissertation, I examine two communicative interactions during the writing act. One examination occurs in a technical communication classroom, and the other occurs in a writing center. I analyze communicative interaction in these two settings using the concept of the third space to illustrate interpretation in the writing act.
This investigation about interpretation and the third space has two important implications for writing pedagogy. One implication is that emphasizing interpretation in the production of discourse encourages us to value one-to-one interactions both within and beyond the writing classroom. A second implication is that embracing interpretation as central to the writing act means that we must move beyond a process pedagogy that advocates a codified, structured model for the writing act. Instead, by focusing on the third space—the intersection of differing interpretations about writing—we can learn how writer and audience negotiate writing and how communicative interaction influences the writing act.
INTRODUCTION

I began thinking about the topic and emphasis of this dissertation when I worked as an interdisciplinary writing tutor in the College of Agriculture at Iowa State University. Although I had served as a tutor for several years, this particular experience was different from any tutoring I had done before. In working with students from other disciplines, I noticed that my understanding and my students' understandings of writing conventions varied in significant ways. For example, we held differing expectations about writing formats (i.e., reports or correspondence formats), writing conventions (i.e., the use of topic sentences, voice, and tone), and information design (i.e., use of headings and white space). Furthermore, our discussions were often hindered by my lack of technical knowledge about their academic disciplines (i.e., animal science, plant pathology, horticulture, and agricultural and biosystems technology). While these differences were sometimes obstacles in our discussions about writing and communication, I considered these differences valuable learning tools, and I discovered that identifying our differences made our discussions about writing more productive and helpful. For example, sometimes tutorial discussions would reveal different perceptions of how documents might be organized (i.e., a report). Students brought with them suggestions their professors had made about structuring documents, and often these suggestions differed from mine. Through my experience working with students from disciplines outside of English and composition, I began to consider the importance of interpretation in communicative interaction, especially in the act of writing and in our acts of teaching writing. That is, I began to wonder how different interpretations about writing influenced the writing act. At this point, I began to formulate the "third
space" as a concept to help explain this intersection of differences.

The "third space" represents for me a way in which we can identify differing interpretations of the writing act (i.e., writing conventions, writing formats, ideas about writing). For example, as I talked with agriculture students about their expectations for writing, I noticed that we tended to occupy our "own" spaces—a space in which the students would express their expectations about writing and a space in which I would express my expectations about writing. The third space represents an area between these spaces where overlaps and differences about writing can be examined more thoroughly. I discovered that when my students and I took time to examine these differences, we communicated much better about writing.

The third space obviously incorporates the act of communication—or, what Donald Davidson calls "communicative interaction." Davidson suggests that interpretation derives from communicative interaction. In reading Davidson, I was struck by his formulations of a "prior theory" and "passing theory." The term "prior theory" refers to the prior understandings we bring to communicative interaction as well as how we might expect others to interpret our utterances; the term "passing theory" describes the way in which we actually attempt to understand someone else during communicative interaction. Davidson's idea of the "passing theory"—a momentary, partial understanding—helped me to formulate the idea of the third space.

Adopting Davidson's interpretive framework, however, changed significantly the nature of my inquiry. My original inquiry involved the primary question: What is the role of interpretation in the writing act? As I read more about interpretation and became familiar with the work of Richard Rorty, Stanley Fish, and Thomas Kent, I realized that employing an interpretive
framework for writing pedagogy had important and unexpected implications. So, my inquiry changed, and I confronted this question: How does interpretation influence writing pedagogy? For example, in *Paralogic Rhetoric* Thomas Kent (1991) describes at length the implications of what he calls an "externalist" position for writing pedagogy. The heart and soul of this position, which embraces the hermeneutic emphasis found in Davidson's work, is that writing cannot be taught. Kent says, for example, that if we accept the claims that writing and reading constitute kinds of communicative interaction that require us to make hermeneutic guesses about how others will interpret our utterances, then "... writing and reading—conceived broadly as processes or bodies of knowledge—cannot be taught, for nothing exists to teach" (161). In other words, Kent suggests (and carefully outlines in *Paralogic Rhetoric*) that if we agree that writing is a hermeneutic, communicative activity, then we also must agree that it cannot be structured or codified in any "teachable" way. The consequence of this perspective is that our current dominant approach to writing pedagogy (namely, process pedagogy) must change.

Intrigued by this interpretive perspective and mindful of the tutoring situations where I experienced similar realizations, I began investigating writing pedagogies that might embrace the interpretive perspective that Kent described; somewhat surprisingly, I found no pedagogy that resembled the theoretical perspective he outlined. The only pedagogies that came close were postmodern or antifoundationalist frameworks for writing pedagogy; yet, I discerned that these pedagogies failed to embrace, in any meaningful way, the ideas about interpretation forwarded by Davidson and Kent.

Working with these postmodern concerns about interpretation, I began to develop the ideas about the third space that culminated in this dissertation.
Consequently, the intent of this dissertation is (1) to explain and to explore how the interpretive perspective might be relevant to and useful for writing pedagogy, and (2) to illustrate this interpretive perspective through the concept of the third space. Through examining the interpretive perspective in relation to the writing act in this dissertation, I explore a definition of writing that departs from current process explanations of the writing act. This new, interpretive definition of the writing act may have important ramifications for writing pedagogy such as increasing communicative interaction between teachers, students, and public audiences in writing classes.

My investigation begins with a discussion in chapters one and two about the nature of interpretation. The discussions in these chapters address the primary question: What is the role of interpretation in the writing act? In chapter one, I explore various postmodern pedagogies that claim—but fail in my view—to teach students about what being situated means in particular writing environments. I suggest in this chapter that postmodern pedagogies fail in this regard because they do not acknowledge the value of interpretation in explaining the writing act. In chapter two, I describe how interpretation relates to communicative interaction and, consequently, the writing act. In this chapter, I also introduce the idea of the third space. These chapters provide a basis for the interpretive perspective that is illustrated in the remaining chapters of the dissertation.

Following these introductory chapters, I investigate the uses of the interpretive perspective in writing pedagogy by addressing the question: How does interpretation influence the teaching of writing? In chapter three, I suggest that writing instruction must focus on dialogic interactions between teachers and students, and that writing instruction should also encourage dialogues between
students and outside audiences for their writing. In chapter four, I analyze, through the concept of the third space, various dialogues that occurred in a classroom situation between students, teacher, and an outside audience. In this analysis, I attempt to reveal the intersection of various interpretations that emerged through communicative interaction about writing.

In chapter five, I continue this investigation of writing pedagogy by exploring the writing center as a site where various dialogue strategies are employed, strategies that are endorsed by many teachers and students but strategies do not reflect the interpretive perspective outlined by Davidson. In chapter six, I explain how interpretation occurs in specific writing center dialogues, and I use the concept of the third space as a way to identify the intersection of prior and passing theories between a student and a tutor as they engage in communicative interaction about writing.

Although I stress in this dissertation an interpretive perspective in the study of discourse production, much more research needs to be done about the role that interpretation plays in the writing act. For the most part, this dissertation constitutes only an exploratory essay about interpretation and writing pedagogy, and I certainly do not claim to be outlining a complete interpretive pedagogy. However, if the writing act is an indeterminate, hermeneutic activity as the interpretive perspective suggests, the assumption follows that current writing instruction is in need of significant modification. I hope that this dissertation serves as a first step toward making such an important and necessary change in our thinking about the act of writing.
CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM OF POSTMODERN PEDAGOGY

In order to explain what I mean by the indeterminate nature of the writing act, I examine in this chapter certain postmodern and antifoundationalist approaches to writing pedagogy.¹ I believe these postmodern and antifoundationalist frameworks provide an appropriate starting place for this investigation because they generally describe meaning-making as an indeterminate, situated activity. Furthermore, several attempts have been made to apply these frameworks to writing pedagogy in the area of what has come to be called "postmodern pedagogy." David Smit (1995) reports, for example, that a recent fascination with postmodernism and antifoundationalism has driven several writing scholars to apply these concepts to writing pedagogy. These attempts have included such divergent efforts as reconfigured computer pedagogies (Barker and Kemp 1990), ideological pedagogies (Berlin 1992; Bizzell 1986), and post-process pedagogies (Ward 1994). In this chapter I examine these divergent efforts and argue that none of these attempts employs postmodern theory or antifoundationalist theory in any meaningful way. In fact, I believe that most postmodern pedagogies simply misuse the label of postmodern in relation to the pedagogies they propose.

In this chapter, then, I suggest that postmodernism and antifoundationalism can be useful to writing pedagogy in describing the indeterminate nature of the writing act, but I argue that current descriptions of postmodern pedagogies fail to apply these theoretical frameworks accurately or

¹By "writing pedagogy" I include not only composition pedagogy but also the ever-growing field of professional communication pedagogy, which may include courses such as technical communication, business communication, and proposal writing.
consistently. Rather, I find current postmodern pedagogy—or what is called "postmodern"—to be problematic in large part because its advocates attempt to teach rather than examine postmodern issues in relation to the indeterminate nature of writing. To develop this argument, I investigate in detail three additional problems. First, the pedagogies that claim to be postmodern inappropriately adapt the term "postmodern" to suit their individual pedagogies; these adaptations produce vague and unuseful notions about how postmodernism can be applied to writing pedagogy. Second, some writing researchers argue that a structured, principled, postmodern pedagogy is a contradiction in terms, since the term postmodern resists foundational classifications, principles, or theoretical applications. Consequently, teaching postmodernism in any structured and principled way creates what David Wallace (1996) has called the "paradox of postmodernism" (110): how may a pedagogy that denies foundational knowledge be employed as a foundation itself? A third difficulty with postmodern pedagogy concerns its efficacy in the classroom. David Smit notes this important deficiency: "[there is] a remarkable lack of discussion about whether these methods of instruction actually produce good writers or good writing" (47).

In the discussion to follow, I explain various descriptions of postmodern principles that form the backdrop for my discussion of postmodern pedagogy. Then, in order to relate some of the difficulties of current postmodern pedagogy, I review some different approaches to postmodern pedagogy that attempt to adopt postmodernism to writing pedagogy. In addition, I discuss Wallace's "paradox" of postmodern pedagogy by reviewing the argument that antifoundationalism (and related isms) cannot be taught. Finally, by taking up Smit's point that little concrete work has been done to demonstrate the
effectiveness of a postmodern pedagogy, I explain why such demonstrations do not exist.

The Postmodern Condition

The term "postmodern" has been used in a number of fields spanning philosophy, cultural studies, art, mathematics, and even politics, and the term has been employed to mean very different things. By the time postmodernism can be concretely defined, according to Lester Faigley (1992), "the provocativeness of postmodernism will have long since ended" (4). Although the concept of postmodernism has been widely defined, it generally refers to a "growing awareness of randomness, ambiguity, and chaos" (Faigley 3), and for many postmodern theorists, it includes as well (1) a critique of modernist principles and practices, (2) a rejection of foundational truths, and (3) the idea of situatedness. In an effort to relate more clearly the nature and the importance of these three postmodern concerns, I address them one at a time.

One way to describe postmodernism is to contrast modernism with postmodernism. According to David Ray Griffin (1993), modernism is "the worldview that has developed out of the seventeenth-century Galilean-Cartesian-Baconian-Newtonian science . . . modernity in the sense of the world order that both conditioned and was conditioned by this worldview" (viii). As a reaction against modernism, postmodernism refutes and discredits modernist practices and principles, often through a critique of modernist formulations of foundational or "standardized" meaning and truth. Griffin explains that this resistance to standardized meanings makes postmodernism part of an antimodern movement in which "modernism as a worldview is less and less
seen as The Final Truth" (Griffin vii). Griffin's formulation is compatible with other descriptions of postmodernism found in writing pedagogy. For example, in "Cultural Studies, Postmodernism, and Composition," John Schilb (1991) describes postmodernism as "a critique of traditional epistemology, a set of artistic practices, and an ensemble of larger social conditions—just as modernism referred to intellectual developments, artistic trends, and transformations in the wider social landscape" (174). According to both Griffin and Schilb, then, postmodernism involves a critique of modernist standards and practices.

In its critique of modernism, postmodernism rejects the possibility for a foundational truth or meaning; that is, postmodernism resists unified standards that can be universally applied. Stated a bit differently, postmodernism endorses antifoundationalism, and, according to Patricia Bizzell (1986), antifoundationalism is "the belief that an absolute standard for the judgment of truth can never be found, precisely because the individual mind can never transcend personal emotions, social circumstances, and historical conditions" (39-40). Because postmodernism and antifoundationalism go hand in hand, an understanding of antifoundationalism helps us to appreciate the postmodern concern with history, context, and community, and these postmodern concerns

---

2Another helpful distinction offered by Griffin suggests that postmodernism has divided into two general camps: a deconstructive camp in which a modernist worldview is criticized, demonstrated in a critique of such things as meaning and truth (he associates this camp with art and literature) (viii), and a constructive or reconstructive camp in which modernist and premodernist truths and values are revised—not eliminated—to adapt to a postmodernist world (ix). Griffin favors the constructive version of postmodernism, citing that by eliminating modernist or premodernist truths and values, a deconstructive postmodernism results in relativism, and furthermore "[carries] modern premises to their logical conclusions" (viii).

3Bizzell often refers to the categories of personal, social, and historical in her discussion of postmodernism and antifoundationalism as sort of checks and balances of foundationalist and antifoundationalist thought: "Hence any argument promoting a candidate for the position of absolute standard should be scrutinized to reveal the personal, social, and/or historical interests it serves, interests that are likely to center around the controversial area of knowledge the standard is supposed to adjudicate" (40).
comprise a second claim about postmodernism. For example, Stanley Fish (1989) suggests that antifoundationalism is a rejection of "any attempt to ground inquiry and communication in something more firm and stable than mere belief or unexamined practice" (342). Fish further asserts that antifoundationalism teaches that questions of fact, truth, correctness, validity, and clarity can neither be posed nor answered in reference to some extracontextual, ahistorical, nonsituational reality, or rule, or law, or value; rather, antifoundationalism asserts, all of these matters are intelligible and debatable only within the precincts of the contexts or situations or paradigms or communities that give them their local and changeable shape. (344)

Fish explains that antifoundationalism rejects absolute standards, asserting that meaning is indeterminate. This indeterminacy of meaning, which derives from the antifoundationalist claim that all knowledge requires historicizing, leads directly to a third related claim endorsed by postmodernists: knowledge is situational.

By indeterminacy of meaning, Fish means that knowledge is not based on foundational truths, but rather on the situations in which we find ourselves when we communicate. Indeterminacy of meaning also implies that knowledge is subject to change and interpretation. That is, to repeat Fish's comment, knowledge (or questions of fact, truth, correctness, validity, and clarity) results "only within the precincts of the contexts or situations or paradigms or communities that give them their local and changeable shape" (344). Key to the idea of situatedness, then, is the idea that knowledge is unstable, rather than stable as modernists would assert.

By advocating situatedness—the idea that no foundational meaning or truth exists across different situations—postmodernism seems altogether pluralistic and situational, in that meaning and knowledge derive from the
specific situations in which we find ourselves. Griffin's observation that "modernism as a worldview is less and less seen as The Final Truth" (vii) captures this idea of indeterminacy, for postmodernism seems to critique Truth with a capital "T."

Postmodern Pedagogies

Despite the fascination with postmodernism among composition scholars (Smit 1995), no clear shared definition of postmodernism exists in writing pedagogy, and further, other terms such as poststructuralism, anti-foundationalism, and deconstruction are regularly used interchangeably to refer to postmodernism in writing pedagogy. For example, James Berlin (1992) combines poststructuralism, cultural studies, and postmodernism in his discussion of postmodern theory in practice. And John Schilb (1991) explains that the beginnings of postmodernism in composition may have emerged from an interest in poststructuralism that was particularly present in the field of literature (173). Although a standard definition of "postmodern pedagogy" is difficult to come by, some theorists have attempted to narrow the term. For example, Irene Ward (1994) defines a postmodern pedagogy as one that "conceives of truth and knowledge not as stable and determinable but as always contingent and dependent on local context" (129). In her description of this kind of pedagogy, Ward maintains that "knowledge, like language, can be understood, or have meaning, only within unique communicative situations in which two or more people engage in a dialogue about an object or idea" (129). Other theorists maintain that postmodern pedagogy endorses context-dependent knowledge, or "situatedness." For example, James Sosnoski (1991) asserts that postmodern classrooms "do not have to follow a single blueprint and should
change according to the situation" (210). Also endorsing situatedness, Thomas Barker and Fred Kemp (1990) explain that postmodernism is "a self-conscious acknowledgment of the immediate present and an attempt to respond to it in new ways" (1). Situatedness, for these theorists, refers to the ability to respond to specific situations rather than rely on transcendent or foundational principles or rules.

As a result of the emphasis placed on situatedness in these definitions of postmodern pedagogy, postmodernism—as a kind of intellectual tradition—has not resulted in a unified writing pedagogy, but rather, it has resulted in several pedagogies. This plurality should not be surprising given the open nature of postmodernism. To illustrate this pluralism, in this section I review a sampling of postmodern pedagogies presented by James Berlin (1992), Patricia Bizzell (1986; 1990), Thomas Barker and Fred Kemp (1990), and Irene Ward (1994). Each of these theorists adapts postmodernism in order to forward a particular brand of writing pedagogy. While these pedagogies emphasize situatedness, these adaptations cannot help but create confusion about what postmodern pedagogy is and what it should attempt to accomplish in the writing classroom. Rather, these pedagogies are problematic because they do not accurately reflect the postmodern perspective; furthermore, these examples illustrate that the label "postmodern" does not necessarily equate a postmodern pedagogy.

In an effort to explain why these approaches are not really "postmodern" in practice, I would like to consider first James Berlin's adaptation of postmodernism to writing pedagogy, which demonstrates a clear ideological perspective. In "Poststructuralism, Cultural Studies, and the Composition Classroom: Postmodern Theory in Practice," Berlin (1992) defends the value of postmodernism for composition, stating that it "[offers] strikingly convergent
and remarkably compelling visions" for teachers (16). In this version of postmodern pedagogy, Berlin is concerned with helping students become aware that they are influenced by social, political, and material conditions (18). He argues that "each of us is heterogeneously made up of various competing discourses, conflicted and contradictory scripts, that make our consciousness anything but unified, coherent, and autonomous" (18). Berlin employs postmodernism to explore these competing discourses, drawing attention to class, race, gender, and ethnicity (20).

Berlin makes explicit his intent to merge this postmodern pedagogy with social-epistemic rhetoric, the result of which encourages students to engage in a dialectic concerning not only the production of discourse, but also the social and political forces that surround the student. He makes explicit his ideological intentions:

All of this has great consequences for the writing classroom. Given the ubiquitous role of discourse in human affairs, instructors cannot be content to focus exclusively on teaching the production of academic texts. Our business must be to instruct students in signifying practices broadly conceived—to see not only the rhetoric of the college essay but the rhetoric of the institution of schooling, of the workplace, and of the media. (24)

Berlin includes in his postmodern pedagogy, then, an ideological motive in which writing teachers have a duty beyond teaching writing: they have the duty of making students citizens who are socially and politically active. To achieve this goal, Berlin adapts postmodernism to his own pedagogy by narrowing the postmodern perspective to one in which "signifying practices shape the subject, the social, and the material—the perceiver and the perceived" (19).

In the classroom, this postmodern pedagogy becomes enforced through "dialectical interaction, working out a rhetoric more adequate to the historical
moment and the actual conditions of teacher and students" (25). Berlin maintains that this postmodern pedagogy includes such course units as advertising, work, play, education, gender, and individuality (27), each of which requires that students read narratives as well as write their own narratives to explore their roles within the larger structure of society. As students interpret narratives through this postmodern, social-epistemic lens, Berlin hopes to make clear that student interpretations of text "are ideologically invested in the construction of subjectivities within recommended economic, social, and political arrangements" (29). That is, Berlin hopes to encourage students to recognize how power shapes their interpretations. Though intriguing, Berlin's postmodern pedagogy is explicitly ideological, and, further, he defines postmodernism as a signifying practice—a definition that suits his own pedagogy associated with social epistemology.

While Berlin's postmodern pedagogy drives social-epistemic rhetoric and encourages an ideological perspective, another postmodern pedagogy offered by Patricia Bizzell emphasizes the situational aspect of postmodernism. In "Foundationalism and Anti-Foundationalism in Composition Studies," Bizzell (1986) suggests that "Rhetoric is the study of the personal, social and historical elements in human discourse—how to recognize them, interpret them, and act on them, in terms both of situational context and of verbal style" (52). She asserts that postmodernism—or, more accurately, an antifoundationalist perspective—is helpful, for "an anti-foundationalist understanding of discourse would see the student's way of thinking and interacting with the world, the student's very self, as fundamentally altered by participation in any new discourse" (43). Bizzell uses antifoundationalism to help students and teachers recognize forms of discourse and their roles as participants in discourse. Further,
she suggests that we can improve "social justice" by engaging in political activity to change the nature of our discursive practices (54). Through a call to action, Bizzell's use of postmodernism in this instance is ultimately ideological, though it is perhaps not as explicitly ideological as Berlin's approach to pedagogy. Bizzell encourages the mastery of discourse as a means of student power, and she encourages the employment of the antifoundationalist perspective as a way to help students identify their own positions within a discourse.

In a later article, "Beyond Anti-Foundationalism to Rhetorical Authority: Problems Defining 'Cultural Literacy,'" however, Bizzell (1990) strengthens her ideological perspective. She criticizes anti-foundationalism for being too pluralistic and for refusing to acknowledge authority:

We exercise authority over [students] in asking them to give up their foundational beliefs, but we give them nothing to put in the place of these foundational beliefs because we deny the validity of all authority, including, presumably, our own. (269)

Bizzell suggests that teachers must be "more forthright about the ideologies we support as well as those we attack, and we will have to articulate a positive program legitimated by an authority that is nevertheless nonfoundational" (271). Frustrated with the pluralism of postmodernist pedagogy, Bizzell asserts that teachers who employ postmodernism or antifoundationalism still bring goals into the classroom—goals that deserve recognition (269). In other words, Bizzell argues that teachers must be more articulate about their intentions in their pedagogies.

In true postmodern fashion, and to her great credit, Bizzell deconstructs academic discourse and asks students to do the same; however, she ultimately presents an ideological perspective that focuses on student power and teacher
authority, for she makes clear that she wants students to recognize the role that power plays in discourse. Like Berlin, Bizzell adapts postmodernism to forward her own ideological goals. The irony of this adaptation is that postmodernism resists such a configured goal, and Bizzell herself recognizes this irony when she tells us that "we will have to articulate a positive program legitimated by an authority that is nevertheless nonfoundational" (italics mine, 271). Although Bizzell mentions that her emphasis on ideology may not be compatible with her proclaimed antifoundationalist pedagogy, she seems to suggest that ideology and antifoundationalism can somehow be reconciled in an antifoundationalist pedagogy. However, I believe that Bizzell ultimately disclaims antifoundationalism and, I believe, postmodernism too by suggesting that teachers should clearly state their ideological goals in the classroom.4

In "Network Theory: A Postmodern Pedagogy for the Writing Classroom," Thomas Barker and Fred Kemp (1990) relate yet another application of postmodernism that is less ideologically oriented than either Berlin's or Bizzell's pedagogies. These authors maintain that postmodernism and postmodern pedagogy should address the present moment:

Postmodern in our terms means both a way of looking sensitively and self-consciously at the conditions of the present, and also a means of appropriating new ways of knowing about knowing itself, unencumbered by static assumptions or conventions. A postmodern writing pedagogy represents a structured attempt to combine the realities of current social and economic conditions with instruction that emphasizes the communal aspect of knowledge making. (2)

Barker and Kemp maintain that writing pedagogy can respond to the present through the use of computers in writing. By critiquing traditional classrooms

4We might also consider the influence of a teacher's role on postmodernism. The very role of a teacher may also bring with it ideological assumptions that might disavow the postmodern perspective.
that employ face-to-face interactions and other methods of instruction such as peer review, Barker and Kemp suggest that a computer-networked classroom allows students more opportunities to interact with other students through the written word: "We believe that irrespective of further pedagogical measures, the sharing of text easily promotes the power of text, which in turn motivates and directs the writer in instructionally effective ways" (18). Barker and Kemp also promote "network theory," which emphasizes textual transactions between writers as central to writing pedagogy. The assumption behind network theory is that the more frequently writers engage in written transactions with other writers, the more frequently writers will learn about themselves as transactors and therefore become better writers (15). Network theory, consequently, de-emphasizes the text and instead emphasizes transactions that occur between writers. Because transactional exchanges play such a central role in network theory, this approach to writing pedagogy also reflects certain aspects of social constructionism. For example, Barker and Kemp suggest that transactions lead to a type of "group knowledge," which relies on the transactions for the creation of that knowledge (15). In this way, the postmodern pedagogy described by Barker and Kemp emphasizes discourse communities and a kind of social construction.

While Barker and Kemp call their pedagogy "postmodern," their employment of postmodernism seems to go no further than this label. Barker and Kemp use postmodernism in a very nondistinct way to justify their computer pedagogy by suggesting that computer pedagogy responds to the needs of the current situation in writing pedagogy. Beyond this somewhat superficial reliance on postmodernism, however, these authors do not explicitly connect their computer pedagogy or network theory to the idea of situatedness or other
postmodern issues. Instead, they focus on a particular practice in the classroom—written transactions—and use postmodernism simply as a framework in which to situate their own computer-based pedagogy and application of network theory.

A useful example of postmodern pedagogy—and perhaps an example closer to the spirit of postmodernism than the ones I've discussed thus far—is proposed by Irene Ward (1994) in *Literacy, Ideology, and Dialogue: Towards a Dialogic Pedagogy*. In this book, Ward describes how a "dialogic" pedagogy relates to postmodernism, and although postmodernism is only one lens through which Ward views dialogic pedagogy, her associations between dialogism and postmodernism are interesting to examine here. Ward explains that postmodern pedagogy "conceives of truth and knowledge not as stable and determinable but as always contingent and dependent on local context" (129). This formulation includes the notion of situatedness and implies a critique of foundational truth and meaning. However, unlike the postmodern pedagogies espoused by Berlin, Bizzell, and Barker and Kemp, Ward stresses situatedness and contingency in her pedagogy. In her approach to pedagogy, Ward advocates that "knowledge, like language, can be understood, or have meaning, only within unique communicative situations in which two or more people engage in a dialogue about an object or idea" (129). That is, Ward suggests that students should engage dialogically in communicative interaction with one another in and outside the classroom. Furthermore, Ward suggests that this dialogic activity is central to postmodern pedagogy because it embodies situatedness and indeterminacy. For this reason, dialogic activity may be more important perhaps

---

4Ward also describes dialogic pedagogy as it relates to social construction, expressivism, and radical pedagogies, though she favors a postmodern association with dialogic pedagogy.
than teaching skills or a codified writing process. In place of process-centered pedagogy, Ward advocates a dialogue-centered pedagogy in which students become literate by learning to address audiences through engaging others in dialogue.

Ward suggests that dialogism employed in the classroom relies on interactions between students and texts, students and students, teachers and students, and students and nonacademic audiences (201):

The various types of dialogue . . . all are necessary for the development of students as competent writers who can produce written documents capable of carrying on the work of a literate society. In short, a comprehensive dialogic pedagogy would recognize that knowledge unfolds in the process of attempting to communicate with others, what [Thomas Kent] calls communicative interaction; in the give-and-take of this process, people come to know themselves, other people, and something about the concrete world. (201-202)

While Ward does not offer concrete suggestions for employing this type of pedagogy, her work provides, I think, the strongest possibility for a truly postmodern pedagogy, for it stresses the postmodern features of indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. For example, Ward recognizes that dialogues change from situation to situation and that knowledge is created through these interactions. Other pedagogies that I have reviewed here tend to employ the term "postmodernism" in an effort to promote a specific ideological practice or traditional computer pedagogy. In contrast, the dialogic activity proposed by Ward, in a sense, enacts postmodernism by focusing on communicative interaction rather than foundational assumptions about writing.

While the pedagogies I have reviewed here encourage a critique of academic discourse, the pedagogies themselves are quite structured, goal-

---

*For this reason, Ward has also described this postmodern pedagogy as a post-process pedagogy.*
oriented, and even foundational. Berlin, Bizzell, and Barker and Kemp, for example, do not incorporate postmodern issues such as the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness within their pedagogies. They simply have used postmodernism to situate a particular brand of pedagogy, and even when postmodern concerns are more appropriately addressed in writing pedagogy, as I believe is the case in Ward's dialogic pedagogy, the question still remains: Can we teach these postmodern issues? The plurality of postmodern pedagogies leaves writing teachers without a clear understanding about how postmodern concerns such as situatedness, antifoundationalism, and the indeterminacy of meaning may be employed in the classroom.

Can We Teach Postmodernism?

In "Antifoundationalism: Can Believers Teach?" Terry Rasmussen (1994) questions the possibility of a postmodern or antifoundationalist pedagogy. Calling herself an antifoundationalist "wanna be," Rasmussen tells us that

While I am willing to acknowledge that our beliefs are just that, beliefs, and that objectivity is a futile attempt to purify or legitimize subjectivity, I'm weary of antifoundationalists crying foul every time someone approaches anything that slightly resembles an attempt to establish a foundation or, for that matter, a promising persuasion. (157)

Although Rasmussen expresses her desire to gain something from postmodern or antifoundationalist concepts to benefit her teaching, she ultimately concludes that postmodernism and antifoundationalism are not compatible with teaching writing. Echoing Bizzell, Rasmussen criticizes the antifoundationalist position for persuading teachers to withhold their opinions in the classroom, and she suggests that teachers openly acknowledge their beliefs: "I want to argue that teaching can be a worthwhile endeavor only if we acknowledge our authority as
teachers and accept the responsibilities that that authority entails, such as sharing our convictions without reservation and . . . occasionally censoring the beliefs of our students" (151). Unlike Bizzell, however, she admits that her desire to impose authority in the classroom may not be consistent with postmodernism or antifoundationalism, and therefore, she refrains from calling herself an antifoundationalist. Instead, she calls herself a "wanna be" antifoundationalist—one who understands antifoundationalist issues but sees the contradiction in employing them in the classroom. As a result, Rasmussen questions her ability (or even the possibility) of employing a postmodern or antifoundationalist pedagogy in writing classes.

Rasmussen's careful critique suggests a paradox between postmodern issues and teaching postmodern issues. That is, given the "randomness" of postmodernism and its denial of structured, foundational knowledge, is it possible that any approach to writing pedagogy—including a postmodern one—could avoid foundationalism? This question poses a kind of "paradox" of postmodernism that David Wallace (1996) explains:

If we recognize that structural understandings of language and rhetoric are not objective and have no intrinsic basis in reality, then we must also recognize that any act of pedagogy that requires (or encourages) conformity to convention is ultimately a power move. . . Thus any pedagogical act must be seen as socially and culturally implicated because asking students to move in any direction—whether that be toward mastery of the conventions of standard written English or toward a critical awareness of
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7Rasmussen argues that those interested in teaching antifoundationalism must develop their ethos in order to acknowledge their authority (151).

8I think the term "wanna be" accurately describes many teachers who want to employ postmodernism or antifoundationalism in the classroom but find that it is difficult, if not impossible, to do so. The "wanna be" idea illustrates to me the incompleteness of postmodern pedagogy—one cannot employ postmodernism or antifoundationalism completely in the writing classroom without forwarding their own (foundational) teaching agenda. The "wanna be" condition illustrates to me the impossibility—the unrealized fulfillment—of teaching postmodernism or antifoundationalism in the writing classroom.
the social and political consequences of acts of literacy—is to ask them to change not just what they know but who they are. (110-111)

Wallace explains that any pedagogy—even a postmodern one—adopts a stance and therefore cannot be considered, as Faigley (1992) maintains, random, chaotic, or ambiguous (3). Notice that Wallace describes this paradox in terms of power—that any pedagogical act is an act of power. Rasmussen acknowledges this paradox, too, in terms of teacher authority. By proclaiming herself a "wanna be," Rasmussen recognizes that she cannot reconcile her teacher authority with antifoundationalist assumptions about knowledge. In attempt to make sense of this paradox, Wallace finally concludes that "the critical question, then, becomes how to implement pedagogy that aids teachers in understanding the implications of their decisions for students and engages students in substantive critique of their own learning" (111). Wallace suggests, however, that this postmodern teaching agenda, like any other teaching agenda, "requires a leap of faith" (111).

Faith is an interesting term to describe postmodern pedagogy, for faith is not grounded in rationality; rather, faith is grounded in hope and the possibility of belief. Wallace uses the term to mean that teachers must find a "starting point" for their teaching and have faith that those goals may be valuable in some way for students (111).9 In contrast to this perspective, Stanley Fish argues that we cannot have faith in an antifoundationalist pedagogy. Unlike the positions held by Berlin and Bizzell, Fish argues that we should not hope to gain anything

9But the word "faith" could also be used to forward another ideological and foundational agenda, as is the case in Judson Curry's (1993) article titled "A Return to 'Converting the Natives,' or Antifoundationalist Faith in the Composition Class." In this article, Curry forwards the dangerous argument that teachers who believe in antifoundationalism have the duty to "convert" students into the antifoundationalist "faith." Likening antifoundationalism to a Baptist (not to mention foundational) faith, Curry suggests that antifoundationalism provides students the ability to deconstruct social, political, and cultural assumptions that surround them (162). Ironically, Curry has turned an antifoundationalist project into a foundational one.
from the antifoundationalist argument. In fact, in "Anti-Foundationalism, Theory Hope, and the Teaching of Composition," Fish (1989) argues the futility of teaching situatedness:

To put the matter in a nutshell, the knowledge that one is in a situation has no particular payoff for any situation you happen to be in, because the constraints of that situation will not be realized by that knowledge. It follows, then, that teaching our students the lesson of anti-foundationalism, while it will put them in possession of a new philosophical perspective, will not give them a tool for operating in a world they already inhabit. Being told that you are in a situation will help you neither to dwell in it more perfectly nor to write within it more successfully. (35)

Although Fish admits to being a "card-carrying anti-foundationalist" (347), he maintains that the project to develop a postmodern or antifoundationalist pedagogy should be abandoned—not simply because the project would be difficult, but because it is impossible. Fish resists any attempt to fashion a so-called anti-foundationalist pedagogy for three reasons: 1) anti-foundationalism cannot be taught; 2) the key concept in anti-foundationalism is situatedness; and 3) we can do nothing with the knowledge that we are situated. I would like to review each of these claims, for I believe that Fish accurately presents postmodern issues—particularly about the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness.

First, Fish argues that anti-foundationalism does not give us new knowledge or a new set of discourse conventions that we can employ to inform our teaching. Instead, when Fish states that antifoundationalism cannot be taught, he means, in part, that discourse conventions alone do not constitute an antifoundationalist pedagogy. The problem with this idea, says Fish, is that a reliance on discourse conventions attempts to find something solid, concrete,
and "correct" that we can teach as a foundation for composition pedagogy. In short, Fish suggests that using discourse conventions as the focus for writing pedagogy is the same as teaching cognitive strategies, or grammar, or modes of writing that may reduce writing instruction to a more obvious foundationalist approach. In his writings, Fish desires to dismantle not only the potential for an antifoundationalist pedagogy, but the possibility for it. Fish argues that if antifoundationalism does not possess a foundation—if knowledge, in other words, refutes reduction to a traditional epistemology—then we cannot turn that knowing into a method: "As a searching critique of method, antifoundationalism cannot itself be made the basis of a method without losing its anti-foundationalist character" (351).

Fish's point that anti-foundationalism cannot be taught relates directly to his second point: antifoundationalism only helps us to know that we are situated. That is, knowing means to understand that we are always situated. This point is central to Fish, and he returns to over and over again in "Anti-Foundationalism, Theory Hope, and the Teaching of Composition." For example, early in his essay, he tells us that anti-foundationalism "asserts [that questions of fact, truth, correctness, validity, and clarity] are intelligible and debatable only within the precincts of the contexts or situations or paradigms or communities that give them their local and changeable shape" (344). Of course, these situations never remain stable; they always change. So, Fish's antifoundationalism understands "situations" to be highly contingent and unstable (345). Later in the essay, Fish explains that situatedness does not "buy" us anything:

Indeed, any claim in which the notion of situatedness is said to be a lever that allows us to get a purchase on situations is finally a claim to have
escaped situatedness, and is therefore nothing more or less than a reinvention of foundationalism by the very form of thought that has supposedly reduced it to ruins. (348-9)

For Fish, situatedness is everything, for we know what we know only because we find ourselves in some particular situation at some particular historical moment.

I have already pointed out pedagogies (excluding Ward) that, according to Fish, have made the mistake of trying to apply situatedness or antifoundationalism in general to composition pedagogy (Barker and Kemp, Bizzell, Berlin). This "mistake" is also apparent in the areas of professional communication. For example, Susan Wells (1986) in "Jurgen Habermas, Communicative Competence, and the Teaching of Technical Discourse," suggests that the goal of technical writing pedagogy should be to help students enter into communicative action and to help them understand their situatedness, and she encourages students to learn how to adapt to new workplace situations in which they might find themselves. The way to adapt to these situations, she suggests, is "to work with the structures of technical discourse so that students can negotiate their demands but also be aware of the limited but real possibility of moving beyond them" (264). Wells bases this pedagogy on the idea that "the objective and universal form of discourse conceals an intersubjective relation, a relation directed toward understanding" (256). Wells suggests that what we know is governed by intersubjective, situated relations, and she advocates a pedagogy that helps students become aware of
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10Technical communication as a field is not primarily focused on first-year composition but is still considered writing pedagogy. Technical communication is a particularly fruitful area because it provides teachers the opportunity to explore situations other than the classroom, such as in apprenticeships or internship opportunities in which students might engage in client/consultant relationships instead of student/teacher relationships.
those situated relations. Wells' ideas are similar to Irene Ward's advocacy of a
dialogic pedagogy where attention is focused on the intersubjective
communicative interaction between students. Like Ward, Wells acknowledges
the situatedness of interactions between students; for this reason, Wells' work
more appropriately addresses postmodern issues such as situatedness and
indeterminacy of meaning than other examples I have examined thus far.

Another example of teaching situatedness is Thomas Miller's "Writing as
Social Praxis." (1991). Miller suggests that we need to teach technical writing not
as technē (or cognitive skills) but as praxis, which means that writers must
understand the situations and contexts that surround them: "We can foster such
'practical wisdom' by developing a pedagogy that contributes to our students'
ability to locate themselves and their professional communities in the larger
public context" (68). To accomplish this goal, Miller recommends that we
encourage students "to analyze both how shared assumptions are put into
practice within organizations and disciplines and how these communities
themselves function in the larger public context" (69). Like Wells, Miller
encourages students to focus on situations in which they find themselves. In
each of these cases, I believe that Wells' and Miller's pedagogical goals
incorporate more effectively postmodern issues than the previous examples I
have examined.

But in both cases, Fish would argue, Wells and Miller are wrong to want
to teach situatedness, for we can do nothing with the knowledge that we are
situated, which is Fish's third major claim in "Anti-foundationalism, Theory
Hope, and the Teaching of Composition." Antifoundationalism only helps us
understand that we are situated—that our writing is situated. We can do
nothing with this knowledge, and we certainly can't put it to use. In the
conclusion of "Anti-Foundationalism," Fish offers a kind of apology for this view:

Perhaps I should apologize for taking up so much of your time in return for so small a yield; but the smallness of the yield has been my point. It is also the point of anti-foundationalism, which offers you nothing but the assurance that what it is unable to give you—knowledge, goals, purposes, strategies—is what you already have. (355)

Finally, Fish argues that anti-foundationalism does not give us a "lever" to escape situatedness, to rise above it, to employ it in pedagogy, or to do anything with it at all (348). An antifoundationalist approach, says Fish, is "always historicist" (321); it denies the premises of foundationalist theory. Anti-foundationalism is not really a theory but is "an argument against the possibility of theory" (322). Given Fish's argument, we must question whether or not we can ever hope (or have faith) in building a pedagogy out of such a theory.

In another well-known essay, "Consequences," Fish (1989) calls faith in theories "Theory hope" (with a capital "T"), or the

hope that our claims to knowledge can be justified on the basis of some objective method of assessing such claims' rather than on the basis of the individual beliefs that have been derived from the accidents of education and experience. (322)

Fish uses the term "Theory hope" to explain our desire to have a system of rules that, when applied, produce a "correct" answer about questions we might have about writing tasks (317). In true postmodern fashion, Fish argues that Theory hope is empty because theories do not have the consequences we expect them to possess, such as correct answers, or a "recipe with premeasured ingredients which... will produce, all by itself, the correct result" (343). Rather, he argues that theory only has consequences for our institutional practices such as
employment and curricular design. The phrase Theory hope captures, then, the faith and hope that teachers sometimes seem to want in antifoundationalist and postmodernist pedagogies. According to Fish, however, Theory hope is a clear misunderstanding of postmodernism, especially when teachers imagine that antifoundationalism can be taught. We might relate Fish’s claims to an even larger debate about whether or not writing can be taught. For example, the argument that antifoundationalism cannot be taught can be extended to the argument that writing cannot be taught, and I will discuss this issue at length in chapter two.

As I have noted, past efforts to invent an antifoundationalist or postmodern pedagogy have resulted in contradiction and confusion because central postmodern issues were ignored, appropriated to forward other pedagogies, or were unsuccessfully taught. I agree with Fish that we should give up the quest for a postmodern pedagogy—or at least the desire to teach postmodern issues such as situatedness and indeterminacy of meaning.

Lack of Research on Postmodern Pedagogy

Because of the confusion about the nature of postmodernism, it is not surprising, and almost inevitable, that we now have so little practical research in the area of postmodern pedagogy. This absence of research has been noted by David Smit (1995): "[there is] a remarkable lack of discussion about whether these methods of instruction actually produce good writers or good writing" (47). Although several efforts have been made to formulate a postmodern pedagogy, and I have mentioned several of them in this discussion, few if any of these efforts describe what Smit requests—studies that investigate whether postmodern "methods of instruction actually produce good writers or good
writing." Scholars like Berlin, Bizzell, Barker and Kemp, and even Ward have described guidelines and goals for certain pedagogical approaches that employ antifoundationalist and postmodernist concepts, but they have offered no actual descriptions of the approaches in practice—no stories, no studies, no evidence.

This lack of research is the third problem with postmodern pedagogy that I outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Noting this lack, David Smit argues that "If [postmodernism] is to have any relevance to composition and rhetoric, it must offer some convincing suggestions about how we ought to teach writing, suggestions which seem to be organic or integral to the theory" (41). Smit explains that the absence of research investigating the practical applications of postmodern pedagogy—this gap between theory and practice—weakens the possibility both for postmodern pedagogy and for postmodern theory in general.

One explanation for the absence of research in what might be called "postmodern practice" is that postmodern pedagogy to date has attempted to teach postmodern issues rather than examine them. Postmodern pedagogy has attempted to teach issues such as indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness (Wells 1986; Miller 1991), or to teach a postmodern critique (Bizzell 1986, 1990; Berlin 1992; Curry 1993). Instead, following Fish, I want to suggest that issues associated with postmodernism can be examined through pedagogy. Certain pedagogical approaches may certainly allow us to examine issues such as indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. For example, I indicated earlier that Ward's dialogic pedagogy incorporated postmodern issues such as indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. I suggested that her proposed dialogic pedagogy gave life to these issues by demonstrating them rather than by teaching them. To some extent, Susan Wells and Thomas Miller incorporate a similar perspective when they point out the importance of intersubjective dialogues that help
students situate themselves in unfamiliar contexts. So, we can learn from these approaches how indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness are relevant to the act of writing, but we need to go further, I believe, to investigate the efficacy of these approaches and the ways in which these approaches actually contribute to the practice of writing.

In an effort to investigate how postmodernism contributes to writing practice, we might begin by considering the nature of the writing act itself. In all of the approaches I discussed here, we discover that interpretation plays a central role in the act of writing—as it does in the work of important postmodern theorists (such as Derrida, Davidson, Dasenbrock, Fish)—and I believe that by considering the role that interpretation plays in the act of writing, we can respond more carefully to postmodern issues such as the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. James, Berlin, for example, takes us at least part way down the road towards a "hermeneutic" understanding of writing when he acknowledges the importance of interpretation in both the reception and production of discourse:

In enacting the composing process, students are learning that all experience is situated within signifying practices, and that learning to understand personal and social experience involves acts of discourse production and interpretation, the two acting reciprocally in reading and writing codes. Students in the class come to see that interpretation involves production as well as reproduction, and is as constructive as composing itself. At the same time, they discover that the more one knows about a text—its author, place of publication, audience, historical context—the less indeterminate it becomes and the more confident the reader can be in interpreting and negotiating its intentions. (31)

While Berlin encourages a political, social-epistemic rhetoric (31), his mention of interpretation is noteworthy because he makes a distinction between production and reception of discourse. Interpretation has always been a crucial
issue in discussions of the reception of discourse (reading and listening); rarely, however, do we associate interpretation with the production of discourse (speaking and writing). In fact, interpretation for the most part has been ignored in writing studies, although sometimes scholars allude to interpretation. For example, in their approaches to writing pedagogy, Ward, Wells, and Miller broach the issue of interpretation when they examine the subjective interactions that occur within the production of discourse. But, these scholars do not explicitly address the role that interpretation plays in the writing act. I believe that interpretation deserves further examination in writing studies, and I also believe that interpretation embodies the characteristics of indeterminacy and situatedness.

When we consider the writing act as an interpretive act, we might also consider a more broad-based intellectual movement known in philosophical circles called "the interpretive turn," in which meaning is thought to be shaped by interpretation rather than by foundational standards or absolute truths. In the next chapter, I examine the interpretive turn and the influence of this hermeneutic movement on writing pedagogy. To conclude this chapter, however, I want to suggest that attempts to establish a postmodern pedagogy have failed. More often than not, these attempts at postmodern pedagogy have ignored postmodern issues such as indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness, replaced these issues with another pedagogical agenda, or attempted to teach these issues and, consequently, present a foundational approach to teaching writing. Instead of attempting to create a postmodern pedagogy, which I believe is an impossible project, I propose that we examine situatedness and indeterminacy of meaning through the lens of interpretation in the act of
writing. If we want to explore the indeterminate nature of the writing act, I suggest that we focus on interpretation.
CHAPTER TWO
INTERPRETATION AND THE THIRD SPACE IN THE PRODUCTION OF DISCOURSE

In chapter one, I suggested that interpretation has been largely ignored in research about the production of discourse. In this chapter, I expand this discussion of interpretation by exploring the relation of interpretation to the act of writing. Specifically, I argue that the production of discourse embodies interpretation and that, in turn, our interpretive acts constitute a kind of open-ended communicative interaction. I attempt to demonstrate how interpretation affects communicative interaction through the concept of what I call the "third space."

Although the connection between interpretation and production of discourse has been discussed by some scholars (Berlin 1992; Kent 1993; Bizzell 1986; Flower 1994), most of the influential work regarding the role that interpretation plays in communicative interaction has been carried out by literary theorists and philosophers interested in the reception—not the production—of discourse (Fish 1980; Davidson 1984; Dasenbrock 1993; Kent 1989). Consequently, in my discussion of interpretation, I address the conceptions of interpretation formulated by these reception theorists, especially those philosophers and theorists interested specifically in the characteristics of communicative interaction. In this discussion, I emphasize what Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman (1991) call "hermeneutic universalism" and "hermeneutic contextualism," and I suggest that hermeneutic universalism most completely embraces interpretation as it relates to communicative
interaction. To develop this argument, I elaborate the following four claims in this chapter:

(1) The "interpretive turn" stresses either hermeneutic universalism or hermeneutic contextualism.

(2) Interpretation is treated centrally in discussions about reception of discourse, and hermeneutic universalism dominates these discussions.

(3) Most discussions of interpretation in the production of discourse do not address interpretation as a central issue, or if they do, they generally endorse hermeneutic contextualism.

(4) The third space is a theoretical concept that endorses hermeneutic universalism and attempts to account for interpretation in the act of writing through a focus on communicative interaction.

I conclude this chapter by explaining the concept of the third space and how the concept helps us identify episodes of communicative interaction that demonstrate uncertainty, situatedness, and indeterminate meaning in the writing act.

**Hermeneutic Universalism and Hermeneutic Contextualism**

A relatively recent philosophical movement that Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman (1991) call the "interpretive turn" has influenced several disciplines, and this "turn" endorses the claim that what we know is shaped by our interpretations. The interpretive turn described by Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman follows previous philosophical movements such as the "epistemological turn" of the 18th century where knowledge was equated with rational thought, especially the kind of rational thought exemplified by the scientific method, and the "linguistic turn" early in this century where emphasis
was placed on the structure of language and the meanings generated through language systems. According to Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman, the interpretive turn breaks with these previous traditions by giving up the notion that the essence or the foundations of knowledge and meaning can be discovered:

... the views about the foundations of knowledge and the knowing subject that were the basis for the epistemological turn have been called into question, and it has seemed to many philosophers that language and meaning cannot bear the kind of weight the linguistic turn required. (Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman 1)

When we give up our search for the foundations of knowledge, and when we relinquish our attempts to reduce knowledge and meaning to foundational categories of linguistic or mental states, we encounter the interpretive turn—the acknowledgment that meaning is shaped by our interpretive acts. According to Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman, our move toward interpretation can take one of two forms: either "hermeneutic universalism" or "hermeneutic contextualism" (7). Hermeneutic universalism holds that interpretation never stops—that communication itself constitutes an interpretive act. Hermeneutic contextualism holds that interpretation takes place within some context, community, or background (7). In short, contextualism suggests that there are limits to interpretation, while universalism does not.

These competing conceptions of interpretation characterize a recurring debate within current hermeneutic theory, and clear examples of this debate are

---


12 Rorty also makes this distinction between these two camps. He says that one camp maintains that interpretations never end, or that interpretations "go all the way down." The other camp says that interpretations stop at some point or are limited to a context or social environment (70).
found in the writings of Thomas Kuhn and Richard Rorty. For example, in "Natural and Human Sciences," Thomas Kuhn (1991), a hermeneutic contextualist, notes that both the natural and the human sciences rely on interpretation, but that human sciences rely on interpretation more completely: "The natural sciences, therefore, though they may require what I have called a hermeneutic base, are not themselves hermeneutic enterprises. The human sciences, on the other hand, often are, and they may have no alternative" (23). Kuhn endorses the idea that the natural sciences are more objective, and, finally, more "truthful" than the human sciences because the natural sciences "are not themselves hermeneutic enterprises" (23).

On the other hand, Richard Rorty, a hermeneutic universalist, argues that interpretation goes "all the way down": "My fantasy is of a culture so deeply anti-essentialist that it makes only a sociological distinction between sociologists and physicists, not a methodological or philosophical one" (71). In "Inquiry as Recontextualization," Rorty (1991) asserts that our minds are "webs of beliefs and desires, of sentential attitudes—webs that continually reweave themselves so as to accommodate new sentential attitudes" (59). For Rorty, both the human sciences and the natural sciences are thoroughly hermeneutic enterprises, and he argues that what we know or could ever know about the world derives from the webs of beliefs and desires that we continually reweave or "recontextualize":

As one moves along the spectrum from habit to inquiry—from instinctive revision of intentions through routine calculation toward revolutionary science or politics—the number of beliefs added to or subtracted from the web increases. At a certain point in this process it becomes useful to speak of "recontextualization." The more widespread the changes, the more use we have for the notion of "a new context." This new context can be a new explanatory theory, a new comparison class, a new descriptive vocabulary, a new private or political purpose, the latest book one has read, the last person one talked to; the possibilities are endless. (61)
According to Rorty, interpretation—what he calls "reinterpretation" and "recontextualization"—never ceases, for every interpretation is based on a previous interpretation.\textsuperscript{13} The different views about the power of interpretation held by Rorty and Kuhn exemplify the current debate concerning hermeneutic universalism and hermeneutic contextualization that we encounter in studies of both the reception and the production of discourse.

**Interpretation and the Reception of Discourse**

Hermeneutic universalism and hermeneutic contextualism have been especially important in current literary theory. Perhaps the most obvious example of hermeneutic contextualism in recent literary theory occurs in the approach to interpretation advocated by certain reader-response critics such as Stanley Fish. According to Fish (1980), because meaning is located in the reader rather than in the text, interpretation is inescapable: "The moral is clear: the choice is never between objectivity and interpretation but between an interpretation that is unacknowledged as such and an interpretation that is at least aware of itself" (324).\textsuperscript{14} However, while Fish acknowledges the central role

\textsuperscript{13}It is for this reason that interpretation cannot be called a theory; interpretation is on-going and always situated; it is not goal-oriented.

\textsuperscript{14}Of course, hermeneutic universalism shows up in other approaches to the interpretation of literary texts such as deconstruction theory. In "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences," for example, Jacques Derrida (1978) makes a similar observation about the universalism of interpretation (see pages 121-122). Derrida's conception of "differance" (the idea that meaning is deferred and resists classification), which results from his deconstruction of the metaphysics of presence, suggests that meaning is not found in structures, or even the presence of the text. Rather, differance encourages us to look at the absence of presence (See Kearny and Rainwater 438). Differance aside, however, Derrida's project to deconstruct foundational assumptions about knowledge may have influenced the anti-formalist perspective in reader reception theories. And, more to the point, while Derrida's focus is not specifically on reader reception in the passage above, Derrida makes the same observation as Fish—that interpretation can never be left out of the process of meaning making. Both Fish and Derrida recognize the inescapability of interpretation.
of interpretation, he also asserts that interpretation takes place within the context of a specific community. Fish explains in "Interpreting the Variorum," for example, that interpretive communities give shape to strategies of reader reception (326):

Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way around. If it is an article of faith in a particular community that there are a variety of texts, its members will boast a repertoire of strategies for making them. And if a community believes in the existence of only one text, then the single strategy its members employ will be forever writing it. (327)

While Fish's notion of interpretive communities counters the dominant formalist perspective within reader-response theory and criticism (see also Iser 1972; Hirsh 1976), Fish's version of reception theory and his endorsement of hermeneutic contextualism has not gone unchallenged by hermeneutic universalists.

According to hermeneutic universalists, a significant problem with hermeneutic contextualism is relativism. Donald Davidson, for example, argues that hermeneutic contextualists are "conceptual relativists." In "The Myth of the Subjective," he explains what he means by "conceptual relativism" and why he rejects it:

If by conceptual relativism we mean the idea that conceptual schemes and moral systems, or the languages associated with them, can differ massively—to the extent of being mutually unintelligible or incommensurable, or forever beyond rational resolve—then I reject conceptual relativism. . . . The meaninglessness of the idea of a conceptual scheme forever beyond our grasp is due not to our inability to understand
such a scheme or to our other human limitations; it is due simply to what we mean by a system of concepts. (160)

Davidson asserts that for hermeneutic contextualists, knowledge is relative to the communities or paradigms or conceptual schemes in which we find ourselves so that our beliefs and our truths become relative to those communities, paradigms, or conceptual schemes. Although individual communities allow for various interpretations, Davidson points out that hermeneutic contextualism ultimately presents us with a paradox (ITI 184; Dasenbrock 23). Davidson explains that to distinguish between communities, one must know one's own community, but also know in what ways one's community is different from others. Kent (1993) applies Davidson's position to Fish's hermeneutic contextualism:

All we can ever know is the conceptual framework that holds together the community in which we happen to exist, a conceptual framework that separates us from others and from the world. To hold such a Cartesian position means that Fish possesses no convincing response to the skeptic or to those who charge him with relativism. (40-41)

As I have noted, by endorsing the idea of interpretive communities, Fish holds that knowledge is relative to a context of some sort—in Fish's case, a "community" of interpreters—and context shapes and determines what we can know about the world. Davidson rejects this idea because it posits a split between self and others, and mind and body that leads directly to conceptual relativism.

15The problems of skepticism and relativism are common problems with interpretation that Bohman, Hiley, and Shusterman (1991) point out in their introduction to The Interpretive Turn. Skepticism raises the question "what makes an interpretation correct or better than another interpretation?" (2) while relativism raises the question "If interpretations are fallible and circular and if there is nothing to appeal to that is not an interpretation, is the interpretive turn relativistic and ethnocentric?" (2). These problems are recurrent topics of debate and discussion within the interpretive perspective.
For Davidson, contextualists such as Fish are not nearly hermeneutic enough; for Davidson and other universal hermeneuticists, relativism may be avoided only by admitting that interpretation goes all the way down.

Reed Way Dasenbrock (1993) also criticizes Fish for reducing interpretation to conceptual schemes, and he terms Fish’s position the "hermeneutics of identity":

What is wrong with Fish’s "interpretive community" model of interpretation, the notion that readers write texts, is, finally, that it is a hermeneutics of identity. The model of interpretive communities assumes, because we can understand only on our own terms that the text cannot be understood and at the same time be understood to be different from us. (32)

As an alternative to interpretive communities, Dasenbrock offers Davidson’s (universal) interpretive perspective. Davidson’s ideas of radical interpretation (25-26) and principle of charity, according to Dasenbrock, provide a way for negotiating meaning rather than understanding meaning to be the product of a consensual community. Davidson’s conception of interpretation develops a middle ground—a place where meaning can be negotiated. Dasenbrock suggests: "We do adjust, we do change, in order to interpret anomalous utterances, in ways that the theory of the interpretive community writing the text it reads does not quite make sense of" (27). Davidson explains in an interview with Kent (1993) what he means by radical interpretation and the principle of charity:

Radical interpretation is a way of studying interpretation by purifying the situation in an artificial way. Imagine trying to understand somebody else when you have no head start: there is no translator around; there’s no dictionary available; you have to work it out from scratch. It would beg the question, in trying to study the nature of interpretation, to assume that you know in advance what a person’s intentions, beliefs, and desires are. I hold that you never could get a detailed picture of any of those things.
unless you could communicate with the person first. There is no master key or framework theory that you can have prior to a communicative interaction or situation. You’ve got to work your way into the whole system at the same time. (6)

In other words, radical interpretation assumes that meaning derives from communicative interaction because we cannot know in advance the mental states of others before we engage in communicative interaction with them. The principle of charity goes hand-in-hand with radical interpretation. "Charity" means that in order to communicate we must assume that the utterances of others hold together in some way (7). Davidson explains:

The word charity is a misnomer because it’s not a matter of being kind to people; it’s the condition for understanding them at all. Thus, charity has two features: one is that you can’t understand people if you don’t see them as sharing a world with you; the other is that you can’t understand people if you don’t see them as logical in the way that you are—up to a point, of course. (7)

Stated a bit differently, Simon Evnine (1991) explains that the principle of charity and radical interpretation concern the general agreement between two speakers:

The assumption [regarding interpretation] that Davidson is requiring us to make, therefore, is that we take others (the interpretees) to find obvious what we (the interpreters) find obvious. . . . This means that in radical interpretation we must assume that the objects of interpretation, by and large, believe what we think is true. (103)

These concepts are useful counterpoints to Fish’s idea of interpretive communities. To say that understanding may not ever be completely shared (as in consensus), but that understanding is mostly shared, allows for disagreements and misinterpretations that occur in the process of communicative interaction. Dasenbrock (1993) explains in "Do We Write the Text that We Read" that this
room for clarification is necessary: ". . . because beliefs and meanings differ (not totally, but appreciably), interpreters find that their assumption of shared agreement on belief and meaning needs modification in places" (26).

Consequently, Dasenbrock and Kent—both of whom follow Davidson's lead—argue that Fish and other hermeneutic contextualists do not go far enough when they claim that interpretation shapes the reception of discourse. For hermeneutic universalists such as Dasenbrock, Kent, and Davidson, interpretation is not context-bound; it goes all the way down. In the following sections, I attempt to draw out some of the implications of this hermeneutic universalism for the production of discourse.

**Interpretation and the Production of Discourse**

Although different conceptions of interpretation have directly influenced studies dealing with the reception of discourse, studies of the production of discourse have not examined interpretation in quite the same way. For example, Berlin (1992) explicitly mentions interpretation, but not in terms of the universalist/contextualist debate. Instead, Berlin alludes to interpretation as practice in both composing and reading:

> In enacting the composing process, students are learning that all experience is situated within signifying practices, and that learning to understand personal and social experience involves acts of discourse production and interpretation, the two acting reciprocally in reading and writing codes. Students in the class come to see that interpretation involves production as well as reproduction, and is as constructive as composing itself. (31)

---

16Stanley Fish has since argued for the hermeneutic universalist position. See "Anti-Foundationalism, Theory Hope, and the Teaching of Composition."
In addition, accounts of interpretation in rhetoric and composition studies are generally underdeveloped. Although interpretation may be addressed, most studies do not treat interpretation as a central issue (see Wells 1986; Miller 1991; Ward 1994; Bizzell 1986). For example, in "Beyond Anti-Foundationalism," Patricia Bizzell (1986) alludes to the importance of interpretation by suggesting that the idea of a community may no longer be stable (much like the hermeneutic universalist argument in the reception of discourse); however, she does not explicitly mention interpretation. Instead, Bizzell describes the breakdown of community in terms of a shift between discourse community and persuasive language:

I am coming to suspect, however, that the academic discourse community is not such a stable entity... I now think the academic discourse community is more unstable than this—more fraught with contradiction, more polyvocal—and that this instability is a sign of its health, its ability to adapt to changing historical conditions. (258)

In "Beyond Anti-Foundationalism" Bizzell (1990) further asserts that a rhetorical turn, rather than an interpretive turn, is occurring in composition and rhetoric:

If all knowledge is nonfoundational, made by people, then the discourse used to frame and promulgate knowledge takes on new importance. Persuasive language is no longer the servant of truth, making it possible for people to understand so that they can believe. Rather, persuasive language creates truth by inducing belief; "truth" results when rhetoric is successful. (261)

Although Bizzell labels this view of language a "rhetorical turn," the notion sounds similar to a hermeneutic universalist perspective because she tends to

---

17 Ward's dialogic pedagogy, for example, does not explicitly focus on interpretation, but rather the exchange of dialogue.

18 While Bizzell seems to describe a shift toward hermeneutic universalism (toward communicative interaction), she does not couch her argument in terms of interpretation.
endorse the idea that meaning is created through language-in-use (communicative interaction) rather than through foundational structures. In addition, she emphasizes the ways in which discourse is produced—rather than received: "the discourse used to frame and promulgate knowledge takes on new importance" (261). Rather than grounding knowledge in discourse communities, Bizzell concludes that knowledge is shaped by language-in-use. Nevertheless, Bizzell does not express this shift in terms of interpretation.

Recently, however, some scholars (Flower 1994; Kent 1992) have begun to address directly the importance of interpretation in the area of discourse production, but few of these more developed discussions of interpretation fully embrace the universalist perspective described by Davidson. For example, in The Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive Theory of Writing, Linda Flower (1994) critiques the idea that meaning is made within communicative interactions. Employing "conversation" as a kind of communicative interaction, Flower argues that conversation is agentless and that individuals—rather than conversations—create meaning (65). Flower suggests that individuals create meaning through the act of negotiation rather than through the act of conversation (66).

Because we are individual minds operating on social experience, at some level of analysis and in some sense of the word, all meaning is negotiated or shaped in a dialogue with our world. But... we need to distinguish these moments of negotiated construction and the meanings that emerge from it from the broader category of what we might call socially shaped meaning and the many ways it is produced. (56)

Flower also suggests that meaning can be internalized. For example, Flower points out that conversational analyses of teacher-student interactions do not
entirely depict the meanings that each individual internalizes (63). Flower believes that there is an internal, cognitive process occurring in negotiation:

In these images of negotiation, individuals (and groups) come to the table as independent knowers, ready to talk. I wish to add to this picture by arguing that negotiation is also an internal process by which writers construct (rather than merely defend) personal, but socially situated meanings. (66)

She explains that this negotiation involves interpretation of multidimensional meanings:

A multidimensional meaning of the sort we are talking about is often envisioned as a network. It does not exist as statements or as a list of linguistic propositions, but as a great number of more elementary attitudes, ideas, or perceptions that are intricately linked to one another in a network that permits us to entertain multiple ways of knowing. The local elements of knowledge that stand as "nodes" of this network may be words or they may be images, sounds, emotions, or ideas. They may be linked by verbal, spatial, affective, or visceral relations... It is to this web of meaning—of activated knowledge and its dynamic patterns of interconnection going well beyond the propositional structure of a text—that we want our theory of how writers construct meaning to be accountable. (39)

Flower's use of the web metaphor reminds us of Rorty's "web of beliefs." As I pointed out earlier, Rorty claims that beliefs cannot escape situatedness—they are always related to other beliefs. However, rather than using the idea of a web to demonstrate that interpretation goes "all the way down," Flower uses the web metaphor to locate "patterns of interconnection." She is interested in describing a cognitive process in which interpretation occurs, and she is very clear about this intent (42). Because Flower wishes to codify and ground interpretation in a social cognitive theory, she eschews hermeneutic universalism.
Interestingly, Flower supplements her conception of negotiation by endorsing what she terms an "anti-essentialist" version of interpretation in her description of "provisional resolution" (68). Provisional resolution, as Flower describes it, is a temporary form of constructed meaning-making that responds to "multiple voices or kinds of knowledge that would shape action" (67). The constructed meaning that occurs through negotiation "is not necessarily stable or even coherent with other resolutions that may occur across the span of a text. Resolutions may harbor unresolved conflict and ambiguity. Voices suppressed at one point may emerge at another" (68). On the surface, this passage seems to correspond to the hermeneutic universalism advocated by Davidson, and Flower acknowledges this quality of her work:

I will argue that it is possible to take an anti-essentialist stance to meaning making—to recognize fragmentation and contradiction within our own positions as individuals—but to still envision a constructive act that is more than the brush of discourses passing in the night. (41)

While the idea of provisional resolution seems to endorse hermeneutic universalism, this passage, I think, actually demonstrates Flower's full resistance to a universally hermeneutic perspective. She acknowledges the role of interpretation in the production of discourse—in this case in terms of negotiation—but she is not willing to assert that interpretation has no foundation. Instead, she provides this foundation in terms of individual agency. By understanding negotiation as an individual, internalized act, Flower denies the Davidsonian idea that meaning is created through communicative interaction with others. Because Flower limits interpretation to the context of intersubjective negotiation, her conception of interpretation therefore should be
seen as endorsing hermeneutic contextualism rather than hermeneutic
universalism.

In place of the contextual conversational model that Flower recommends, I believe that we might more profitably understand communicative interaction from the Davidsonian perspective of “language-in-use.” Davidson (1984) explains in "A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs" that language-in-use does not rely on some sort of foundational structure (like Chomsky’s deep structure) or even conventions of language. Rather, Davidson’s description of language-in-use has radical implications for the idea that language is contextually or “convention” bound:

There is no such thing as a language, not if a language is anything like what many philosophers and linguists have supposed. There is therefore no such thing to be learned, mastered, or born with. We must give up the idea of a clearly defined shared structure which language-users acquire and then apply to cases. And we should try again to say how convention in any important sense is involved in language; or, as I think, we should give up the attempt to illuminate how we communicate by appeal to conventions. (446)

The idea that meaning is a product of communicative interaction rather than of a language structure illustrates, I think, the indeterminacy of meaning that is associated with the hermeneutic universalist perspective. Davidson’s version of communicative interaction suggests that meaning is not relative to a community or to discourse conventions but is a product of language-in-use, and language-in-use, as Dasenbrock (1993) explains, is always public and accessible to other language users:

Networks of meaning, thus, are both inner and outer, including ourselves and others in a web. It is not that we have something unique to say stemming from our personal experience before we negotiate the public structures of meaning, but what we have to say forms as a response to that
public structure, to what has come before us and what is being said and done around us. (29)

Unlike Flower who minimizes the idea of communicative interaction by equating it with conversation, Davidson argues that "We must give up the idea of a clearly defined shared structure which language-users acquire and then apply to cases." By reducing the idea of communicative interaction to conversation, Flower stresses individual agency over intersubjectivity, and she does not share with Davidson the conviction that individuality derives from the intersubjectivity that results from communicative interaction with others. As Dasenbrock (1993) relates the point in "The Myths of the Subjective and of the Subject of Composition Studies": "To theorize what we share with others as taking away our individuality makes no sense, for our individuality only comes about as a reaction to those others" (29).

In contrast with Flower's social cognitivism and her hermeneutic contextualism, Thomas Kent focuses on communicative interaction as an interpretive act. Through this focus, Kent openly acknowledges his externalist stance, which directly contrasts with Flower's internalism. Kent (1992) describes the difference between the two in "Externalism and the Production of Discourse":

The internalist imagines that a conceptual scheme or internal realm of mental states—beliefs, desires, intentions, and so forth—exists anterior to an external realm of objects and events. In relation to meaning and language, the internalist thinks that we have ideas in our heads, a kind of private language, and then we find a public shared language to help us communicate these ideas. (57)

Kent opposes internalism because of its inherent dualism, and he explains that "this Cartesian valorization of mind leads directly to the construction of one
epistemological system after another in an attempt to explain our linguistic ability in terms of a totalizing model" (62). Instead, Kent advocates a version of externalism in which language-in-use, or communicative interaction, plays a major role:

Broadly speaking, the externalist takes the position that no split exists between an inner and outer world and claims that our sense of an inner world actually derives from our rapport with other language users, people we interpret during the give and take of communicative interaction. (62)

Language-in-use, then, becomes crucial to the externalist position, for it is the connection between language users and the world.

Kent's perspective of language-in-use also corresponds to Davidson's idea of "triangulation,"19 which Davidson understands as the connection between language users and the world. About triangulation, Davidson (1993) tells us that

... the basic idea is that our concept of objectivity—our idea that our thoughts may or may not correspond to the truth—is an idea that we would not have if it weren't for interpersonal relations. In other words, the source of objectivity is intersubjectivity: the triangle consists of two people and the world. ("Language Philosophy, Writing, and Reading: A Conversation with Donald Davidson," Kent 8)

Triangulation is a key concept for explaining how meanings are located within our communicative interactions with others. In short, triangulation suggests that we can't know things without knowing others. In "On the Very Idea of a Discourse Community," Kent (1991) uses Davidson's idea of triangulation and communicative interaction to distinguish the externalist perspective from the internalist perspective:

19The term "triangulation" that Davidson uses is not to be confused with the term "triangulation" that denotes qualitative research methodology in which data are compiled from more three or more perspectives to establish a more verifiable analysis.
... internal mental states derive from communicative interaction; communicative interaction does not derive from our internal mental states. For externalists like Davidson, communicative interaction—which allows concepts, beliefs, and knowledge to come into being—depends on our ability to interpret the language of others and others' abilities to interpret our language, for without interpretation—the ability to get close enough to an understanding that will satisfy both our intentions and beliefs and someone else's—there can be no communication, no mental states, no thought, no beliefs, and no truth. Interpretation, then, takes center stage. (432)

According to Kent, communication can only be accomplished through interpretation, and interpretation requires triangulation. In other words, Kent tells us that our ability to interpret derives from the intersubjective triangular relationship that exists among us, other language users, and the world.

Kent's explicit concern with communicative interaction and interpretation figures into his account of the production of discourse. Kent argues that the production of discourse cannot be reduced to a codifiable system or set of rules that may be employed to teach students "how to write." (See "Paralogic Hermeneutics and the Possibilities of Rhetoric" 25; Paralogic Rhetoric 1993). Instead, Kent promotes the argument that the act of writing relies on the communicative interaction that takes place during the writing act. He explains that this communicative interaction cannot be codified or systematized in any important way. In "Paralogic Hermeneutics and the Possibilities of Rhetoric" he writes:

What holds for the producer of discourse also holds for the receiver and for the same reasons. The most fundamental activity of discourse analysis—the account of the effects of discourse—corresponds precisely to the hermeneutic act required in discourse production. Like discourse production, discourse analysis requires us to interpret another's code and then integrate it into our own, and this hermeneutic act cannot be codified or described exactly. (27)
Kent emphasizes here issues dealing with indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. He suggests that no system—no codifiable structure—can account in advance for communicative interaction, and he argues that interpretation never ceases. In contrast to Flower’s contextualist theory of negotiation, Kent holds a universal hermeneutic perspective, and through his endorsement of triangulation and his rejection of dualism, he follows Davidson’s and Rorty’s motto that interpretation "goes all the way down." I believe that the universal hermeneutic perspective advocated by theorists such as Kent, Dasenbrock, Davidson, and Rorty provides the most efficacious means for examining postmodern issues such as the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness—issues, as I pointed out in chapter one, that have not been adequately addressed in writing studies. In the remainder of this chapter and in the chapters to follow, I discuss the implications of this universal hermeneutic perspective by explaining what I mean by the "third space."

The Third Space

The concept of a "third space" endorses hermeneutic universalism and helps show how interpretation operates in the act of writing. The third space also helps to reveal the indeterminate nature of the writing act by focusing on episodes within communicative interaction that illustrate uncertainty, doubt, or confusion about writing. These episodes of communicative interaction about writing often occur in activities such as peer review, classroom discussion,

---

20 The third space, in its conception here, is exploratory only; future studies may more concretely investigate ways in which the third space can be applied and analyzed.


22 As analyses in later chapters show, communicative interaction also reveals uncertainty, doubt, and confusion about content of documents.
or one-to-one conferences about writing. These episodes of uncertainty often demonstrate a mismatch of interpretation between the speakers involved in communicative interaction about a particular topic they are discussing. These mismatches of interpretation, captured in the third space, can then be examined further by looking at utterances within the episodes themselves. As I explain in the next section, these utterances, called "passing theories" by Donald Davidson, may represent moments of uncertainty within communicative interaction about the writing act, and they can be expressed through guesses, questions, doubts, or uncertainties in communicative interaction.

By examining mismatches of interpretation within communicative interaction and the indeterminacy that arises, I suggest that we may learn more about the indeterminate nature of the writing act than our current writing pedagogy allows. For example, through examining interpretations expressed in dialogue, we may learn about student interpretations of the writing act rather than about instructor interpretations of the writing act. In addition, we may learn how uncertainties within communicative interaction about writing—fostered through activities such as peer review and one-to-one conferences—influence student written work.

The term "third space" that I am employing here has been used elsewhere; it is not original to this dissertation. Another use of the term "third space" is found in a paper about cultural knowledge called "Language as Social Practice" written by Kris Gutierrez, Joanne Larson and Lynda Stone (1995). In this study about culture and literacy, these authors describe how interactions between students and teachers can form a "curriculum for a linguistically and culturally diverse community" (1). They call discussions between students and teachers "communities of effective practice" (11), and in these communities occur the
exchange of three scripts: teacher's script, student's script, and "third space" in which cultural differences are negotiated. According to these authors, the third space is crucial to cultural literacy, for it represents participation between students and teachers that is essential to negotiating cultural differences. Furthermore, the third space demonstrates the participatory, co-constructed, and bi-directional nature of communities of practice. Gutierez, Larson, and Stone argue that intersubjectivity occurs in the third space in an open exchange to explore critical forms of literacy (12). In addition, they suggest that the third space accommodates a variety of dialogue structures used to maintain communities of practice: "participation structures are flexible, such that access to multiple roles and ways of participating are provided for both experts and novices" (11-12).

My use of the third space concept expands on Gutierez, Larson, and Stone's original conception. I agree that the third space can illustrate participatory, co-constructed dialogues; however, I am interested in looking at how the third space can demonstrate indeterminacy of meaning in the writing act rather than how the third space can demonstrate a negotiation of cultural differences. Therefore, in my analyses (to follow in chapters four and six), I examine dialogue excerpts that illustrate uncertainties about writing. This analysis based on the concept of the third space expands the original use of the third space by Gutierez, Larson, and Stone.

My use of the term "third space" also differs from Gutierez, Larson, and Stone because I adopt the hermeneutic universalist perspective in my application of the third space concept. This adoption has certain consequences for the concept of the third space. For example, my use of the third space does not rely on the idea of a community. As I have already discussed in this chapter, hermeneutic universalism (interpretation "all the way down") does not endorse
the idea of a convention-bound community of language users because the term "community" suggests that interpretation can be restrained—and, indeed, limited. In contrast, Gutierrez, Larson, and Stone ground the third space around what they call "communities of practice." Although their notion of community is rather flexible (more flexible, than, say Fish's interpretive communities), the concept of the third space that I advocate carefully avoids the idea of an interpretive community. Instead, and in accordance with the hermeneutic universalist perspective, my use of the third space advocates interpretation that goes "all the way down." In this way, interpretation is not limited to community but rather is always contextualized and recontextualized.

In order to explain the concept of the third space more fully, I would like to focus on two aspects that are crucial to the concept. These concepts are (1) its focus on communicative interaction in the writing act and (2) the role of "passing" and "prior" theories in identifying indeterminacy in communicative interaction.

Communicative Interaction

In keeping with the hermeneutic universalist approach, the concept of the third space explores the idea that writing is not grounded in a systematic process but rather in the communicative interaction that occurs during the act of writing. Consequently, to examine indeterminacy in the writing act, the third space focuses on communicative interaction within the writing act. Although the term "communicative interaction" is employed by Davidson (1984) to refer primarily to oral communication, Kent (1992) argues that communicative interaction can also refer to written communication as well. In "The Production
of Discourse," Kent describes written communicative interaction in terms of a "hermeneutic dance":

When we produce discourse, we engage in a kind of hermeneutic dance with other interpreters, and no grammar or theory of cognition can choreograph this dance in any meaningful way. On the other hand, the marks we make and the noises we utter may be choreographed, systematized, and taught, but these marks and noises should not be confused with communicative interaction. . . Writing is communicative interaction, and until machines acquire the ability to get together socially and to construct cultural monuments—buildings, books, religions, political systems, and so forth—they can produce no public evidence of communicative interaction. . . Generating systematic marks and noises does not warrant communicative interaction. (69)

Kent's point here is an important one. He argues that the act of writing corresponds to indeterminate communicative interactions, not to a codifiable, foundational writing process. Stated a bit differently, Kent locates the writing act in communicative interaction—the hermeneutic dance—that occurs while writing. This point is central to the concept of the third space. If the act of writing is not represented by a foundational process, but rather by the communicative interaction that occurs during the writing act, then communicative interaction becomes integral to the writing act. To understand the writing act better, it then makes sense that we should attempt to observe and to describe the communicative interaction that occurs during the act of writing.

As I mentioned already, good sites for examining communicative interaction in the act of writing include classroom discussions, peer review sessions, and one-to-one conferences about writing. (These types of communicative interaction are described in more detail in chapters four and six, where my analyses address class discussions and one-to-one conferences.) I should stress that my emphasis on dialogic interactions in the classroom is not
new. Of course, much research has been done that examines discussions about writing (i.e., student-teacher conferences; see Sperling 1991; Harris 1986), but much of this research uses the method of conversational analysis. For example, in "Analyzing Talk about Writing," Peter Mortensen (1992) suggests that conversational analysis is a primary methodological frame for examining one-to-one interactions about student writing (106). Indeed, many studies of one-to-one interactions about student writing have employed conversational analysis (see Freedman and Katz 1987; Sperling 1991). Conversational analysts examine one-to-one interactions about writing for any number of characteristics that occur in conversation such as length of conversational turns, number of conversational turns, type of comments, content of comments, mode of turns (declarative, interrogative, imperative), pauses, overlaps, or other conversational features.\(^{23}\) In contrast, however, communicative interaction does not quantify or code conversational features, or even simple conversation. Instead, the term "communicative interaction" as Davidson and Kent describe it involves interpretation and the indeterminacy of meaning that occurs in conversations. I would like to suggest that the third space helps us to describe this interpretation and indeterminacy in the act of writing. To describe the analytical tool that the third space can provide and the ways in which it differs from traditional conversational analysis, I need to also discuss the ideas of "prior" and "passing theories," which are central to the idea of the third space.

\(^{23}\)Mortensen suggests, however, that one problem with conversational analysis is determining what a "normal" conversational turn is in the writing classroom (109)—that is, does the composition teacher define "normal" dialogue or do the students' utterances define "normal" dialogue? Mortensen describes a second weakness of conversational analysis, which is that a description of conversational features may not provide substantive information about one-to-one interactions, such as how content is interpreted or negotiated in dialogues (109).


**Passing and Prior Theories in the Third Space**

Because the third space stresses the idea of communicative interaction and not codifiable, quantifiable methods of conversational analysis, I need to explain how the third space helps us to understand how interpretation informs the writing act. My explanation hinges primarily on Donald Davidson's ideas of "prior" and "passing" theories.

Davidson describes interpretive interaction in terms of a "prior theory" and a "passing theory." In "A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs," Davidson (1984) employs the term "prior theory" to represent the knowledge that one brings to a communicative interaction and the term "passing theory" to describe how meaning-making occurs:

For the hearer, the prior theory expresses how he is prepared in advance to interpret an utterance of the speaker, while the passing theory is how he does interpret the utterance. For the speaker, the prior theory is what he believes the interpreter's prior theory to be, while his passing theory is the theory he intends the interpreter to use. (442)

He further explains that "the passing theory is the one the interpreter actually uses to interpret an utterance, and it is the theory the speaker intends the interpreter to use. Only if these coincide is understanding complete . . . The passing theory is where, accident aside, agreement is greatest" (442). According to Davidson, understanding is always incomplete because the prior theories of speakers never fully agree; as a result, the passing theory is where "agreement is greatest"—not necessarily complete. Through the concept of the third space and the examination of prior and passing theories, I believe that we can observe one-to-one interactions and then describe how interpretation operates in the act of writing.
The concept of the third space that I propose employs Davidson's idea of the passing theory in that the third space comprises an episode within communicative interaction that demonstrate a mismatch of interpretations about writing. I propose that these mismatches can be correlated with Davidson's idea of passing theory. In my analyses of communicative interaction, I want to pinpoint passing theories by identifying utterances in these episodes that reflect interpretations—or misinterpretations—about what has been said in interactions about writing. These passing theories could be expressed through questions, or expressed doubts and uncertainties by participants in class discussions, peer reviews, or one-to-one conferences about writing. Furthermore, these passing theories could either be resolved in dialogue or remain unresolved. I am particularly interested in examining whether passing theories result in agreement or if passing theories are simply expressed and left unresolved. That is, I am interested in investigating whether or not these misinterpretations—whether resolved or unresolved—influence student writing.

**Visualizing the Third Space**

As I completed my analyses for this study, I realized that the third space could take different forms. The third space could be indicated visually by mapping the third space—that is, locating a physical area for the third space. I played with this idea by creating a three-column format in which different "spaces" were indicated. Recall that Gutierrez, Larson, and Stone first described the third space as a place in between a "teacher's script" and a "student's script" where utterances indicated a negotiation of cultural literacy. My visualization of the third space is slightly different; I employ "spaces" in which prior and passing
theories are indicated. Consider the transcript in Figure 1. In this transcript, a writing tutor and a biology student discussed biology terminology and ways to write a lab report; their misunderstandings of terminology and lab report expectations emerged during their communicative interaction. In Figure 1, I distinguish between contributions made by the tutor and by the student (the columns on the left and right). I suggest that these columns represent prior knowledge that conversants bring to the conversation. In the third space (the column in the middle), conversants question, miscommunicate, or struggle to understand one another. In the column marked "third space," for example, tutor and student struggle to understand the knowledge they bring to the tutorial. The student asks about how to state an idea while the tutor struggles with the subject content, in this case meiosis. Both conversants ask questions and voice their confusions in the third space. Through this three-column format, we can see that the third space includes both individual utterances that represent passing theories as well as a collection of utterances (the column in the middle) that demonstrate uncertainties.

This three-column analysis locates the third space by identifying all comments that might indicate uncertainty about writing. This third column also illustrates, I believe, Davidson's idea of triangulation (or what Gutierez, Larson and Stone call "communities of social action"). Davidson explains that triangulation is the connection between language users and the world:

24 A conceivable problem with the third space that I am describing is the categorization of dialogue into three categories; one could easily confuse the idea of third space as a way to code or classify utterances in communicative interaction. Another conceivable problem is that even placing an utterance in the third column imposes one person's (most often the researcher) interpretation of communicative interaction. However, I wish to emphasize through the three-column transcript only that the third space exists—the third space is not an attempt to classify or codify miscommunications, but simply to suggest that they exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Theory (Tutor)</th>
<th>Passing Theory (&quot;Third Space&quot;)</th>
<th>Prior Theory (Student)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: I'm lost. In this sentence. This throws me off. Because I read &quot;The experiment is to study the applicability of Mendel's Law of segregation.&quot; And then, is this Mendel's Law again?</td>
<td>uh huh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Um, well, it might be the same.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student: I just can't make this fit. Because I don't know how to connect these sentences because I state this about the study... and then I try to find how the dominant and recessive genes...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How about a new sentence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uh huh</td>
<td>No. Since I cannot use the first person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student: How do I state this in third person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You could just say &quot;This experiment also studies dominance and recessiveness and sex chromosomes theory to inheritance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: What's this? &quot;of inheritance?&quot; &quot;The theory—sex chromosomes theory to inheritance?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Um, because, um, if I take this—omit this part out, would—the reliability of this word would still be OK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Oh, I see. So we can take this out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Um hm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Let's do that. &quot;The purpose of this experiment is to study the applicability of Mendel's Law of segregation. Mendel's Law of independent assortment and sex chromosomes theory to inheritance and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This would be to test the concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The third space in dialogue.
the basic idea is that our concept of objectivity—our idea that our thoughts may or may not correspond to the truth—is an idea that we would not have if it weren't for interpersonal relations. In other words, the source of objectivity is intersubjectivity: the triangle consists of two people and the world. ("Language Philosophy, Writing, and Reading: A Conversation with Donald Davidson," Kent 8)

Triangulation is a key concept that helps us to understand how meanings are located within our communicative interactions with others, for triangulation means that to know something is to interact with another language user and the world. The third space—the middle column—in the transcripts demonstrates this interaction with others by indicating an overlap between student and, in this case, tutor uncertainties expressed in dialogue.25

Although the three-column format is helpful, I believe there are problems with this visual indication of the third space. One problem is that the column format does not suggest how prior and passing theories are selected. That is, in order to create the column format, one must have a method—a coding scheme—for placing utterances in a particular column. Because my intent in this essay is not to create a coding scheme for the third space, but simply to explore the idea that the third space is also a physical space, I decided not to create such a coding scheme; therefore, my placement of passing and prior theories in the three column format could not be verified. Although I do not use the three column format in my analyses in chapters four and six, I believe the visual image created by the three column format can be helpful when considering the third space concept, for it shows where uncertainty takes place in dialogues.

25Visually locating the third space in this way is similar, I believe, to what Vygotsky attempts to do in the idea of "zone of proximal development." Vygotsky suggests that experts and novices can exchange information to contribute to their prior knowledge about a subject. The zone of proximal development attempts to locate scaffolding—a knowledge building activity. The third space also tries to locate an activity—in this case, the third space tries to locate indeterminacies about writing.
Another way in which the third space can be indicated is through marking utterances that serve as passing theories in communicative interaction. This approach to demarcating a third space is similar to a method of conversational analysis that explores a "third phenomenon" similar to the idea of passing theories in the third space. In "A three-step Process as a Unit of Analysis in Dialogue," Ivana Markova (1990) describes a new unit of conversational analysis. She investigates units of conversational analysis "that are primarily conceptual and epistemological in character . . . the basic assumption of this approach is that every message is embedded in its linguistic and social contexts and that it is both past- and future-oriented" (131, italics mine). Although a form of conversational analysis, Markova's methodology is quite different from typical conversational analysis in that she claims that a third phenomenon arises from the conversation:

The logic of internal relations underlies the co-development of all mutually interdependent phenomena, for example, of the individual and its environment. The two, individual and environment, come into existence together . . . The idea of internal relations between phenomena therefore implies three-step processes: as the two phenomena interact, co-determining each other, they give rise to a new, i.e., a third, phenomenon that is qualitatively different from the two constitutive ones. (132-133)

Markova's descriptions of this three-step unit of analysis are similar to the third space in that the third space indicates interaction and co-creation of meaning. Recall that Gutierrez, Larson, and Stone describe this co-created nature as bidirectional dialogue, while Davidson describes this interaction as triangulation. Markova actually creates a unit of analysis that captures this aspect of the third space.26 She tells us that "According to the logic of internal relations, mutually

26The idea of three-sided communicative interactions in Markova's work relies on co-genetic logic as a base for this three-step unit of analysis.
interacting phenomena must give rise to a third phenomenon for the process to be completed" (139), and she includes a diagram to illustrate this three-step process (139, shown in Figure 2).

The third phenomenon that Markova describes, I believe, is interpretive interaction along the lines that I attempt to identify through the third space. However, I believe Markova's endorsement of a three-step unit is methodologically different from mine; furthermore, her approach is still underdeveloped and difficult to apply. Although her idea is intriguing, I did not attempt to employ Markova's three-step unit in my analyses in chapters four and six. Instead, I indicate the third space by selecting episodes of dialogue that demonstrate misinterpretation, uncertainty, confusion, or doubt about writing. Within these episodes, I closely examined specific comments that represented moments of uncertainty, or passing theories as described by Donald Davidson. These passing theories in communicative interaction are most often represented

Figure 2. Adaptation of Markova's Three-Step Dialogue
by questions, doubts, or expressed uncertainties about the topic of discussion. In the transcripts that I review in chapters four and six, then, I highlight passing theories by bolding them in the transcripts. See the sample transcript below.

(T = Tutor; S = Student)

T: I'm lost. In this sentence. This throws me off.
S: Um hm.
T: Because I read "The experiment is to study the applicability of Mendel's Law of segregation. Mendel's Law of independent assortment." And then, is this Mendel's law again?
S: No, um, well, it might be the same. I just can't make this fit. Because I don't know how to connect these sentences, because I state this about the study... and then I try to find how the dominant and recessive genes...
T: How about a new sentence?
S: No. Since I cannot use the first person
T: Uh huh
S: How do I state this in third person?
T: "Besides," or you could just say "This experiment also studies"
S: Um hm
T: "dominance and recessiveness and sex chromosomes theory to inheritance." What's this? of inheritance? The theory to inheritance?
S: Um, because um, if I take this omit this part out, the reliability of this word would still be OK

The use of bold print represents utterances within communicative interaction that display uncertainties in the dialogue. As the above transcript shows, these uncertainties can be expressed by phrases such as "I'm lost" as well as questions about what is meant (i.e., "What's this?"). As this excerpt illustrates, many passing theories are indicated by questions about meaning. In this example, the tutor has several questions about what the student has written, but the student also has questions about how to use certain writing conventions in her paper.
(i.e., third person). I believe these questions and expressed doubts constitute indeterminacy about the writing act expressed in communicative interaction.

Although I indicate certain utterances as passing theories in this excerpt and in other excerpts in this dissertation, I acknowledge that my analyses of passing theories have not been tested for reliability. However, as I mentioned before, the goal of this investigation is not to quantify dialogues about writing; in fact, to do so would contradict the interpretive perspective that I have outlined thus far. Rather, my goal is to examine communicative interaction about writing, and I am particularly interested in episodes within communicative interaction that demonstrate mismatches of interpretation. Although I mark passing theories within these episodes, I am most interested in how these demonstrations of the third space as I have described them influence student interpretation about writing and, consequently, student written work. Therefore, in my analyses in chapters four and six, I examine episodes in which indeterminacy is expressed, and I compare these episodes to the final written work that students produce. I hope that in some way these analyses help us to begin exploring the indeterminate nature of the writing act, as well as to suggest further venues for research about interpretation in the production of discourse.

Throughout this chapter, I have argued that interpretation plays a crucial role in every form of communicative interaction—including the act of writing—and that a hermeneutic universalist perspective provides the most effective means to describe the writing act. While most scholars in composition and rhetoric have not fully embraced the universal hermeneutic perspective, I believe that only hermeneutic universalism fully accounts for the indeterminacy of meaning, and only hermeneutic universalism helps us to account for the open-ended and dialogic nature of human communication. The concept of the
third space embraces hermeneutic universalism and helps us to examine the writing act more closely in terms of interpretation.

Because the interpretive perspective that I have outlined in this chapter possesses certain implications for how we regard the act of writing, I believe it is also important to examine how this interpretive perspective may influence writing pedagogy. In the chapters to follow, I explain some of the implications of the interpretive perspective—specifically hermeneutic universalism—for writing instruction, both in the classroom and in the writing center. I also attempt to illustrate interpretation in pedagogical writing situations using the concept of the third space.
CHAPTER THREE
INTERPRETATION AND WRITING PEDAGOGY

The introductory chapters of this dissertation addressed the primary question: What is the role of interpretation in the production of discourse? In chapter one, I developed the argument that indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness—as postmodern issues—have not been adequately addressed in writing pedagogy because current writing pedagogy has not emphasized the role of interpretation in the writing act. In chapter two, I argued that hermeneutic universalism implies that writing is constituted not by codified strategies or processes but by communicative interaction that occurs during the writing act. If we take seriously these arguments about the nature of writing, we must consider next the ramifications of this position for writing instruction. So, in this chapter I address the following question: How does interpretation influence writing pedagogy?

One answer to this question is that we cannot teach writing at all (Kent 1991). In Paralogic Rhetoric, Kent argues (in line, I believe, with the hermeneutic universalist argument) that if the production of discourse cannot be reduced to systems or codified processes, then it cannot be taught: "If we accept these claims, we cannot ignore the pedagogical consequence of our position: writing and reading—conceived broadly as processes or bodies of knowledge—cannot be taught, for nothing exists to teach" (161). Instead, Kent suggests that writing pedagogy should be significantly reconceptualized to accommodate the indeterminate nature of the writing act.

In response to Kent’s argument, in this chapter I carefully examine the implications of hermeneutic universalism—what I refer to as the interpretive
perspective—for writing pedagogy. I argue that although the interpretive perspective redefines writing as an act of interpretation rather than as a codified process, there are strategies instructors can adopt to accommodate this new definition of writing. Primarily, we might consider moving beyond notions of process pedagogy and toward a pedagogy that recognizes writing as an indeterminate, interpretive act. To make this move, we need to recognize that the current writing process paradigm instead presents a foundational approach to writing instruction, and we might entertain certain "post-process" pedagogies in place of or in addition to process approaches. Adopting the interpretive perspective would alter current writing pedagogy in other ways as well. For example, teachers of writing might emphasize communicative interaction or dialogism more extensively than they might in process pedagogy. Instead of simply advocating dialogic interaction in activities such as peer review, instructors might pay closer attention to the ways in which those dialogues influence student interpretation about writing as well as their final written work. Teachers may focus on interpretation by employing the concept of the third space (identifying miscommunications that occur in dialogic activities); in doing so they may identify the "hermeneutic dance" that occurs in communicative interaction. Finally, in the concluding section of this chapter, I suggest that instructors can examine interpretation more concretely in the writing act by assigning public writing acts that involve students with audiences outside of the classroom.

While I discuss possible applications of the interpretive perspective to writing pedagogy in this chapter, I do not mean to suggest these are the only ways in which the interpretive perspective can influence writing pedagogy. That is, my intent is not to advocate a certain "interpretive pedagogy.” Rather, in this
chapter I hope to explore some possible applications of the interpretive perspective. I begin by describing the shift from process to "post-process" pedagogy that the interpretive perspective advocates.

**Beyond Process**

The process movement resembled what some scholars have called a "paradigm shift" from writing as product to writing as process (Hairston 1982; Young 1978). For example, in "Paradigms and Problems," Richard Young (1978) describes product-based writing as the "current-traditional paradigm" in which modes such as narration, description, exposition, and argument were taught, and in which style, usage, and the analysis of discourse according to words, sentences, and paragraphs held primary importance (Young 31). In sum, the current-traditional paradigm emphasized writing as the written product—the academic paper. As Young argues, however, the current-traditional paradigm was repeatedly attacked for ignoring the process of writing, thus creating what Kuhn would call a "crisis" in the current-traditional paradigm leading to a paradigm shift. And according to Maxine Hairston (1982), this crisis in the current-traditional paradigm led to the revolution of viewing writing as process, not product. According to Hairston, the process paradigm focused on writing in terms of invention, discovery, and arrangement, and it emphasized rhetorical concerns such as audience and purpose (86). The process paradigm was reinforced by work on various aspects of process, such as invention (Young 1978),

---

27In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Kuhn (1962) describes paradigms as "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners." A paradigm shift occurs when, as Kuhn explains, the current paradigm no longer works and significant changes lead to the formation of a new paradigm, or a scientific revolution. Although Kuhn refers specifically to natural sciences—not social sciences—in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Hairston 77), the idea of paradigm shift has been applied to writing studies.
revision (Sommers 1980), functions of writing (Emig 1971; Britton 1978), and protocols (Flower and Hayes 1980; Perl 1980).

Although the process paradigm has been firmly in place for twenty some years in the field of composition, some scholars believe that the process paradigm is in crisis and on the verge of another paradigm shift toward post-process pedagogy. These scholars critique the process movement for conceiving of writing as a series of activities that can be applied in any writing situation (Olson forthcoming; See also Couture forthcoming; Pullman forthcoming).

Joseph Petraglia (1999) explains the process movement in more detail from a post-process perspective:

In a nutshell, the process movement was an amalgam of theories, models, and pedagogies that were devised as an antidote to the current-traditional paradigm in writing that focused on the written product rather than the means by which the product was produced ... writing was less a single behavior but a series of procedures and strategic choices that formed a complex system of text production: in short, a process. ... For writing specialists, the process movement could not stop at the level of speculation, it had to offer a regime, and thus a faith in both the describability and the manipulability of the processes by which writers produce texts allowed teachers to do their job in a more academically legitimated manner. (60-61)

Although post-process scholars criticize the codified nature of process pedagogy, they generally agree with the process paradigm’s rejection of product-based instruction. Additionally, post-process scholars value as well the process paradigm for acknowledging that writing is an activity rather than a product. Gary Olson (1990) suggests, for example, that

the activities involved in the act of writing are typically recursive rather than linear; that writing is first and foremost a social activity; ... that experienced writers are often intensely aware of audience, purpose, and
context; ... that effective instruction in composition provides opportunities for students to practice the kinds of activities involved in the act of writing. (1)

For providing these insights, Olson suggests that the process movement "served us well" (1). However, post-process critics, largely influenced by postmodernism and antifoundationalism, recently have suggested that the process movement simply offers us another foundational explanation of writing. In other words, these critics suggest that the process paradigm has serious shortcomings. The crisis facing the process paradigm, according to these scholars, is the need to redefine writing as an indeterminate and uncodifiable act rather than a codifiable, systematized activity that is generalizable to every writing situation. Olson explains, for example, that the process approach is problematic because it attempts to generalize the writing act:

The problem with process theory, then, is not so much that scholars are attempting to theorize various aspects of composing as it is that they are endeavoring (consciously or not) to construct a model of the composing process, thereby constructing a Theory of Writing, a series of generalizations about writing that supposedly hold true all or most of the time. (3)

This generalization can be especially problematic if teachers of writing encourage a process as a solution to all writing situations. George Pullman (1990) explains:

If the writing process as it is taught can actually obstruct the production of an adequate document in certain circumstances, then it cannot be considered universally applicable and therefore it cannot be considered a universally valid description of how to write. (29)

28 Of course, any writing paradigm or model has flaws if it generalizes and does not account for specific situations.
According to some scholars, then, the danger of the process approach is that it may attempt to universally represent the act of writing; this representation may result in a foundational theory. Said a bit differently, the process approach to teaching writing may not accommodate specific communicative situations. Admittedly, this criticism of process pedagogy may be unfair. After all, it is not accurate to suggest that the goal of process pedagogy is to generalize all writing situations. More to the point, I believe that process pedagogy could be criticized for its attempt to codify the writing act into predictable phases or steps. The interpretive perspective suggests that prediction and codification of the writing act are not possible, whether process is applied in general or to specific situations.

In order to accommodate the indeterminacy and situatedness of particular writing acts, scholars interested in post-process theory suggest that we need to redefine what it means to teach writing. Joseph Petraglia (1999) suggests, for example, a "reconceptualization" of writing pedagogy that "requires that the discipline let go of its current pedagogical shape (i.e., its focus on supplying students with productive rhetoric skills that can be exercised through writing)" (74-75). The post-process perspective has begun to "let go" of the process approach to teaching writing by focusing on situational aspects of writing. Petraglia explains:

As I understand it, "post-process" signifies a rejection of the generally formulaic framework for understanding writing that process suggested. Of course, the fundamental observation that an individual produces text by means of a writing process has not been discarded. Instead, it has dissolved and shifted from figure to ground. (63)

 Whereas the process paradigm redefined writing as process instead of product, the post-process movement redefines writing as an uncodifiable,
communicative act rather than a systematic process. And due to the poststructural and postmodern influence on the post-process movement, post-process scholars are careful not to suggest that there is one codifiable, systematic, or generalizable approach to writing. Consequently, the post-process movement, as Petraglia notes, is "hybridized and complex" (63). Those scholars interested in post-process propose a variety of benefits for viewing writing beyond process including a revised account of agency, the construction of a new social scientism, and the use of a critical approach in research (See Kent, 1999).

In this shift from process to post-process, then, writing is redefined as a communicative act rather than a systematized process. Whereas various versions of this shift are occurring under the umbrella of post-process theory, I want to suggest that this shift is an implication of hermeneutic universalism that I described in the last chapter. For instance, if we accept that interpretation goes "all the way down" and that writing is antifoundational, it only makes sense that we define writing as a communicative act rather than as a systematized, generalizable process. This implication connects us back to arguments made by hermeneutic universalists, particularly those arguments in which communicative interaction plays a central role. In the last chapter, for example, I explained that communicative interaction is a necessary focus for the production of discourse, for through it we can more readily observe interpretation as it occurs in the writing act. Embracing writing as a communicative act, then, moves us beyond the limitations of a process approach, or as Kent explains, beyond an "internalist conception of communicative interaction":

As strong externalists, we would stop talking about writing and reading as processes and start talking about these activities as determinate social acts.
This shift from an internalist conception of communicative interaction—the notion that communication is a product of the internal workings of the mind or the workings of the discourse communities in which we live—to an externalist conception that I have outlined here would challenge us to drop our current process-oriented vocabulary and to begin talking about our social and public uses of language. (169)

To make sense of the externalist argument, we must relate this new focus on communicative interaction to writing pedagogy, and I would like to focus on Kent’s suggestions for pedagogy mentioned in Paralogic Rhetoric because I believe it is one of the few that most closely follows the hermeneutic universalist argument. Like Petraglia, Kent encourages teachers to "reimagine" writing pedagogy—particularly in terms of communicative interaction. He asserts that a focus on communicative interaction in the classroom requires us "to reimagine the traditional student-teacher relationship as well as to reimagine the curricular mission of composition and literature courses within the university" (158). Kent explains that revisioning writing instruction in this way would require significant changes (and I quote this passage in its entirety to explain the full impact of this change in instruction he is proposing):

... a shift to this collaborative instructional method would be very costly, for significantly more teachers would be required in our schools, and faculty in disciplines outside English departments would need to be retrained in order to take responsibility for the written discourse generated in their courses. Moving from a dialectic to a collaborative pedagogy also would create complex problems for the discipline of English. Such a shift would require a wholesale change in the way we currently think about writing and reading pedagogy. Teachers would need to accept, in some version, the principle of charity. We would need to acknowledge that writing and reading do not take place in the head and that writing cannot be reduced to a repeatable process. Ultimately we would need to accept the externalist position that writing and reading instruction is a misnomer, for no body of knowledge in the area of discourse production and reception exists to be taught. We cannot instruct students to become good writers or good readers because good writing and good reading, as
transcendental categories, do not exist. For us externalists, *good writing* and *good reading* can only mean something like "utterances that make good sense in some particular situation. (169-170)

This post-process reconceptualization of writing clearly represents the ramifications of moving beyond process. According to Kent, this move, in short, requires a shift away from process-based instruction and toward the *communicative interaction between teachers and students*. Again, the shift toward communicative interaction in this way, I believe, most closely aligns with hermeneutic universalism.

This move toward teacher-student communicative interaction is also articulated in terms of an "interactive pedagogy" as described by Patricia Donahue and Ellen Quandahl (1993) in *Reclaiming Pedagogy: The Rhetoric of the Classroom*. By "interactive," these authors suggest that writing pedagogy interacts, rather than submits to, theory: "We use the term interact to distinguish what we regard as self-reflexive, self-critical pedagogies from those that promote theory at the expense of composition and composition at the expense of theory" (5). But "interactive" also has a second meaning for Donahue and Quandahl: the term resembles the interpretive and social acts that occur during writing and reading (3). Calling the process movement "cliche" (7)—one that actually bears similarities to product models of writing—these authors suggest that "socialness" is crucial to interactive pedagogies, and they point out that socialness cannot be systematized:

Refusing conversation or speech as originary, [we] suggest that any learning—whether organized conversationally, collaboratively, or in the most authoritarian manner—is social, and its socialness is beyond conscious reproduction. . . Interactive pedagogies are less interested in the fact of socialness (a fact [we] take as given) than in particular kinds of
socialness, the cultural inscriptions in any text, including the pedagogical scene. (8-9)

In this section, I have argued that the move beyond process and toward social, communicative interaction resembles a crisis in the current process paradigm in writing pedagogy. In the next section, I further define the shift toward communicative interaction as "dialogism" and discuss the implications of this dialogic approach in the classroom.

Dialogism and Writing Pedagogy

The reconceptualization that writing cannot be defined by a process, but rather by indeterminate, communicative interaction that occurs during the act of writing, redirects writing instruction toward pedagogies that advocate dialogism. Writing instructors might consider, then, a pedagogy that advocates, as Donahue and Quandahl (1993) suggest, "socialness" in writing pedagogy in which students are engaged in dialogue with each other and with the instructor during the writing act. However, if we are to also accommodate the interpretive perspective through dialogic, pedagogical approaches, I believe we must take current dialogic models further than simply advocating interaction. I believe that we must examine the ways in which these dialogues are interpreted and the ways in which these dialogues influence student writing.

Dialogic pedagogies, nevertheless, provide a helpful starting point. In Toward a Dialogic Pedagogy, Irene Ward (1994) provides a very helpful model of dialogism for writing instructors, and she is quite thorough in her description of it. Ward defines a dialogic approach in contrast to a monologic approach: "The

---

29 Such "social" pedagogies might advocate social constructionist perspectives in which learning is thought to occur through interaction with others.
self in a dialogic pedagogy is not autonomous and solitary but multiple, composed of all the voices or texts one has ever heard or read and therefore capable of playing an infinite number of roles in service of the internal dialogic interaction" (172-173). In this way, Ward uses the word "dialogue" in terms of Bakhtin's heteroglossia. That is, Ward explains that this move toward dialogism replaces "one-way" communication in the classroom with communication involving author, audience, and context:

Many compositionists are abandoning the notion that written communication is a one-way process in which a reader decodes a message sent by a writer via the conduit of language. Replacing this view of written discourse is a much more complex one in which the writer, reader, and their cultural and historical contexts are implicated in the production of the text. Producing written discourse is a communicative, rhetorical, and, above all, dialogic process. The text, no longer seen as "authored" by a single individual, is conceived as being produced in a collaboration of individuals and institutions that both constrain and multiply its meaning, as a single strand in a vast web of linguistic, historical, and cultural factors. (2-3)

In her careful examination of a dialogic pedagogy, Ward claims that dialogism is present—although different—in several theoretical perspectives in composition including expressivism, social constructionism, radical pedagogy, and poststructuralism. For example, Ward describes dialogism in expressivism as an internal dialogue that encourages self-discovery in an individual writer (6); dialogism in social constructionism as a "continuous" dialogue through which knowledge is made (7); dialogism in radical pedagogy as an opportunity to engage students in their "personal and political consciousness (9); dialogism in poststructuralism as a means to explore the "interpretive, interactive, and communicative processes presumed to be much like the process of rhetorical invention" (9).
In addition to her review of dialogism in each of these perspectives, Ward synthesizes these perspectives into what she calls a "functional dialogism" for writing pedagogy. This functional dialogism contains the following forms of dialogue in the writing classroom:

- internal dialogues between a self and an internalized audience
- dialogue between teacher and student
- dialogue between students and other larger social institutions, including but not limited to the educational institution or some other social institution within any one or more of the student's immediate communities
- dialogues among students about the formal matters of the composition of about the ideas or subject of the discourse
- composing using dialogic forms in order to understand an issue or group of issues from various points of view and gain insight into one's relationship to those ideas and into multiple perspectives represented by many voices that have already entered into public dialogue. (171)

As we can see from Ward's compilation here, the dialogic interactions she advocates are not uncommon. In fact, several of us probably have similarly employed dialogue in the classroom in one form or another through peer review, student-teacher conferences, or class discussions about various aspects of writing. Therefore, Ward isn't introducing dialogic methods that are new to us; in fact, her synthesis of dialogism is surprisingly lukewarm in that she does not challenge us to revise, but rather encourages us to combine, various dialogistic approaches. However, Ward's dialogism does encourage us to change the fundamental assumption that writing is a process, as she proposes the idea that writing is a dialogic act.

In accordance with, but in addition to, Ward's assumption that writing is a dialogic act, I would like to argue that dialogism has larger implications for writing pedagogy than simply enacting dialogic methods in the classroom. That
is, the shift toward interactive, dialogic pedagogy has important implications for interpretation that we can relate back to the argument about hermeneutic universalism. For example, in chapter two I argued that hermeneutic universalism—interpretation "all the way down"—most completely embraces indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the act of writing. I asserted that communicative interaction, or language-in-use, is a useful focus for these features of interpretation because it does not rely on foundational structures or conventions of language for meaning. In addition, communicative interaction—particularly Davidson's idea of triangulation—is crucial to the externalist position because communicative interaction connects language users and the world. Because communicative interaction plays such an important role in the hermeneutic universalist perspective, dialogism not only seems a natural but essential approach to writing instruction. Dialogism in this way not only means employing dialogic methods, but employing them with the assumption that we cannot know things unless we know others. That is, dialogism is more than a method; it contributes to a fundamental assumption about knowledge-making. And, interpretation is an integral part of that knowledge-making.

To explore these larger implications of dialogism, we might return to Kent's reconception of writing pedagogy. Noting that "all communicative interaction is collaborative through and through" (260), Kent (1993) suggests collaborative, dialogic instruction would require "significantly more teachers" as well as an increase in their dialogic participation with students. I would like to examine this change more closely. In Kent's revision of writing pedagogy, more teachers would be needed because he is suggesting that teachers fundamentally change their roles in the classroom from "dialecticians" to "mentors":

Instead of dialecticians who initiate students into new knowledge, mentors who endorse a paralogic rhetoric become co-workers who actively collaborate with their students to help them through different communicative situations both within and outside the university. As co-workers, these mentors—by relinquishing their roles as high priests—engender a new relationship with their students in that they actively collaborate with their students and become, in a sense, students themselves. (166)

Donahue and Quandahl (1993) explain this new role for teachers in a similar fashion: "The point is made again and again that teachers must begin where the students are, that teachers themselves are students in the classroom, constantly being taught by those—the students—who know how they can learn" (4).

This fundamental change in the role of teacher as mentor and collaborator requires a more time-consuming, personal, one-to-one dialogue between teacher and students than the dialectic enacted by the teacher as "high priest." This one-to-one dialogue is not "one-way" but, in Bakhtinian terms, two-sided, engaging all communicators in response. I believe that this change in instruction is exactly in line with the hermeneutic universalist argument. However, note that these revisions of writing instruction still do not emphasize interpretation in dialogue, or if they do, they do so indirectly. I believe that here the idea of third space can be most helpful.

The third space suggests that we focus on particular dialogic episodes to examine miscommunications and misinterpretations that occur during the writing act. In these episodes, the third space highlights misinterpretations, questions, or attempts at understanding. As I explained in the previous chapter, a central feature of the third space is Davidson's idea of a passing theory. These passing theories suggest that something other than dialogue is occurring—that interpretation also occurs during communication. Kent acknowledges this
interpretation as "hermeneutic guessing" in dialogue, or making guesses about what the speaker has said:

By "dialogic," I mean an open-ended, nonsystemic, paralogic interaction between hermeneutic strategies. Whenever we produce or analyze discourse, we always guess at the hermeneutic strategy employed by someone else, and when we guess, we engage the other in a kind of dialogue in the sense that we continually interpret the other's language code. This dialogue, in turn, always brings about a tentative resolution or "meaning" that each participant takes away from a communicative interchange, and the tentative resolution enables the participants to enter new dialogic relations that consequently engender different effects in the world. (42)

Current dialogic pedagogies that I have reviewed here (and, I believe, other dialogic pedagogies as well) do not account for interpretation in the manner Kent describes; therefore, a way to conceptualize this hermeneutic activity more concretely would be helpful. The concept of the third space can be especially helpful because it focuses on episodes in which "hermeneutic guessing" occurs during the writing act. For example, as collaborators and "coworkers," teacher and student may engage in responsive dialogues in the classroom. In doing so, they interpret one another's utterances by making "hermeneutic guesses," or by forming "tentative resolutions" in dialogue, either in written or oral form. Or, as Davidson would put it, they form "passing theories" about each other's utterances, and these passing theories eventually inform and even change their prior theories. The third space can highlight hermeneutic guessing and passing theories—the interpretation—that occurs during communicative or dialogic interaction. By emphasizing the third space, interpretation is emphasized as well as the dialogic activity that may occur in a writing classroom.
It is important, therefore, that when we consider a dialogic pedagogy, we also consider what Kent (1993) would call a "hermeneutic dance" in which conversants express prior theories and form passing theories in the process of interpretation: "When we communicate we make informed guesses about meaning; we engage in a kind of impromptu hermeneutic dance choreographed by our prior and passing theories. This dance is impromptu because it cannot be codified, systematized, or taught" (87).

In this section, I've discussed the dialogic activity that can take place in the classroom between teacher and students, and I've argued that to align with hermeneutic universalism, interpretation in dialogue must also be emphasized. The concept of the third space can emphasize interpretation (and I illustrate this emphasis in the next chapter). But I'd like to go one step beyond articulating the usefulness of the interpretive perspective for dialogue in the classroom between teachers and students. I'd like to suggest that this responsive, hermeneutic guessing that occurs during communicative interaction in the classroom can also occur between writers and their audiences. For example, interpretation could play a role in interactions in which writers and audiences discuss their expectations for a written document. The third space concept could be useful in these situations as well by highlighting episodes of communicative interaction that reveal mismatches of interpretations about document expectations.

The writing classroom can provide an environment for examining writer/audience interactions if writing teachers require assignments in which students write for an audience other than the teacher. I call these types of assignments "public" assignments in which students write for an outside audience. Extending dialogic activity to outside audiences may make more

---

30"Public" may be a weak term, but by it I mean to describe writing audiences that are persons other than a writing teacher.
visible the dialogic, interpretive activity that occurs in the writing act. For example, outside audiences may bring prior knowledge (or "prior theory" as Davidson calls it) to interactions about writing that is noticeably different from prior knowledge students and teachers bring to these interactions. These differences may result in more frequent misinterpretations and miscommunications about writing expectations. Consequently, these interactions with outside audiences may help make the role of interpretation in the writing act more visible to students and teachers. Furthermore, and as I explain in the next section, this extension of classroom interactions falls in line with the type of pedagogical reconceptualization that I have outlined thus far. In the next section, I describe in more detail how public interaction may be executed in writing classrooms as a way to highlight interpretation in the act of writing. Although this is not the only way teachers can highlight interpretation in the writing act, I suggest that it is a promising approach that is worth investigating.

Public Interaction

To help illustrate the hermeneutic and dialogic nature of writing, a hermeneutic universalist perspective would encourage writing teachers to regularly engage students in public writing acts that involve them with audiences outside of the classroom. Encouraging public interaction in writing pedagogy seems a natural extension of the role of communicative interaction in knowledge-making demonstrated by the externalist position and hermeneutic universalism. This public aspect of writing is one of the helpful descriptions Irene Ward provides us in her dialogic pedagogy:

Because learning takes place best in communicative interaction, a functional dialogic pedagogy will have to employ a great deal of public
writing—that is, writing directed to others capable of and interested in responding—if we are to produce students who are able to generate not only correct, readable prose, but also prose that can elicit a response from others, thereby enabling students to become active participants in communities beyond the classroom. (170)

Kent also acknowledges the need for public communication: "Collaborating with the student, the teacher would be thrown into specific communicative situations, and the teacher and the student together would engage in communicative interaction with others within and outside the university" (169). The type of interactions that might result from these dialogues include student/student, teacher/student, student/professional, and teacher/professional interactions during the act of writing. I argue that there are two advantages to this public interaction that coincide with hermeneutic universalism and the concept of third space: 1) students are encouraged to identify purposes and audiences other than academic purposes or audiences; 2) public interaction with audiences can illustrate the indeterminate nature of the writing act perhaps more clearly than in-class interactions.

One advantage of public interaction is that it encourages students to identify concrete purposes and audiences for writing outside of the classroom. Margaret Mansfield (1993) calls this advantage writing for "real" audiences. In "Real World Writing and the English Curriculum," Mansfield describes the process of her pedagogical conversion from traditional writing assignments to assignments with "real" audiences:

My work with interns and my concurrent experience in positions of leadership in collegiate governance convinced me that some of the most engaging, demanding, and "creative" writing can be done in contexts of practical and political necessity, in contexts where what you write will be read by "real people" and will be used to gain essential information,
complete tasks, evaluate proposals, make policy decisions, and so forth. (70)

The "real" in this approach, I think, refers simply to the idea that students would write documents that might be used by an audience other than their writing instructor. If the term "real writing" offends some (which is quite likely, for it might imply that writing instructors are somehow "fake" or artificial audiences), we could describe this same approach also in terms of "transactional" writing, a term highlighted in the influential study by Britton (1978). According to Britton, "transactional" writing means "writing to get things done" (18), and it serves some functional purpose. Joseph Petraglia (1995) further explains transactionality: "Accordingly, transactionality does not exclusively lie in an author's intention to communicate, but in the writer and reader's process of jointly constructing the text in line with their motives, expectations, and sense of the other" (20).31

One example of this type of transactional approach is Margaret Mansfield's graduate course titled "Writing for the Public." In this course, Mansfield assigned her class the task of writing a survey for the university. She explains the origin of this assignment:

A College Senate committee was looking into student complaints about the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE), a mandatory test all students had to pass by their junior year. Since I knew that many of my graduate students would be current or prospective secondary school writing teachers, I thought they might find the work of this committee intrinsically interesting. Our class could be involved in several areas of its work: interviewing faculty and students to discover their concerns about the WPE; designing a faculty questionnaire based on these interviews;

31Ede and Lunsford (1984) critique the idea of transactional writing for its shallow notion of audience. They argue that it concerns the audience more than the writer, and consequently, that it creates imbalanced writing (see page 165).
Mansfield explains that this task required a thoroughly collaborative approach between both students and instructor, and she cites several benefits of this transactional type of assignment such as (1) providing students with new types of writing; (2) providing insights into the complexity of audience and of the collaborative process involved in writing the survey; (3) encouraging reflection about what constitutes "real" writing (81). Further, while the "Writing for the Public" class was a graduate class, Mansfield suggests that "we might want to think more about ways in which less advanced writers—perhaps even first-year students—could be given opportunities to make some of the discoveries my seminar students made" (81). Specifically, Mansfield suggests that having undergraduate students explore writing outside of the classroom helps them realize purposes and audiences for writing other than academic audiences (teacher) and purposes (evaluation). Mansfield makes a strong case for exploring writing purposes and audiences outside of traditional academic essays, and her experience demonstrates, I think, a dialogic approach that engaged students, teacher, and those faculty and students affected by the survey.

Although this "transactional" or "real" approach complies with dialogism, and although it might introduce students to nonacademic purposes and audiences, it can be problematic. One problem with this approach is that students have difficulty writing for both a public audience and a teacher audience. That is, the public approach requires students to write for audiences other than teachers, but then students are ultimately evaluated by a teacher. Mansfield admits to this difficulty, calling it a "paradox" (72), but neither Kent
nor Ward admits to this problem in their descriptions of a dialogic pedagogy.
The problem of this dual audience, and, indeed, dual purpose, can potentially thwart a dialogic, transactional, or "real" approach. For example, Joseph Petraglia (1995) argues that undergraduate students—unlike, perhaps, the graduate students in Mansfield's class—may not be able to make the leap to writing for an external audience, resulting in what he calls "pseudotransactionality," or writing that is "solely intended to meet teacher expectations rather than engage in a transference of information for the purposes of informing the uninformed or demonstrating mastery over content" (21). Said a bit differently, Petraglia suggests that students may more often write to the academic purpose (evaluation) rather than to the transactional purpose; therefore, the documents they produce may be less transactional than teachers would hope them to be.

Clay Spinuzzi (1996) notes this same problem in terms of genres and activity networks. In "Pseudotransactionality, Activity Theory, and Professional Writing Instruction," Spinuzzi suggests that workplaces and classrooms represent different activity networks and use different genres for communication (299). Because of these differences, students often may fall back into the activity network and genre that is most comfortable for them—the academic community:

> The student's past encounters with a genre and awareness of the teacher's goals cannot help but affect the genre's form. What results is a genre adapted for meeting the object(ive)s of the particular classroom [activity network] in which the student writes, not the object(ive)s of a particular workplace. (301)

We might conclude, then, that the success of transactional, "real," or public writing assignments depends on the students' ability to consider the
assignment as real. Petraglia also comes to this conclusion: "To question the transactive value of a writing tasks is not to question whether or not the exigence for writing is real in any objective sense, but whether (and the sense[s] in which) the writer is able or willing to legitimate it as real" (29). The fact remains that students have difficulty balancing the academic, evaluative purpose of their writing with a practical, transactional purpose for outside audiences. These documents ultimately cannot escape teacher evaluation.

Despite this limitation, another advantage of the public interaction approach is that it, finally, helps illustrate the role of interpretation in the writing act. What this boils down to is that public or transactional audiences and purposes encourage students to write to those situations rather than to codified systems or processes for writing. In other words, when students are encouraged to write for public audiences, they realize that prior knowledge they gain from their writing classes about process provides general, but not specific, guidance for writing situations. Instead, public writing assignments may encourage students to adjust their ideas of generalized writing conventions to the specific situation at hand. As a result, they might rely on communicative interaction between themselves and their audience, for only through these interactions can they begin to understand audience expectations for a written document. This means that conventions and general processes for writing that are described in textbooks become simply "crutches," as Davidson calls them, that assist but do not determine communicative interaction involved in the writing act.

In essence, the point here is that conventions and codified processes for writing may not always be generalizable. This argument is not much different from Kent's radical reconceptualization of writing pedagogy in which he suggests that dialogic interaction—rather than systemic conventions or processes—
comprise the writing act. This point is central to the hermeneutic universalist perspective, as Kent explains:

Following Davidson and Derrida, I mean to suggest only that language makes convention possible; convention does not make language possible. No one questions the claim that convention aids communication, but as Davidson points out, after we make this claim and after we demonstrate that the claim possesses validity, we have said nothing about the nature of language. We have commented only about one feature of language: its sufficient ability to generate social conventions. Language does not represent a superstructure built on convention; language provides the base on which a superstructure of conventions resides. (35)

The role of conventions described by Kent here has important implications for writing pedagogy. If language makes conventions possible, and not the other way around, it does not make sense to teach conventions and expect students to learn how to communicate from them. Rather, students must surrender to the indeterminacy of situated dialogues and adapt their knowledge of conventions to those situations. In other words, students must learn to balance conventions with the situation at hand. Susan Wells (1986) describes this balance in terms of helping students move beyond conventions in a technical writing class:

A pedagogy for technical writing would begin, then, by teaching students the conventional structure of purposive-rational discourse, but then go on to identify the rhetoric of strategic claims to authority, to demonstrate the contradictions between these strategic claims and the purposive-rational intention of technical discourse, and to suggest how such claims can be contested. . . [The teachers' aim] would be to work with the structures of technical discourse so that students can negotiate their demands but also be aware of the limited but real possibility of moving beyond them. (264)
Labeling this type of approach "intersubjective rhetoric," Wells asserts that an intersubjective rhetoric "would refuse to confine itself to the normal topics of a composition course—organization, usage, the conventions of an academic paper" (265). Instead, Wells suggests that an intersubjective rhetoric

would accept as its paradigmatic situation the communication of equals who attempt to understand each other, not because such communication is 'normal' or usual, but because it is normative: it generates the expectations with which we enter speech situations. (265)

Wells illustrates what for me is a key point in public interaction assignments in writing classes: interaction, rather than conventions, become central. And, fostering an interactive writing environment is central because we cannot examine interpretation without first examining communicative interaction.

In different curricular contexts this public interaction, brought on through transactional or public assignments, might go in different directions. Three particular curricular contexts come to mind, though some of these contexts might be more amenable to public interaction than others: 1) first-year composition; 2) technical or professional writing; 3) writing-across-the-disciplines.

First-year composition is perhaps the most difficult context for public interaction assignments for several reasons: first-year students may not yet have developed an understanding of rhetorical elements such as audience and purpose, and the assignments typically assigned in first-year composition such as narration, exposition, or description don't require much interaction with the audience. In fact, many first-year writing courses try to help students simply get over the fear of writing by having them write about their own personal
experiences. These type of assignments may not encourage students to think of an audience beyond their teacher (evaluator) or peers. Or, these assignments might encourage students to think of themselves as a primary audience in order to "free up" their writing. In *Writing Without Teachers*, for example, Peter Elbow (1973) encourages student writers to ignore the audience as they tap into their own goals for writing:

So instead of letting the standards of the readers call the shots for you, gradually you come to make your own decisions as to what is good and bad, and use the responses of others to help you fulfill your own goals, not their goals. You are interested in their responses and you learn from them, but you no longer worry about them. This nonworrying frees your writing. (126)

Because first-year students often have trouble envisioning an audience outside of their writing classes, public interaction assignments used in the first-year composition classroom might simply help students solidify the idea of audience and purpose other than their writing teacher. First-year composition courses in argumentation provide ample opportunities for students to write to audiences other than their teacher or peers. Students could write to argue or convince a particular audience either for a particular point of view or even for a policy change. For example, a policy change paper might argue that there needs to be more parking available on campus for commuter students. In completing the paper, the student or students writing about the topic may converse with university parking officials to find out what the current situation is and how or if it can be altered. In researching the topic and talking with university officials, students may also discover who, specifically, would be their most receptive

---

32 Of course this does not comprise all first-year composition instruction. In addition, some first-year students taking composition may have had public writing experiences in high school writing classes.
audience. To whom should they write their argument? Parking officials? The president of the university? Student senate? Such an assignment would require students to identify their audience and then, interact with that audience to find out how they can better shape their argument.

Another argumentation assignment first-year composition teachers could assign is an editorial for a local or university newspaper in which students must present a point of view and support it with evidence. This type of assignment would encourage students to identify an audience outside of the classroom—such as the Iowa State Daily—as the reading audience for the editorial. Having read editorials in the university newspaper and considered themselves as part of the audience, students might more easily visualize an audience other than their writing teacher.

The context of a technical or professional writing class provides more opportunity for students to interact publicly with their audiences than a first-year composition course. Oftentimes, technical or professional writing courses are junior- and senior-level courses rather than first-year courses; thus, these students may already have a basic understanding of audience and purpose for writing. Further, the students who are generally encouraged to take technical or professional writing courses might be from more technical fields such as engineering and might have practical workplace experience to help them visualize audiences outside of the academic classroom. In addition, technical and professional writing courses often have the goal of introducing students to workplace writing. Thus, the invitation to write to outside audiences in a technical or professional writing course may be accepted and encouraged more easily than in a first-year composition course. Professional writing courses might include assignments such as correspondence, reports, instructions, or manuals—
each with specific audiences. One public interaction assignment might encourage students to write a set of instructions for a workplace audience, such as the topic "How to Clean a NOAA Weather Station Radio" (written by one of my former students in a technical writing class) for an audience of student-workers at the weather radio station. Another example might be the topic "How to Complete a Chemical Titration"—a section in an undergraduate chemistry course lab manual—that a group of students wrote in another technical writing class as a collaborative project. Similarly, in correspondence assignments, students could send electronic mail or write letters directly to company representatives to gather information about a specific product and inquire about the instructions written on the product.

Through writing for audiences other than the teacher, students in technical or professional writing courses are free to interact with the outside audiences to develop a better understanding of the purpose for their writing. In the next chapter, for example, I describe a "public interaction" writing project that I assigned in two of my technical communication classes. In this project, I spoke with a doctor from a local allergy clinic who needed revisions of several documents for patient use. The doctor agreed to let student teams in two of my technical communication classes revise documents from the clinic, and he chose the best revisions for actual use in the clinic. Throughout the project, the students communicated, oftentimes through me as instructor and mediator, about what needed to be included in the document, about the most important messages in the document, and about the primary and secondary audiences for the document(s). Students were free to explore through this experience the reality that textbook conventions we had discussed in our technical writing class had to be adjusted to fit the needs of the document they were creating for clinic
patients. Projects similar to this can be set up so that professional or technical writing students can interact with the audience directly.

A third context in which public interaction may be encouraged is in writing-intensive courses in disciplines outside of English. Since these disciplines often seek to strengthen writing in their courses that reflect workplace writing in their disciplines, disciplines outside English may eagerly incorporate assignments that help students practice workplace writing. For example, a horticulture Professor at Iowa State University regularly incorporates a newsletter writing assignment in her Introduction to Horticulture course. In this assignment, students interview two horticulture professionals and then write two articles based on those interviews. They then write a newsletter based on the two articles. Through this assignment, students interact with horticulture professionals but also write interesting articles that may be employed in a horticulture university publication.

Writing-intensive courses outside English may also view written assignments as an opportunity to complete a project for a workplace audience. That is, writing intensive assignments might be used to help students in apprenticeship projects. Such was the case in another Iowa State University course, this time in Agronomy, called Ground Water Technology. In this class, senior-level students divided into teams of three to four students to complete soil and water testing of a local farmer’s land. The project required students to meet and talk with the farmer, complete the testing on the farmer’s land, write a report of their findings and recommendations, and then orally present their findings to the farmer. This interactive project encouraged students to interact with the audience—the farmer—as often as possible to get a clear idea of what to include in the report. While the report was ultimately evaluated by the
instructors of this course to assess agronomy knowledge, the content and even organization of the written report was tailored to meet the farmer's needs, and students developed a concrete understanding of audience and purpose specific to that communicative situation.

If instructors are serious about following through with a thoroughly dialogic—yet interpretive—writing pedagogy, they might create opportunities for their students to write to public audiences, much like Margaret Mansfield and others above did for their students. Projects such as these allow students the opportunity to write for audiences other than their writing teacher; they help students recognize multiple audiences for their writing (Forsberg 1989); they encourage students to look beyond textbook conventions for writing; and they encourage students to engage in dialogue with other students, with the teacher, and with an outside audience about expectations for a particular project.33

Setting up these type of assignments, however, is only part of the work. Other work begins when students discover that textbook conventions and the writing process do not alone comprise the writing act. Rather, through a dialogic, interpretive approach, students may discover that interacting with their audience—particularly a public audience—comprises the writing act. As teachers, we can encourage students to spend time reflecting on and interpreting these interactions with audience. Students may experience difficulty with this approach, as they might realize that writing for public audiences requires them to accept the indeterminacy of the situation rather than the systematized or codifiable strategies that the writing process paradigm offers. However,

33In addition to setting up these projects, if teachers hope to examine interactions using the concept of the third space, they may also want to carefully record the project, either by video-recording class sessions in which students work on the project, or video-taping interactions between the nonacademic professional and the students. Teachers may also want to ask students to keep a journal about the project, writing in particular about any differences writing to a "real" audience makes, or writing to the difficulties that such a project creates.
examining communicative interaction for interpretation in the writing act may help students understand better the indeterminate nature of writing. As a result, students may discover the messiness of the writing act, rather than a neat, codifiable process.

This public interaction approach, I believe, accommodates both communicative interaction and interpretation that is in line with the hermeneutic universalist argument. In the next chapter, I detail a project in which I employed a public interaction assignment in a technical writing class, and I illustrate how the third space concept was applied to highlight interpretation in communicative interaction between students, teacher, and public audience.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE THIRD SPACE AND CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS

In chapter three I emphasized that a dialogic style of pedagogy does not tell us much on its own without also examining the role of interpretation in that dialogue. Examining interpretation through the concept of the third space may tell us not only what kind of dialogues occur in classrooms; this examination may tell us as well how interpretations of these dialogues influence the writing act. For example, an analysis of classroom dialogues in terms of the third space might reveal important misinterpretations that lead to final writings. In this chapter, I examine a specific classroom situation in which students wrote for a public audience, and I analyze this situation in terms of interpretation and the concept of the third space.

The situation I discuss in this chapter involves two sections of a technical communication course that I taught at Iowa State University. In both sections of this technical communication class, the first half of the semester was spent reviewing rhetorical conventions about technical communication such as audience, purpose, context/situation, organization, design, expression, and support. In the latter half of the course, both sections of the technical communication class engaged in a public writing assignment with a local clinic. Completing this project for the clinic involved dialogic and interpretive activity between students, myself, and a non-academic professional from the clinic.

In my examination of dialogic activity in this particular writing act, I pay attention to episodes of communicative interaction that I believe represent the third space. Specifically, I examine dialogues between students, myself, and the physician from the clinic that reflect misinterpretations, questions, or guesses
about expectations for written documents. I compare these expressed uncertainties to the final written documents. In completing this examination, I hope to examine indeterminacy in the writing act. While I do not claim that the examination in this chapter is the answer to failed attempts at establishing a postmodern pedagogy, nor is it an attempt to establish an interpretive pedagogy, I suggest that through an examination of interpretation in the writing act, we might better understand indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness that are characteristics of hermeneutic universalism.

In applying the concept of third space to the dialogic interactions between students, teacher, and an outside professional (a physician from the clinic), I was interested in examining the way that interpretation factored into the writing act through communicative interaction. Particularly, I was interested in the interpretations and misinterpretations that occurred in the dialogic interaction regarding classroom descriptions of technical communication and workplace technical information. I was also interested in the influence of these dialogues on students' final document design.

Through this project, I found that the third space examination generally foregrounded interpretations of communicative interaction regarding (1) general expectations for the documents, and (2) technical information in the documents. These results suggest that the concept of the third space can be an explanatory tool for investigating miscommunications about technical or interdisciplinary information; furthermore, the third space examination, if shared with students, can illustrate the importance of audience expectations for written documentation. In these ways, the third space can demonstrate the instability of the writing act and the indeterminate meanings that surface in communicative interaction during the writing act.
Because this project occurred in a technical communication class, in the next section I briefly situate this clinic project by describing two central issues in technical communication.

Technical Communication

Technical communication is a field concerned with communication of technical knowledge in academic and nonacademic environments. As a teacher of technical communication, I have been concerned with two major issues that are prevalent in the field. One issue concerns the lack of a unified definition of technical communication, which can lead to confusion for students taking a technical communication course. In fact, because of this frequent confusion, I now devote a section of my course to discussing various definitions of technical communication.

In the past few decades, technical communicators have debated the nature of technical communication. Some scholars define technical communication as objective communication (Britton 1975), or technical communication as communication dealing with or related to technology (Dobrin 1985). These definitions have been critiqued for limiting the definition of technical communication too severely. For instance, Lee Forsberg (1987) argues that technical communication accommodates multiple audiences who might interpret the same information differently; Jo Allen (1991) argues in "The Case Against Defining Technical Writing" that reducing technical communication to its relation with technology misses other important aspects of technical communication such as the complexities of task, audience, and purpose. These debates about the definition of technical communication have led to a definition of technical communication that includes the combination of rhetorical concerns
such as audience, purpose, content, format, context, and communication approach (Allen, 1991; Burnett, 6, 1997; Lay et al. 6, 1995). Because several definitions of technical communication exist, and because some scholars characterize technical communication as being difficult to define, students sometimes find the nature of the field confusing.

A second issue that concerns me as a teacher is the degree to which technical communication is an academic or nonacademic practice (or both). Although academic resources—such as technical communication textbooks and research articles—are often based on nonacademic practices of technical communication, classroom instruction in technical communication should emphasize workplace practice as well, and sometimes this task is difficult for technical communication instructors in the academy. Technical communication and other related fields such as business and professional communication often pertain to communication in workplace environments; thus, technical communication and related fields often fall under the umbrella of "nonacademic writing." Nonacademic writing, according to Lee Odell and Dixie Goswami (1985), is writing that occurs in professional communication or workplace settings (see their collection of essays, Writing in Nonacademic Settings). In addition, nonacademic writing has been defined as "writing that gets something done, as opposed to writing that serves an aesthetic, cognitive, or affective function" (Cooper x, 1996). In contrast to these more concrete definitions of nonacademic writing, in Nonacademic Writing: Social Theory and Technology, Duin and Hansen (1996) suggest that "Clearly, a satisfactory definition for nonacademic writing is elusive" (2). These authors suggest that

...nonacademic writing will continue as a dynamic, changing field of study... There will be no end to investigating nonacademic writing because
there are no limits to the "settings of consequence" (Ackerman & Oates, chap. 5) to be studied and no limits to evolving technologies. There will be no end to defining nonacademic writing because to understand the term one must embrace so many themes. (2)

While definitions of nonacademic writing differ, one common factor in these definitions is the emphasis on the workplace environment. Because of this emphasis, however, some scholars have expressed concern about how well nonacademic writing is taught in an academic environment. For example, C. H. Knoblauch (1989) counters the claim that nonacademic writing or communication is based on workplace settings. In "The Teaching and Practice of 'Professional Writing,'" Knoblauch argues that instruction of professional communication is still very much tied to theoretical, rather than practical, notions:

The point I prefer to make is that professional writing, insofar as textbooks define it, is altogether an academic conception, very much tied to school notions of literacy, language, and discourse, specifically those held among humanities faculty. (250)

Knoblauch's critique draws important attention to the way in which technical communication is taught in college and university settings. How can technical communication be taught in a way that reflects nonacademic practice and yet upholds academic rigor?

This issue has recently received attention in Technical Communication, the journal for the Society of Technical Communication. In an editorial titled "The Academe-Industry Partnership: What's in It for All of Us?" George F. Hayhoe (1998) addresses the differences between academic and nonacademic perceptions of technical communication. Hayhoe describes the sometimes adversarial relationship between academics and practitioners: "At its extremes,
this attitude manifests itself in practitioners who consider research and theory to
be ivory tower games with no relevance to their practice, and in professors who
regard practitioners as ignorant anti-intellectuals" (19). Hayhoe suggests a
partnership between academics and practitioners of technical communication:

Technical communicators in the academy and industry need to explore a
new model of education for the next millennium, one that fosters,
promotes, and actively pursues learning—and learning to learn. Only by
discovering our own limitations and collaborating effectively with those
whose strengths complement our own will we truly enrich ourselves, our
students, and our audiences. (20)

Hayhoe's articulated goal is one I strive for in my technical communication
course—that is, I work to combine academic and nonacademic goals and explore
the uses of technical communication in both environments. Although there is a
real need for research in this area, some studies already address the gap between
academia and the workplace that Hayhoe articulates. For example, Craig Hansen
(1996) explores the differences in the uses of technology in academic versus
workplace settings in "Networking Technology in the Classroom: Whose
Interests Are We Serving?" (213). Hansen found that academic contexts often
use technology for networking—forming community—whereas nonacademic
contexts use technology as a way to control information (201).

Another study by Rebecca Burnett (1996) describes the complexities, rather
than clear distinctions, of workplace and classroom environments. In "The
Anatomy of a Dysfunctional Team," Burnett investigated a project in which a
student team completed research and a written report for a local engineering
research laboratory. In this student/workplace project, team members were
expected to apply their technical knowledge (gained from academic classes and
work experience) to complete the research and report in a professional manner;
however, the team was not provided with substantive direction to help them bridge their classroom knowledge to the workplace environment. Burnett found, as a result, that the team had extreme difficulty completing the project in a way that satisfied the professional standards of the laboratory. Burnett suggested that there were a number of factors that distinguished classroom and workplace collaboration; these factors overlapped and were unclear during the completion of the project. These factors included exigence and expectations, situatedness and context, formation of teams/groups, motivation, processes and strategies, knowledge of details, conventions, impact, and assessment (153).

Burnett concluded that both students and professionals might have benefited from the project if it were organized differently: "A potentially more successfully model might be based on internships or apprenticeships—students working with professionals rather than for them" (154).

I find Burnett's study helpful because it suggests that the distinctions between workplace and classroom environments are not always clear; furthermore, I believe her suggestion for collaboration between students and professionals relates to Hayhoe's point about bridging the gap between classroom and workplace environments. Future studies like Hansen's and Burnett's may reveal differences and complexities in technical communication among academic and nonacademic environments that may help us bridge the gap between the workplace and the academy.

These two issues—definition of field and the characterization of academic and nonacademic technical communication—concern me as a teacher because I want students to find relevance in the technical communication course I teach. Furthermore, these issues raise pertinent questions for me that relate directly to the clinic project I describe in this chapter. How can professional
communication instruction integrate both classroom and workplace practices? My attempt to address this question is based on the clinic project that I describe in this chapter. In the clinic project, rhetorical understandings of professional communication were combined with workplace practices. Students and I spent class time reviewing, discussing, and practicing technical communication according to the formats, conventions, and rhetorical principles discussed in our academic textbook. The documents that students revised for the clinic were different from any of the formats our textbook reviewed; therefore, the project seemed decidedly "nonacademic." However, some class discussions of rhetorical concerns such as audience, purpose, expression, and design were very relevant to the project. The differences and similarities between textbook conventions and workplace environments are interesting to explore in light of the current discussions about academic and nonacademic contexts in technical communication.

In the next section, I describe more completely the technical communication classes that were involved in a project with a local clinic. Through this description, I point out some perceptions of technical communication that the students in both classes practiced and discussed. Following that section, I describe the clinic project in more detail, my analysis using the third space, the results of the project in terms of the third space, and implications of the project for the third space and technical communication pedagogy.

Technical Communication Course

The technical communication course at Iowa State University, English 314, is a junior/senior level course that is required for many major programs of
study. During spring semester 1997, the two technical communication classes that participated in this project each had 24 enrolled students. Students in these two classes represented a variety of majors including biology, engineering, agriculture, journalism, psychology, and chemistry. Most students in these two classes had enrolled in technical communication because it is required for their major programs of study.\textsuperscript{34}

English 314—Technical Communication—introduces students to various forms of oral, written, and visual communication that they may encounter in their professions. Because technical communication often incorporates technology, and because many programs of study that require the course for their students emphasize technology, many of these technical communication courses are held in computer labs (both PC and Macintosh labs), which was true in my case. Both English 314 courses I taught that semester were "computer-enhanced"—50 percent of all class time (one class day per week) was spent in a Macintosh computer lab.

The units, assignments, class discussions, and daily work in the technical communication course I teach incorporate the definition of technical communication recently accepted by many scholars: technical communication is a compilation of rhetorical concerns such as audience, purpose, content, format, and context, and communication approach. These aspects of technical communication are included in assignments and discussions in my technical communication course; furthermore, these aspects are directly included in an "Evaluation Criteria" sheet that all students receive on the first day of class. (See Appendix A, Figure 1).

\textsuperscript{34}All students agreed to participate in this investigation. See Appendix E, Human Subjects Form.
During spring semester 1997, I structured the technical communication course around three major units that would encourage students to practice oral, written, and visual communication. These course units included (1) introduction to technical communication, (2) technical instructions and presentations, and (3) feasibility report and collaboration. The first unit included assignments such as correspondence (memo and letter writing) and document analysis; the second unit included assignments like technical instructions, usability testing, and oral presentations. The third unit of the course involved a feasibility report package that included a proposal, a feasibility report, and a presentation, each completed collaboratively. For this last assignment, I encouraged students to engage in collaborative projects that would be completed for a professional outside of the class. For example, during one semester a student group created a brochure for the owner of a language translation service. In completing the project, the student group met regularly with the owner of the service to discuss the content and design of the brochure, and they created a brochure that fit her publication and advertising needs.

The major assignments of the course were supplemented by discussion of conventions for technical communication. For example, in every unit we reviewed and discussed conventional formats for different types of technical documents. In the first unit, we reviewed correspondence formats such as block and modified block form for memos and letters. In the second unit, we reviewed formats for instructional documents such as inclusion of a list of materials, necessary definitions, numbering or bullets, and the use of command form or parallel structure. In the final unit, we discussed generic conventions for report
writing such as the inclusion of an introduction, overview, description of the
problem, recommendation, evidence, and conclusion.\(^{35}\)

To supplement the assignments in the three units of the course, I assigned
daily activities and exercises that pertained to rhetorical features of technical
communication such as audience, purpose, content, context, organization,
support, expression, and design. For instance, students explored these rhetorical
features through short, informal presentations that were dispersed throughout
the semester-long course. In addition, students explored rhetorical features and
practiced communication activities while completing regular computer exercises
during our regularly scheduled lab days. (See Appendix A, Figure 2, for copy of
syllabus and policy sheet for this course.)

**Local Clinic Project**

In teaching the technical communication course, as I indicated above, I
actively seek opportunities to allow students to work on technical
communication projects with a public audience for the "feasibility report
package." Often times this public audience is an academic or workplace
professional outside of the classroom. Projects written for a public audience
allow students to explore uses of technical communication beyond the classroom
and textbook models that we explore in class. I have sought these kind of
projects because I believe writing assignments that bridge classroom and out-of-
classroom experiences help students to understand concrete applications of
technical communication. In addition, these projects tend to solidify for students
rhetorical concepts such as audience and purpose.

---

\(^{35}\) These formats were taken from the textbook *Technical Communication* (4th edition) by Rebecca E.
Burnett, which was the required textbook for the course.
During spring semester of 1997, I came across a project that I thought would be fitting for the students in my two technical communication classes. The project involved revising documents for a local allergy clinic. This project came about as a result of my visiting the clinic for allergy treatment. In late February or early March, I was treated at the allergy clinic for some allergic reactions I was experiencing. There I met with Dr. Chmura\(^{36}\) who, as we were talking, discovered that I am a teacher of technical communication. In response to my illness due to allergies, he gave me the standard patient documents, apologizing for their outdated appearance. And, as we were talking, we discussed the possibility that I might do some consulting with them to revise the documents. As I left the clinic, and for a couple of weeks afterward, I realized that the project to revise the documents was a perfect opportunity for the students in my technical communication classes. I then wrote a letter to Dr. Chmura (see Appendix A, Figure 3), asking if he would be interested in the possibility of my students revising the documents for him, free of cost, and then he would get the opportunity to select from those documents the ones he liked best. Dr. Chmura enthusiastically agreed to the project.

Three documents needed revising: (1) a patient consultation form, (2) a "welcome" document introducing patients to the clinic, and (3) an informational document about various allergies, their causes, and preventions for these allergic reactions. (See Appendix A, Figures 4, 5, and 6.) In our preliminary discussions about the project, Dr. Chmura articulated suggestions for each of these forms, which I describe in the following sections.

\(^{36}\)All names in this investigation are pseudonyms.
**Patient Consultation Form**

The patient consultation form (see Appendix A, Figure 4) is a standard form that patients fill out to provide the doctor with information regarding their medical history and also their physical work and home environment. The purpose of the document, according to Dr. Chmura, is to help patients identify their symptoms and to get patients thinking about symptoms they might not have thought about before. The audience of this document includes all patients. Since many patients are children, the audience includes parents of children. Rarely do children fill out the form alone; usually, in fact, the parents fill out the form for their children. The audience also includes adult patients who come to the allergy clinic for treatment.

Dr. Chmura suggested several changes for this document dealing with audience, design, content, and organization. He noted first that the form focused too narrowly on an audience of patients who are children. On the first page of the document, for example, the form asks for the patient’s name and then "Parent's name." Dr. Chmura felt that the language should be all-inclusive for adult patients as well as patients who are children. Concerning design, Dr. Chmura noted that the original document was difficult for patients to use. In one section, for example, patients were supposed to circle their symptoms, but some of the longer symptoms were typed on separate lines, making this indication difficult. He requested a different design format for the symptom indications.

The doctor also made suggestions for reorganizing the content of some sections of the document. For example, he indicated that the section on symptom influences (in part IV of the original document) was "a mess." This section lists a number of allergic symptoms but does not organize them into
appropriate allergic categories. The doctor suggested that segments be added to this section such as "dust," "mold," "pollens," "animal danders." Or, symptoms could be divided into even larger "non-allergic" and "allergic" categories. He suggested that some research on these categories might be helpful to make sure they are exclusive. He made a similar organizational suggestions for a later section of the document.

**The Welcome Document**

A second document about which the doctor requested changes was a "welcome" document—a standard document for all new patients (see Appendix A, Figure 5). This document had the purpose of welcoming patients to the clinic and providing contact information, first-visit information, an explanation of the clinic's function, and a list of medications that patients had to avoid before their first visit. Although the doctor did not make specific suggestions about this document, he pointed out that the document had become a hybrid of phrases from doctors who had previously worked at the clinic. Because information had been added and subtracted during various doctors' stays there, an inconsistent voice ran throughout the document. The document also had some glaring organizational errors. Furthermore, because the document had small margins due to its type-written and Xeroxed format, it excluded the last three lines of the document. The document needed a substantive edit and visual redesign.

**Allergy Information Document**

The third document, the allergy information document (see Appendix A, Figure 6), had the purpose of educating patients about their allergies. Patients received this document after they completed their consultation and had been
diagnosed as having certain allergies. This document, then, indicates patient diagnosis and provides information about various allergies, their causes, and possible measures to prevent them.

Within this document, Dr. Chmura found few, if any, word or sentence changes that needed to be made. Rather, he was more concerned with the design of the document. The original document was type-written (single-spaced) on a conventional format. It was dense and difficult to read. The doctor suggested a redesign for the document into a booklet format, or a brochure, or some other type of appealing format with wider margins and a more appealing font.

After speaking with Dr. Chmura about these documents and about the project, I recorded his specific suggestions for each document so that students would have concrete suggestions for revision (see Appendix A, Figure 7). Given these three documents from the clinic and suggestions for improvement from Dr. Chmura, I then had to propose the project to the students in my technical communication classes.

**Negotiating the Clinic Project**

By the time I had talked with Dr. Chmura and he had agreed to the project, my students and I were approaching the third unit of the course—collaboration and report writing. For an assignment called the "feasibility report package," students were to work with a group to create a document that solved a particular problem or need. Then they were to write a report about the document they created and discuss why it addressed the problem appropriately. The clinic project—though not originally part of the course syllabus—fit well into this last unit of the course. Because I didn't want to choose projects for students, I decided that it would be best to give students an option of choosing the clinic
project or their own project instead. Because of the size of the project, and the opportunity for students to talk with Dr. Chmura during the process, I decided to give students yet another option—the option for all students in both classes to complete the project. If students agreed to this third option, I suspected that the class environment might undergo change.

To "pitch" the project to my classes, I devoted one full class period (in both sections) to proposing the project and my guidelines for the project. I first listed the options available to the students: (1) choose their own group project; (2) choose the clinic project as a group project; (3) choose the clinic project as a class project. Students in both classes wanted to hear more about the clinic project. I described the project and suggested that if they were interested, we would do the project as a class and everyone would work on it. Most students, seeing this as an opportunity to do something spontaneous, were eager to attempt the project. Consequently, the majority of students in both classes voted to complete the project, and some even thought that it would be "cake" compared to the original feasibility report package assignment. However, there were a few students in each class who were unpersuaded and who wondered how their individual performance would be affected by this project. But somehow the other students convinced these few to go along with the project, and in the end, all students in both classes participated in the group project.

Continuing the pitch, I introduced the three clinic documents that Dr. Chmura had given to me. I suggested that this assignment would have to be a group project, but each class could divide themselves up however they wanted and then each group could decide which or how many of the clinic documents they chose to revise. Ultimately, however, I suggested that each class (not each group) had to at least provide one revision of each of the three documents. After
completing the documents, the doctor would then choose which documents he liked best and should be used for the clinic. In a sense, then, the classes and in some cases groups within the classes were in competition with one another.

Following the class period in which I proposed guidelines for the project, another class period was devoted to letting students decide how the project might be completed. One class—I'll call it Class A—decided that class members would break up into four groups and have each group tackle all three of the documents. One student in particular led the decision making process in Class A. "It can't be that difficult or take that much time," she declared. She announced to the class that each group could revise all three documents and that it would be easy. Her opinion apparently swayed the class; consequently, this class decided to break into four groups and have each group tackle revisions of all three documents. In contrast, the other class—I'll call it Class B—thought it would be "crazy" to divide into groups and each attempt to do the whole project. Instead, Class B decided to divide the entire class into two large groups: 12 people for the "pre" documents (Patient Consultation Form and Welcome Document) and 12 people for the "post" document (Allergy Information Document). The pre-document group divided itself into half yet again so that one group would do the Patient Consultation Form while another group did the Welcome Document. In this class, then, each group tackled only one of the three documents, and together they completed the documents for Dr. Chmura.

Data

As I have explained, my goal for the technical communication course was to bridge classroom discussions of rhetorical principles mentioned in our textbook with a workplace writing assignment. Because I found this project an
exciting and unique opportunity to explore the differences between classroom and workplace technical communication, I carefully collected data both during and after the clinic project. Data primarily consisted of two forms: written documents and oral discussions. Written documents included the original clinic documents (already described previously); student revisions of these documents; final revised documents; student feasibility reports on the project; written student evaluations of the experience; and my journal notes about observations of the project.

Keeping in mind that this project was an ideal opportunity as well to examine a dialogic and public interactive approach to teaching writing, I carefully recorded (with permission from all participants—see Human Subject Form in Appendix E) various oral discussions that occurred during the project. These recordings consisted of video-taped classroom discussions about the project; video-taped team discussions in the classroom and computer lab; video-taped discussions between the doctor and students; e-mail exchanges between students and myself during the project; and video-taped final presentations at the end of the project.

Video-recorded dialogues occurred in three different contexts. One context consisted of our regular class discussions during the project. This context shows interaction between students and other students, and between students and myself during regular class periods. These interactions took place in our regular classroom and the computer lab. A second context for video-recordings was student-doctor discussions in which student groups presented their revised documents to Dr. Chmura. After completing the project, each student group had the opportunity to present its final document(s) to the doctor and explain what they did. The dialogues were limited to 15 minutes per group and were held in
an informal setting that allowed the doctor and the students to interact freely. Finally, the third context for video-recording was the final student presentations for which the doctor was not present. These presentations were part of the "feasibility report package." While these presentations were graded by me and served an evaluative purpose for the class, they also served as a record for Dr. Chmura about the project. These final presentations were more monologic than dialogic; however, I found them helpful in summarizing the efforts of each student group.

The Third Space Approach

As I have suggested throughout this dissertation, the third space is a concept that represents the intersection of mismatched interpretations that might influence the creation of a written document. The concept of the third space, as I have developed it in this dissertation, addresses the role of interpretation in the production of discourse by applying Donald Davidson's idea of a passing theory to dialogues about writing. The clinic project that I investigate in this chapter provides an excellent opportunity to explore the third space because the data I have collected from this project consists of written documents (produced by the clinic and my students) and numerous recorded dialogues between participants in the project. Given these data, I carefully examined the dialogues I recorded between students and students, students and teacher, and students and Dr. Chmura. Specifically, I looked for utterances in the dialogues where (1) expectations for the documents were articulated and speculated upon and (2) technical information was discussed and questioned. I speculated that these results might reflect differences in classroom and workplace expectations for technical communication; I also speculated that these results
might show more concern for workplace expectations than classroom expectations.37

I transcribed portions of these dialogues that reflected articulations or guesses about either expectations for the clinic documents or technical information. These transcriptions were from both Class A and Class B. I selected these portions on the basis of content—whether or not they showed uncertainties, questions, or guesses in the dialogue. I then analyzed these dialogue excerpts in terms of the third space—specifically Davidson’s prior and passing theories. Prior theories, I surmised, were reflected in articulated expectations for the documents, whereas passing theories were reflected in articulated guesses and questions about the documents. I was most interested in passing theories, which I identified with indeterminacy in the third space. For example, I was most interested in the guesses and questions that all participants in this project had about document expectations. Given this analysis, I compared the portions of the transcripts that reflected the third space with the final documents that students produced.

**Results**

I found that the third space materialized in two broad categories. These broad categories included very specific, situated instances in which participants voiced confusion about either (1) general expectations for the clinic documents or (2) technical information about the documents. For each of these broader categories, I examined two excerpts from class discussions in which Dr. Chmura

37In this chapter, I do not address evaluation, although it would make an interesting follow-up study. As it turned out, I was wrong about my speculation that students would be more concerned with Dr. Chmura’s evaluation than my evaluation. Toward the end of the project, students were extremely preoccupied with the grade they might receive. Because the project was spontaneous, they expected me to be more lenient and their grades to be higher.
was absent and two excerpts from discussions in which students directly
discussed their projects with Dr. Chmura. These excerpts were selected because
they demonstrated confusion, doubt, or uncertainty about writing.
Consequently, each of these excerpts comprises a "third space episode" in which I
examine prior and passing theories more closely for indeterminacy in
communicative interaction. I indicate passing theories within these episodes
using **boldface** type.

**General Expectations for the Clinic Documents in Class Discussions**

As the project began, many discussions in both Class A and Class B were
devoted to understanding just what the doctor wanted from the clinic
documents. Dr. Chmura made concrete suggestions about the documents in our
preliminary meetings. However, as students began working on the project, they
had questions about these suggestions. The transcript excerpt below
demonstrates a discussion in which class time was devoted to talking about
document expectations. In discussions like these, I would ask students to relate
questions they had about the project, I would write them down, and then I
would ask the doctor for further clarification. I believe the excerpt below
represents an episode of the third space in which various interpretations are
negotiated through passing theories that are expressed in dialogue.

In this first excerpt from Class B, a student, Lyn, asked about one of Dr.
Chmura's suggestions regarding the "Allergy Information" document (see
Appendix A, Figure 7). The suggestion pertained to the addition of information
to the document:

3. Additional information: none. Don't want to give patients so much
    information that they won't read the document. Make the document
appealing (not too big) and inviting. It should not repeat information in
the other booklets they receive.

Because Lyn's group (which also included Gary and Jim) was working on the
Allergy Information Document, she wanted to clarify the suggestion, as the
excerpt below demonstrates. ("LA" represents me, Lee-Ann. Bold comments
represent passing theories within the third space episode.)

Lyn: We need to see what's actually included in the [Welcome
Document], um, because he said he doesn't want it repeated, and if
he wants any of it repeated, is there anything he wants emphasized?
LA: Do you need a copy of the [Welcome Document]. Is that what
you're saying?
Gary: That and—
Lyn: It says on this sheet of suggestions "Do not repeat information from
any booklets that all patients receive." What other booklets do all
patients receive?
LA: Um that all patients receive? OK?
Lyn: Right.
LA: Ah, that's a good question. I don't know. Um, I think the booklets
he was referring to there are those booklets on childhood asthma or
asthma in general—that you shouldn't repeat information that's
there.
Lyn: But should it re-emphasize it. I mean should we keep the little
paragraphs that describe like, what hay fever is?

The third space is represented by the collective utterances in this episode
of communicative interaction. Within this episode, we can examine
indeterminacy by looking more closely at passing theories expressed in dialogue.
Passing theories are expressed, I believe, by both Lyn and me when we attempt to
interpret what Dr. Chmura meant by "repetition" and the "information that all
patients receive" in his suggestions for the document. For example, Lyn asks
specifically what Dr. Chumra means by "do not repeat information" and
"information all patients receive." In response, I interpret Dr. Chmura's
suggestion by commenting "I think the booklets he was referring to there are those booklets on childhood asthma or asthma in general—that you shouldn't repeat information that's there." Articulations by both Lyn and me demonstrate passing theories about what the doctor had suggested. Because the doctor is not present in this discussion, neither I nor Lyn is able to get definite answers about our interpretations of his suggestions; instead, we express our passing theories to one another.

Passing theories are also articulated in this episode of the third space when I try to understand Lyn's request. When Lyn first asks her question, I attempt to interpret her question: "Do you need a copy of the pre document. Is that what you're saying?" Lyn does not even address my question; instead, she tries to clarify her request by pointing to a concrete suggestion that the doctor had given. I had formed a passing theory in attempt to understand Lyn's request, but my passing theory was not an accurate interpretation of Lyn's request. This passing theory represents how student-teacher interactions can also contain mismatches of interpretation.

Following the above exchange, the class discussion then focused on the purpose of the Allergy Information document. I found in this discussion another episode of the third space in which passing theories were made to resolve mismatches of interpretation. In response to Lyn's question about what information should be "emphasized," I brought up the issue of the document's purpose, and I suggested that the purpose was unclear.

LA:  So, I think part of the problem is gonna be defining the purpose in that document, you know, . . . so that people right off the bat know what the purpose is. And right now, I don't know what that is.
Jim:  Just kind of like a summary, maybe of all the pamphlets he has? Maybe this is an overview of each. I was looking at those pamphlets, one's on asthma, one's on childhood asthma,
environmental controls for pets and household things, and all those things were talked about in the post document—it gave an overview of each.

LA: Yeah, right right right right. Yeah, it just glossed it all. **But I don't know. From my point of view, I don't see a good sense of order, like why the questions are sequenced the way they are.**

Jim: Oh I see.

LA: The range of questions is very different from the other booklets, so I don't think you need to worry about repeating information. But if you want to check out each one of those booklets and see how different the purpose is . . . go ahead.

In this excerpt, I seem troubled by the lack of a defined purpose in the Allergy Information document. As the student, Jim, suggests however, the purpose of the document may be quite simple—to provide a brief summary of common allergic reactions that patients might experience. Despite this suggestion, I seem to believe that the organization of the Allergy Information document does not support the summary purpose by suggesting: "From my point of view, I don't see a good sense of order, like why the questions are sequenced the way they are."

In this excerpt, then, both Jim and I are forming passing theories about the document's purpose. Again, because Dr. Chmura was not present for this discussion, we had only each other's interpretations to hear and consider.

Despite this discussion about Dr. Chmura's suggestion to avoid repetition, after this discussion Lyn and her group did not change their document (the Allergy Information Document, see Appendix A, Figure 11). At the time of this discussion, the content of their document mirrored the clinic's original version. This version, as Lyn and Jim alluded to, included brief paragraph descriptions of common allergies. Lyn was asking in this dialogue excerpt if some of these sections repeated information in other documents that patients received. However, the discussion that evolved from her inquiry did not answer her
question about the doctor's suggestion. Clearly, I did not know the answer to her question and instead was interested in talking about the document's purpose. Our passing theories were unresolved except for my suggestion to read through the other patient documents to see if information was repeated. The group responded to this indecision, ultimately, by not responding. They did not change their version of the Allergy Information Document at all. (Please see Appendix A, Figure 11.)

Discussions such as the one shown by the excerpts above characterized many of the class discussions held at the beginning of the clinic project. The third space was made visible simply by episodes in which participants expressed questions about the expectations for the document. Although both students and instructor—as writers—attempted to identify the expectations that Dr. Chmura had for the documents, our interpretations of the suggestions were indeterminate. This indeterminacy comprised the writing act as we worked on the project in the classroom. And, as the excerpts above show, most of these discussions about expectations for the document were not expressed in terms of rhetorical concerns such as audience, content, context, design, or expression from our textbook that we had discussed. Most often, students focused on the concrete suggestions mentioned by Dr. Chmura as well as details pertaining to the project. Students wanted to know specific details about the project such as how long the doctor wanted the documents, if they should use color to produce them, how the documents were distributed to patients, and what type of paper would be used for printing. This finding was particularly interesting given that we had been discussing rhetorical concerns regularly in the classroom prior to this project. The fact that students were unfamiliar with the nonacademic environment and
expectations for these documents added to the indeterminate nature of this particular writing act.

*General Expectations for the Clinic Documents in Consultations with Dr. Chmura*

Toward the end of the project, student groups talked directly with Dr. Chmura as they presented their projects. During these discussions, students had the opportunity to check out their interpretations about expectations for the document. Like the classroom discussions about general expectations, in these discussions I found that indeterminacies about general expectations surfaced in communicative interaction. Most often, these indeterminacies pertained to explanations of either rhetorical conventions for writing or workplace uses of the document. In the discussions that follow, I did not find many expressed passing theories. Rather, I chose the following excerpts because they demonstrated an intersection of differing interpretations about document expectations. These differences, though voiced, were often not negotiated, explored, or resolved through passing theories in communicative interaction.

In contrast to class discussions that focused on nonacademic aspects of the clinic documents, I noticed that as students presented their documents to Dr. Chmura, they often discussed their projects in terms of rhetorical principles we had discussed earlier in the course. That is, when presenting their projects to Dr. Chmura, students seemed well able to combine their understanding of rhetorical principles and the clinic's specific needs for the documents. For example, two principles we discussed in the first two units of the course were audience and

---

38 Unfortunately, due to scheduling students did not get to converse face-to-face with Dr. Chmura until the very end of the project. Discussions with Dr. Chmura at all stages of the project may have helped students clarify document expectations more quickly.
design. In a presentation of their newly designed Patient Consultation Form, a student group referred to their use of bold print as a design tactic that influenced the audience (see Appendix A, Figure 8 for use of bold print in student document). In the excerpt below, Jack and Ray describe for the doctor their use of boldface type to direct the audience toward important or relevant information (notice that there are no passing theories in this episode of the third space):

Jack: One of the things I like about this, and the other documents that we've seen through the class, I've seen is that as a patient coming into an office and seeing this, I mean, I might not have an idea of some of these things and so bold things direct you. You want to read and you see when you need to read it.

Ray: It directs your eye across the page and to what you need to read. It does this naturally. And it focuses the document toward the audience and toward what they would want to read. We tried to make it simple.

Dr: In fact that was one of the problems with the original document is that, ah, ah, it ah, a lot of times people would pick up the original form and say, you know, I'm not here for a kid, I'm here for myself, so... yeah this is nice.

I have categorized this excerpt as a third space episode because, as I explained earlier, it demonstrates various interpretations of document expectations. This excerpt is an example of different prior knowledge that is expressed in communicative interaction without negotiation or resolve through passing theories. In this excerpt the third space helps us to understand how Dr. Chmura and the students do not reach a determinate understanding of the rhetorical characteristic, audience. Although Jack and Ray talk about how they addressed audience in their revised document, Dr. Chmura comments about a problem of audience from the original document. Notice that Jack assumes the role of a patient when he suggests that, "I mean, I might not have an idea of some of these things and so bold things direct you. You want to read, and you
see when you need to read it." Ray adds to this interpretation of audience when he suggests, "And it focuses the document toward the audience and toward what they would want to read." Both Jack and Ray have interpreted what the audience would need to read. In response, Dr. Chmura does not comment on the information that an audience would need emphasized, but he responds to what he perceives as the problem with audience: "In fact [audience] was one of the problems with the original document...". This brief exchange demonstrates their different interpretations about audience.

This third space episode also helps us to understand how the students and Dr. Chmura interpret design differently. Notice that in this excerpt Ray and Jack are interested in discussing their use of bold print, which is something they constructed in the overall design of their document. They have targeted key words and phrases and bolded them for emphasis. The doctor does not pick up on their reference to design at all; instead, he relates the conversation to his own prior theory about the documents' problems with audience. In this discussion, few connections were made between the students and the doctor regarding academic expectations such as the use of appropriate design strategies (that is, no passing theories are evident). This lack of connection is perhaps due to their varying interpretations about design.

Later in this same group discussion, the doctor did, however, comment on his prior knowledge about the document's design and purpose. In the excerpt below, a member of the group, Tim, asks Dr. Chmura if he has any questions about their work. In response, Dr. Chmura does not ask questions but rather comments on the clinic documents. This excerpt is not an example of the third space but rather an interesting and helpful explication of Dr. Chmura's prior knowledge about design and purpose.
Tim: Any questions?

Dr: Um, ah, gosh. Ah, it's interesting, you know this is a document, as much as I hate it, or hated the original format, ah, I've been staring at it for the past three years. Ah, and every time I get the invitation, I have to go back and review this old document. Ah, it's kind of become sort of like an old dysfunctional friend. You know, it's kind of neat to see it get sort of a face lift. So that's great.

[break]

Dr: You know the um, the rules of medicine are changing. And ah, having forms like this included in your, your patients' encounter with you goes a long way towards satisfying the chart boggers (?) that act like something has transpired in a patient's' visit with you, you know what I mean?

Tim: Um hm

Dr: They're interested in reviewing the content of your notes and so if you actually have some sort of function beyond ah, this form that the patient fills out. For example, there's a function beyond just letting me know. It lets somebody like the insurance company or Medicare or Medicaid know that we did something while they were here.

I believe Dr. Chmura's comment here confirms the mismatch of interpretations that the previous third space episode demonstrates. Here he comments that the new design is difficult to absorb because he is accustomed to the original document that has become "sort of like an old dysfunctional friend."
The rhetorical characteristics such as bold face type or even the use of white space or page layout—any of the design principles students may have presented to him—were not interpreted the same by Dr. Chmura and the students because Dr. Chmura was so influenced by his prior expectations for the document.

In the comment above, Dr. Chmura also explains his prior knowledge about purpose as well. Recall that purpose had been a topic of class discussion when the project began. In this excerpt, Dr. Chmura describes purpose in terms of "function" (in this excerpt he is talking about the Patient Consultation Form specifically). He says that the Patient Information Form has a function "beyond
just letting me know." The form is also a record for insurance companies, Medicare, or Medicaid. He again reveals his prior theory about purpose when he mentions "And ah, having forms like this included in your, your patients' encounter with you goes a long way towards satisfying the chart boggers that act like something has transpired in a patients' visit with you, you know what I mean?" In fact, the students probably had no idea what he meant here. He may have been suggesting that having a thorough written record is beneficial for others who may need a written record, or he may have been suggesting that a thorough written record will get other people off of his back in terms of asking about what occurred during a patient visit. The point is that Dr. Chmura is voicing the document's purpose in terms of his prior theory about the document's use. Clearly, the students and Dr. Chmura bring different prior knowledge about document expectations to their discussions. I believe that as the previous third space episode showed, these differences were expressed in terms of prior theories, but were not resolved in terms of passing theories.39

As I've discussed in this section, many interactions in this project revealed details about both classroom and workplace expectations for the document. Class discussions often focused on interpretations of the doctor's suggestions for the documents rather than on textbook principles we had covered in the first half of the course. However, students began to apply these principles when they presented their work to the doctor, as they explained their projects in terms of rhetorical principles such as design. When nonacademic and academic expectations were shared between students and Dr. Chmura in face-to-face discussions, this analysis shows that students and Dr. Chmura had different interpretations of those expectations based on prior knowledge of the documents.

39It would be very interesting to investigate further as to why these differences were not negotiated or resolved in dialogue. A future study might address this point.
The difference in interpretations, shown in the third space episode, demonstrates their (both students and physician) unresolved understanding of the project.

**Technical Information in Class Discussions**

Another way in which the concept of the third space was evident was through discussions about technical information relevant to the clinic documents. In the excerpt below, for example, a student group working on the Welcome Document (see Appendix A, Figure 5) was debating the meaning of the word "sick." In this discussion, notice that students and I expressed passing theories to resolve our different interpretations.

LA: What are you guys working on?
Jon: I don't know. ha!
Ann: We're trying to define the word "sick."
LA: What do you mean?
Ann: Um, well, we don't like this sentence, but we don't know how to clarify it, so we're talking about that.
LA: What's the sentence.
Ann: "Sick patients will be seen right away."
Jon: In an allergy clinic wouldn't everybody be sick?
Ann: We're wondering how sick you have to be in order to be sick enough to be seen right away.
Jon: instead of scheduling that—
Dee: Do they actually do that?
Jon: "Terminally ill patients will be seen right away."

In this excerpt, the students question the meaning of the word "sick" by assuming that all patients in an allergy clinic would be classified as sick. The issue for the students is how to convey information about scheduling "sick" patients. We see the students making active guesses about what the term means, as evidenced by Jon's somewhat sarcastic guess: "Terminally ill patients will be seen right away." The conversation continues:
LA: What else does [the document] say about "sick"? What does it say before and after that [passage]?

Ann: We just changed before that. . . it's talking about when, um, the ah, new appointments can be made and everything . . . what time span . . . it deals with weeks . . . we could say "a regular follow up visit will take up to two weeks" unless you're going to die. ha ha [laughter]

Jon: So is that what that sentence is referring to? A follow up visit? That if they find out in your initial visit that you're really sick then you'll be seen sooner?

Ann: Can you say, you know, two weeks . . . four weeks . . . but if you really need to go, we'll book you in?

Bob: How about "although sick patients can be seen right away,"

Ann: You see, I just, "sick." Everyone is "sick" or else they wouldn't be going to the clinic.

Bob: Yeah, well //

Sam: It's just the degree of sickness

Bob: They're using "sick" to differentiate between //

Sam: If they can live with it

Bob: //between people who need attention right now.

Dee: "Those who need immediate attention"

Bob: I think that's fine. "can be seen right away."

Sam: "If you need immediate attention, you can be seen right away."

Here the group seems to have arrived at an interpretation of the word "sick." First they question whether or not "sick" refers to follow up visits or a first visit. Jon articulates a passing theory about the meaning of the document when he says: "So is that what that sentence is referring to? A follow up visit? That if they find out in your initial visit that you're really sick then you'll be seen sooner?" Jon's questions are left unanswered, but the rest of the group continues to form passing theories about the meaning of the passage, until little by little they begin to define "sick" as Bob suggests, "people who need attention right now." Dee adds to this the word "immediate," suggesting an emergency situation. Sam puts their interpretations together in the sentence "If you need immediate attention, you can be seen right away."
In this conversation, the students formed passing theories about the expectations for the document without the benefit of Dr. Chmura's immediate response to the questions they have raised. After this class session, I mentioned the students' question about the meaning of the word "sick" to Dr. Chmura. When I received his response, I relayed it to Dee in the following e-mail message:

2. What is the definition of a "sick" patient? In the document about welcoming the patient to the clinic, there is mention of priority given to "sick" patients. [The doctor] said that defining "sick" would be very difficult to do. His immediate response was that "sick" meant patients who had severe breathing problems. (He mentioned patients with angioedema). He admitted, though, that most allergy patients will have problems breathing--so it couldn't be mentioned in the document that "sick" patients have trouble breathing. Instead, he suggested that the document states "Emergent cases in which symptoms are severe may receive priority." Or something to that effect. They key word there is "emergent," as in emergency.

Notice the ways in which the students tried to define the word "sick" and the ways in which the doctor defined "sick." The students wanted to discuss "sick" in terms of time or scheduling: "sick patients will be seen right away." Dr. Chmura's response referred directly to medical conditions that might be related to the definition of sick: "severe breathing problems" or "angioedema."

Although the students did not have this medical knowledge, even after reading his response they did not incorporate the medical definition. Instead, they emphasized the part of Dr. Chmura's suggestion that correlated with time: the word "emergent." Their final version of this section of the Welcome Document read as follows (see also Appendix A, Figure 9):

**Appointments**

You may see us by calling for an appointment. A new patient work-up and testing date generally can be obtained within four weeks. A regular
follow-up visit may take up to two additional weeks, although patients with severe symptoms will be seen right away.

As you can see from this final version, the students resolved the definition of “sick” by removing the word “sick” from the document and replacing it with more concrete description "patients with severe symptoms." They also kept awareness of the scheduling issue by acknowledging that these patients would be "seen right away."

I discovered yet another episode of the third space regarding other technical information. A common stumbling block for students working on the project included the Patient Consultation form in which the doctor requested a specific organization for the symptom influences section of the form. After I had spoken with Dr. Chmura in our preliminary visit, I had written this suggestion down and handed it to students: "Symptom influences could be categorized into dust, mold, pollens, animal danders. It could also be divided into allergic and nonallergic categories. He says this section is 'a mess.' You may want to research some categories to make them exclusive." Student groups working on this document, the Patient Consultation form (see Appendix A, Figure 4), consistently had trouble with this section of the document. One conversation I had with a student, Doug, relayed the confusion his group had with this section and Dr. Chmura's suggestion.

LA: Are you saying it's redundant or what are you saying. Repetitive?
Doug: Well I just. To me these are clear boxes to mark some, something about you where it could go through N [nasal] and C [chest] and that. But when it doesn't go through N and C it stops being complete because we've got seven different possibilities. Nasal, chest, [and if symptoms don't fall into these two categories], then what?
LA: Yeah, he, he did mention that those categories weren’t complete. You know, they don’t cover everything.

Doug: Yeah right. So do you think it would be easier. So just leave them in boxes and just mark it and put an X in it? To me it would be easier for the patient. He’s probably going to know what, like you said, might affect your eyes and nose and what would affect your chest.

LA: Um, yeah. I think he’s trying to do is match these allergens to—

Doug: To how it affects them.

LA: Right. So that’s the N and C.

Doug: Right. But—

LA: Hm. Good point.

Doug: They’ve already said, you know, what kind of symptoms they get. So it’s... to me it makes sense just to say what affects your symptoms than whether it affects your... without being specific, cause you could say three for this one and four for this one—

LA: Uh huh

Doug: It’s gonna be, they’re going to be more depleted in... if I was fillin’ this out and it said "mark which of these seven is affected by each of these 20 things here" I’m not going to, I’m going to look through it faster and not be as detailed so they could be more efficient and just have boxes set up and ignore the N and C stuff.

LA: OK

Doug: And that’s my opinion.

[short break]

LA: Yeah, I don’t know what to tell you about that.

In this excerpt, Doug has made a passing theory about what might be easier for the audience. He has put himself in the place of the audience. Section IV of this document asks patients not only to indicate their symptoms, but to indicate their symptoms in terms of medical categories such as "Nasal" and "Chest."

Doug makes the point that these classifications are not complete, and because some symptoms may not fall in these categories, he makes a passing theory in which he suggests that the document may be better if these categories were removed. Instead, his solution is to divide symptoms into "Direct" and "Indirect" categories. As seen in Doug’s revision of this document (Appendix A, Figure 10), Doug only describes a few symptoms as direct, and he describes many
more as indirect. The terms direct and indirect do not have medical significance; Doug simply found them more helpful.

Although Doug is aware of Dr. Chmura's suggestion, he essentially overrides Chmura's suggestion and makes another passing theory about what the audience might expect from the document and what might be easier for the patient to fill out. In response, I attempt to defend Dr. Chmura's suggestion through a passing theory about what I think Dr. Chmura means: "Um, yeah. I think he's trying to do is match these allergens." But in the end, Doug does not consider this alternative. Instead, he leaves the conversation saying "And that's my opinion," whereas I comment, "Yeah, I don't know what to tell you about that." As a result, our interpretations about the document expectations are left unresolved, even though we both made guesses about the technical information.

From this excerpt, we see that the nasal/chest distinction is unclear to both the instructor and the student. Other groups struggled with this section as well. In another discussion, a student, Andrew, voiced his confusion over the allergic/nonallergic categories: "So, is that like, nonallergic, does that mean a one time reaction to [an allergen]? . . . Well I mean, I don't know, I just. This seems just like a stupid section to me. Like something the doctor should just ask about." Students had a difficult time understanding the medical classifications that Dr. Chmura had suggested as organizational categories. In response, many of them seemed simply to eliminate those classifications, just as Doug's group did. I believe this analysis shows how interpretations of medical information directly influenced the students' final documents. The third space episodes show these different interpretations, and the excerpt here shows that these mismatches of interpretation were left unresolved.
Technical Information in Consultations with Dr. Chmura

Groups received the opportunity to check out their interpretations in discussions with Dr. Chmura at the end of the project. For example, Doug took the opportunity in his group presentation with Dr. Chmura to ask directly about the nasal/chest distinction in the original document (see Appendix A, Figure 4).

Doug: One other thing that we did change about this ah, we weren't really sure how to do it. I didn't before mention, I think in the old one here about

Dr.: Chest and nasal?

Doug: Yeah, right. And the problem we had with that is, what if it affects your sinuses, or something that isn't chest or nasal related?

Dr.: Like skin for example.

Doug: Yeah, exactly. And without saying "mark all 1 through 8 that apply to each of these," we thought that would be too cumbersome for the patient and they wouldn't've put the time into giving up accurate information. And we thought that this was about the best way to just make this a simple check box because the main point is that you can get the information you want, and it's hard for the patient, and if it's hard for them to read they are not going to fill it out accurately. So this was the way what we came up with as far as handling that. I think that with the boxes—I noticed a lot of applications anymore have these—a nice box where it groups the information together. It's easier to fill out and to read. . . we feel it's a lot easier to read. This [original document] gets a little, ya know, it looks a little cluttered in places when you try to read it through and ah, something like this is right there in front of you. So. I guess that's ah. . .

Similar to the classroom discussion, Doug acknowledges his confusion about the categories, but then proceeds by forming passing theories about how this confusion could be clarified. Although Doug expresses his hesitation with this section "we weren't really sure how to do it," in this conversation with Dr. Chmura, Doug nonetheless asserts his position in attempt to resolve the misinterpretation.
In response, Dr. Chmura takes time to explain this nasal/chest distinction and seems to suggest that this distinction important:

Dr.: Without me getting technical, the trigger thing is a confusing thing. I've not been happy with this for ah, the main reason you might, like you say the nose chest thing, it is, a little confusing. But also the triggers aren't really stratified according to the types of triggers that there are. We talk about allergic triggers. We talk about triggers for asthma and allergies, and asthma and (?) nasal symptoms as being either allergic or nonallergic. And one of the ways I think I, I, you know I don't know that I gave you guys the technical information you needed to recognize that and none of the other groups did either. And I think one of the things I will do when I revise this is stratify, you know, put the mold triggers, like mowing. You might think of it as a grass trigger but it's really a mold trigger. It picks up the mold spores from the ground. Christmas trees are a mold trigger. Ah, ah, things like basements, barns are all mold triggers whereas vacuums, dust, dustmite triggers or seasonal things like pollen triggers and ah, the stratifying those allergic triggers from nonallergic triggers. Like something like cold air would traditionally bother you know, a characteristically asthmatic patient. Exercise would bother someone with asthma. Even though it's not triggering allergen exposure. So probably...

Dr. Chmura's response, together with Doug's comments, comprise a third space episode because their comments, collectively, illustrate varying interpretations about technical information. I have mentioned that Doug attempts to resolve this mismatch of interpretation by forming passing theories about what he believes the document should contain. Dr. Chmura, on the other hand, attempts to resolve the mismatch of interpretation by sharing the medical explanation for the nasal and chest categories in the document. Notice that in Dr. Chmura's response I have not identified any utterances that express a passing theory. I have not identified passing theories here because Dr. Chmura responds by expressing his prior knowledge (or prior theory) about medical information rather than by forming a passing theory that questions Doug's response in order
to better understand it. Dr. Chmura simply shares the technical knowledge he feels is necessary to clarify Doug's confusion. The result, I believe, is that this third space episode demonstrates different prior theories about technical information but little resolution or agreement about the misinterpretation.

Instead, Dr. Chmura responds to Doug's misinterpretation using his prior theory about nasal and chest distinction by explaining in concrete examples what constitutes the distinction between allergic and nonallergic categories. Notice the different vocabulary used by both Doug and Dr. Chmura. Doug mentions that the patients may not be able to understand the form and so they will not provide "accurate information." Doug avoids the use of any medical- or allergy-specific terms. Instead, Doug slips into an explanation of design "check boxes," and he focuses on the visual organization of the section instead. Dr. Chmura responds by explaining "triggers" and his dissatisfaction with this section of the form. Through concrete examples (i.e., cold air is a nonallergic trigger), Dr. Chmura attempts to address Doug's confusion with the technical information. He does so by forming passing theories in an attempt to explain the technical information to Doug and the rest of his group. What is also interesting about this excerpt, however, is that while Dr. Chmura addresses the misinterpreted technical information, he does not respond at all to the design issues that Doug mentioned—the check boxes. Although Dr. Chmura and Doug both expressed their prior theories about medical information, these excerpts do not show that they understood each other or resolved their misinterpretations. Rather, this analysis shows the intersection of varying interpretations about medical information. These varying interpretations contributes to their indeterminate understanding of the expectations for the project.
As the discussion continues, however, Doug and Dr. Chmura do attempt to resolve their mismatch of interpretations, though I believe they do so unsuccessfully. Responding to Dr. Chmura's suggestion, Doug asks if his group approached the problem correctly (the excerpt below does not demonstrate a third space episode, but rather further explanation of the third space episode above).

Doug: Is this kind of what we . . .
Dr.: Yeah, this is nice. You picked up on some of the nuance—that I didn't give explicit information to really—but so far, I don't think anyone has picked up on direct or indirect or intrinsic triggers, nonallergic triggers.
Doug: We were looking for something like under dust and then all categories that may affect it even though these can affect more of the mold and dust and things like that.
Dr.: Yeah, yeah put it in some broad categories such as allergic and nonallergic categories, and then sub-stratify the allergic triggers into dust mold danders, and pollen. So that's great. Thank you very much.

This continuing excerpt confirms the lack of resolve in Doug and Dr. Chmura's misinterpretations about technical information. Really, Doug's group had eliminated the broader categories of "allergic" and "nonallergic" and substituted them with "direct" and "indirect." Dr. Chmura is being generous here; while the stratification he suggested seems agreeable to Doug and his group, it was not enacted in the document. And even after this exchange (above), Doug believes that his group's interpretation of the medical information was adequate when in reality it was not medically accurate. This excerpt solidifies to me that the indeterminacy of this particular writing act shown in the third space episode earlier was not resolved; students were not sure of the
medical information and made their own decisions based on an indeterminate understanding of the information.

For the most part, excerpts that addressed technical information demonstrate misinterpretations of medical information specific to the clinic documents. These misinterpretations, revealed in the third space analysis, are important to the accuracy of the clinic documents. Even though Doug, for example, may have decided that his interpretation of the nasal and chest distinction was correct, because it was medically incorrect, his version of the document was not chosen. Dr. Chmura was kind to praise the work of Doug and his group, but had this been a workplace situation (i.e., a technical writer being paid for this work), these misinterpretations would have needed to be worked out more completely. At any rate, the third space helped to identify misinterpretations of technical information that were crucial to the documents. This analysis showed an indeterminate understanding of medical information that influenced the students' writing.40

Discussion

Much more could be said about this project, and the results I have shared here represent only a small part of the data I collected. However, I believe that even the few excerpts I have included here reflect the indeterminacy of meaning present in all writing acts, especially in the specific interactions between Dr. Chmura and the students. And these excerpts reflect the various interpretations that can be generated in different communicative interactions. In Table 1: Summary of Third Space Episode Findings, I outline the various expectations

40In emphasizing knowledge about medical information, this analysis shows the importance of content in the writing act. A future study may focus more exclusively on content as a factor of indeterminacy in the writing act.
Table 1: Summary of Third Space Episode Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students’ and Instructor's Prior Theories about Writing</th>
<th>Passing Theories (Questions and Guesses about Writing)</th>
<th>Dr. Chmura's Prior Theories about Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom discussions about document expectations</td>
<td>Brief descriptions about many allergies are included.</td>
<td>What other documents are there? Does he want any information emphasized?</td>
<td>Suggestion: Do not repeat information from the other documents that patients receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ Dr. Chmura discussions about document expectations</td>
<td>Bold print emphasizes words that are important to the audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom discussions about technical information</td>
<td>“Sick” patients must be seen right away.</td>
<td>Aren’t all allergy patients ‘sick’?</td>
<td>“Sick” means patients with breathing problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ Dr. Chmura discussions about document expectations</td>
<td>N [nasal] and C [chest] organization is not helpful.</td>
<td>Are the check boxes Ok?</td>
<td>N [nasal] and C [chest] organization is important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expressed by Dr. Chmura and the students, and I outline some of the ways that the third space foregrounds questions and guesses about these expectations.

As Table 1 indicates, in the excerpts dealing with classroom discussions about document expectations, the third space episodes foreground concrete questions about Dr. Chmura's expectations for the clinic documents. Questions about Dr. Chmura's concrete suggestions were frequently asked in classroom
discussions about the project; however, because Dr. Chmura was absent from these discussions, these questions were sometimes left unanswered. As a result, these discussions did not always influence the final written documents, as was the case in the first excerpt examined.

In excerpts in which students and Dr. Chmura discussed expectations for the documents, the third space episode demonstrated varying interpretations of classroom or workplace expectations for the documents. This excerpt shows the strong prior theories that emerged in communicative interaction (students often phrased their expectations for the document in rhetorical terms; doctor often phrased his expectations in terms specific to allergies). In this excerpt, students directly discussed their work with Dr. Chmura. Recall that in this excerpt, the student group discussed their use of design (bold print) to address the audience. In comparison to these more rhetorically-phrased document expectations, Dr. Chmura's comments were very limited. Rarely did he comment about design, and his only comment about audience concerned the "problem" of audience. The doctor and the students did not seem to connect with each other or ask questions about what the other said because both Dr. Chmura and the students were locked into their own interpretations.

Similarly, various interpretations were evident when Dr. Chmura did mention aspects of the clinic documents that resembled academic expectations, like purpose (i.e., "function"). Students did not question or probe his comments. Perhaps this lack of response is due to Dr. Chmura's use of terms that were specific to his workplace environment (i.e., Medicare and Medicaid). In this excerpt, although prior theories were expressed in terms of classroom and workplace expectations, no connections were made between students and the doctor. In this case the lack of passing theories, and the strong interpretations
based on prior theories, may have represented the gap between academic and nonacademic expectations for written documents. Or, the lack of passing theories could have demonstrated the students' lack of technical knowledge about allergies.

In excerpts that showed classroom discussions about technical information, the third space foregrounded a compilation of passing theories about the meaning of a technical term. In this excerpt, students' formed guesses about the meaning of the word "sick," but then formed new guesses about the meaning of the word after hearing Dr. Chmura's explanation. In this case, students were influenced by the doctor's medical explanation of the word, and their final written document was influenced as well.

Finally, discussions between students and Dr. Chmura about technical information demonstrated a misinterpretation of technical information. The student, Doug, argued that the "nasal" and "chest" categories should be removed from the original document; Dr. Chmura suggested that they were important to keep. Although Doug and Dr. Chmura had the opportunity to discuss their varying interpretations, few connections were made. Doug and his group thought that their new version of the document was accurate, and Dr. Chmura kindly complimented their work, although their understanding of the medical information was inaccurate. Even though both Doug and Dr. Chmura made the effort to check out their interpretations of medical information, their discussion did not result in a determinate understanding of the technical information.

I believe that these results demonstrate that indeterminacy of meaning can result from communicative interaction in the writing act. Various interpretations were acknowledged in these discussions, but they did not influence the final written documents in the same ways. Furthermore, I believe
these results suggest that mismatches of interpretations were more often
resolved through passing theories in classroom discussions than in discussions
with Dr. Chmura. Rather, in discussions with Dr. Chmura, varying
interpretations seemed to be only expressed and not resolved. This finding
suggests that participants were sometimes unable to bridge different classroom
and workplace expectations for the documents, though perhaps they may have
been able to if they conversed regularly throughout the project instead of only at
the end of the project.

Implications

These results have clear implications, I believe, for technical
communication pedagogy. One implication is that academic conventions of
technical communication alone do not comprise the writing act; rather, the
writing act also involves the indeterminacy of meaning that arises from
communicative interaction about writing. In this case, the writing act was made
more complex by the different expectations for the document as well as the
technical expertise required for the documents. I believe that the third space can
be a strong explanatory tool for investigating miscommunications about
technical or interdisciplinary information because it highlights different
understandings of information that may emerge in communicative interaction.
The ability to recognize these differences may benefit students as they practice
communicating technical information. To introduce the third space in the
classroom, teachers might have students enact dialogues that demonstrate
miscommunications (particularly of technical information) and then discuss the
dialogues in more detail.
Another implication for teachers of technical writing is that the third space helps to solidify an understanding of audience. If students have the opportunity to interact with their audience (or someone who has a solid understanding of audience)—particularly in a public writing assignment—students will realize that audience expectations for a document may differ from their own. By examining dialogues between writers and audiences, students may learn to identify these different expectations for documents. In addition, students engaged in discussions focused on Dr. Chmura's suggestions were learning to adapt their communication to a specific audience and purpose. By exploring and discussing the various interpretations of Dr. Chmura's suggestions and expectations, students learned that audience expectations are crucial to a document.

Yet another implication of this investigation is that the third space can illustrate ways in which classroom and workplace notions of professional communication mesh and do not mesh. Earlier in this chapter I mentioned that more studies might focus on the differences between academic and nonacademic conceptions of technical communication to improve technical communication instruction. This investigation helped to identify classroom and workplace perceptions of technical documents, and as I pointed out, these perceptions differed between general, rhetorical expectations (i.e., appropriate address of audience, use of content, and use of design) and specific, contextualized expectations (i.e., what paper would be used for the clinic documents, how are the documents dispersed to patients).

The classroom and workplace differences, however, can also produce conflict. For example, while the third space revealed differences in expectations for the documents, the data here do not show how the final documents were
evaluated by me (letter grade) and by the clinic (chosen final documents). Students understood the need to tailor these documents to the clinic and to Dr. Chmura's suggestions; however, they were also graded by me. Students were conflicted by these expectations and wondered how or if they would be the same. A future study might examine how documents are evaluated in both environments. Such an investigation might reveal varying motives for workplace communication and help define the criteria for technical documents that bridge both general rhetorical concerns and specific workplace applications.
CHAPTER FIVE
INTERPRETATION AND WRITING CENTER PEDAGOGY

In the last two chapters I outlined and described implications of hermeneutic universalism and the third space for writing pedagogy in the classroom. Interpretation has implications for another site of writing pedagogy—the writing center. In this chapter, I argue that writing centers are a valuable site for investigating interpretation in the writing act. The setting of the writing center is different from the writing classroom in that writing centers exclusively focus on one-to-one interactions about writing through tutorials. Because writing centers emphasize one-to-one interactions, and because the interpretive perspective emphasizes communicative interaction, I argue that writing centers are an important, if not crucial, site for closely examining interpretation in the production of discourse. In addition, I argue in this chapter that writing center tutorials can exemplify indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act that are characteristic of the interpretive perspective.

In this chapter, then, I discuss the writing center as a site for the interpretive perspective, and I explain reasons why the interpretive perspective might provide helpful theoretical support for writing center pedagogy. One reason, as I already mentioned, is that writing centers and the interpretive perspective share an interest in communicative interaction. In addition, the emphasis on the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness within the interpretive perspective matches the writing center philosophy that writing center interactions must be flexible and suited to the situation. Furthermore, the interpretive perspective—particularly the concept of the third space—
provides a way to evaluate dialogues about writing. Although current writing center literature focuses on ways to generate tutorial dialogue, the interpretive perspective provides a vehicle to examine the influence of these dialogues on the writing act.

A union between writing centers and the interpretive perspective would have certain implications for writing center pedagogy. One important implication of this union would be that writing centers would be challenged to reconsider their description of writing center interactions as student-centered. In addition, research about writing center interactions might focus less on generating dialogues and more on evaluating these dialogues for interpretation.

In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss in more detail ways in which the interpretive perspective can contribute to writing center pedagogy. To conclude the chapter, I outline implications for writing centers and interpretation, and I introduce a tutor-student situation that is the focus of my examination in Chapter Six.

Interpretive Perspective and Writing Centers Focus on Communicative Interaction

As I mentioned in chapter two, the interpretive perspective emphasizes communicative interaction. According to the hermeneutic universalist perspective, the writing act is grounded in communicative interaction that is situated and indeterminate rather than systematic. Therefore, to examine interpretation in the writing act, we must also examine the communicative interaction that occurs within it. Davidson (1984) explains the term "communicative interaction" through the interplay of prior and passing theories. We may recall that Davidson exclusively focuses on one-to-one
interactions in his explanation of passing and prior theories and the role of interpretation in the reception of discourse. In fact, one-to-one interactions provide an ideal setting in which to describe interpretation. In the last chapter, I examined a variety of interactions—some of them one-to-one—that influenced interpretation within the writing act. Communicative interaction is important to the interpretive perspective because it provides a medium through which interpretations can be examined.

Writing centers provide an ideal setting in which to examine communicative interaction in the writing act. Unlike the writing classroom, where multiple dialogues involving several people can occur, the writing center focuses exclusively on one-to-one interactions between students and tutors. By looking at writing center interactions more closely, we might learn more about the situated, indeterminate communicative interaction that influences the writing act. Writing centers, then, provide a rare opportunity to examine interpretation in the production of discourse.

Because one-to-one interactions are integral to writing center practice, writing center literature is a rich source of information about dialogues that focus on writing. In my review of writing center literature about one-to-one interactions, I discovered that one-to-one interactions are classified into different forms: tutor-student, teacher-student, and student-student interactions. Below I discuss these types of interactions in more detail.

Writing center tutorials typically involve one-to-one interactions between a tutor and a student. The one-to-one tutorial is, in fact, central to writing centers, as Christina Murphy and Steve Sherwood (1995) describe in "The Tutoring Process: Exploring Paradigms and Practices": 
Tutoring is grounded in interpersonal transactions; it is, fundamentally, a relationship more than a body of techniques or even a body of knowledge. In the tutoring session, two people work together toward a common goal; they collaborate. The purpose of the collaboration is to assist writers in their own development. The dialogue between tutor and student—a conversation with a definite purpose—is the basis upon which tutors and students build a supportive, working relationship. Thus, tutoring offers a conceptual and interpersonal framework for the sharing of ideas. (1)

As this passage demonstrates, the one-to-one interaction between tutor and student is integral to writing center tutorials, and it can even be described as a relationship. Judith Powers and Jane Nelson (1995) describe tutoring in similar terms: "Typically, this collaboration is described as an interchange between the writer and the writing center staff member, a one-to-one relationship." (12). (See also Harris 1986; Olson 1984; Bruffee 1994; Lunsford 1991.)

Beside tutor-student interactions, writing centers are informed by literature about teacher-student interactions. In fact, literature on one-to-one interactions in writing pedagogy has influenced and contributed to writing center pedagogy. For example, Muriel Harris' book Teaching One-to-One (1986) has become a staple resource among writing center support staff. In Teaching One-to-One, Harris advocates one-to-one interactions, not only as a strategy useful for tutors in the writing center, but as a teaching strategy in general:

Conferences, opportunities for highly productive dialogues between writers and teacher-readers, are or should be an integral part of teaching writing. It is in the one-to-one setting of a conference that we can meet with writers and hear them talk about their writing. And they can also hear us talk, not about writing in the abstract, but about their writing. (3)

Harris suggests that interactions in one-to-one conferences helps stimulate independent learning (10), promote interaction with readers (13), and individualize learning (15). Other research on one-to-one interactions supports
the idea that teacher-student conferences are helpful—and even necessary—in writing instruction. For example, in "Collaboration and the Teacher-Student Writing Conference," Melanie Sperling (1990) suggests that

We are coming to know, too, that learning to write—which is to say, acquiring and developing written language—is, as is learning to speak, a fundamentally social activity, embedded in interactions with teachers and others. (281)

Literature about student-student interactions also informs writing center pedagogy. One form of student-student interaction is known as peer tutoring, in which students tutor other students. Bruffee (1984) discusses peer tutoring at length in "Peer Tutoring and the 'Conversation of Mankind,'" and he praises peer tutoring for creating the kind of "normal discourse" important to writing: "... peer tutoring provides a social context in which students can experience and practice the kinds of conversation that academics most value" (7). Bruffee supports one-to-one interactions like peer tutoring through the theoretical framework of social constructionism and collaborative learning.

Another form of student-student interaction that resembles writing center tutorials is a strategy called "collaborative planning." In Making Thinking Visible: Writing, Collaborative Planning, and Classroom Inquiry, David Wallace (1994) describes "collaborative planning" as a strategy to help students discuss writing:

First and foremost, collaborative planning is socially supported talk. It is an opportunity for students or other writers to talk about their ideas in a supportive environment where peers will listen, prompt them to develop their ideas further, and, when necessary, press them to flesh out their purposes and their understandings of their audience or to think about how to use text conventions. (50)
As these examples illustrate, a common thread in one-to-one interactions in the writing center—tutor-student, teacher-student, and student-student—is talk. These interactions—particularly writing center tutorials—have a pedagogical benefit in that students can learn more about their writing by discussing it with a tutor. But beyond this benefit, I believe that writing center tutorials provide an excellent opportunity to examine interpretation and communicative interaction in the production of discourse. Writing centers provide a site to both observe and record one-to-one tutorial discussions about writing. Researchers can then explore how tutors and students respond to one another, and they can explore when and how writing occurs during these tutorials. Most important, the one-to-one setting allows us to examine conversation about writing in a way that Davidson advocates—through prior and passing theories.

**Writing Center Theoretical Perspectives Match the Interpretive Perspective**

Throughout this dissertation, I have mentioned that the interpretive perspective highlights indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in both the reception and production of discourse. I mentioned that like the postmodern and antifoundational movements, interpretation does not embrace foundational theoretical perspectives. For example, the interpretive perspective suggests that meaning is created through interpretation of language-in-use (communicative interaction) rather than in foundational structures. These features of interpretation make the perspective difficult to grasp and to apply; however, the writing center has the potential to actualize these features. Like the interpretive perspective, writing center theory ultimately rejects foundational theories (to the extent that it has no consistent theoretical framework), and it rejects social
constructionism as well. In addition, writing centers endorse the idea that meaning comes from language-in-use.

Although one-to-one interactions are commonplace in writing center tutoring, this common writing center practice lacks a consistent theoretical background (Gilliam 1994; Lunsford 1991; Hobson 1994; Murphy and Sherwood 1995). In fact, writing centers characterize themselves as multifaceted, and for this reason, they resemble postmodern and antifoundationalist theoretical perspectives—the avoidance of a Theory with a capital "T". For example, in "Writing Center Practice Often Counters Its Theory. So What?" Eric Hobson (1994) points out that writing centers have had a "patchwork" of theories (Hobson 1). This patchwork consists of everything from educational to psychological, social, behavioral, and philosophical theories (3). While it would seem that a patched theoretical framework would be problematic, writing centers seem to embrace this characteristic. That is, although writing center scholars acknowledge the importance of theory, they do not find it necessary to frame writing center work under one theoretical perspective. For example, in "The Theory Behind the Centers," Joan Mullin (1994) characterizes writing centers by their various theoretical perspectives (Intersections), and she advocates "the value of re-visioning the theories that inform our practice" (vii).

Also in accordance with the interpretive perspective and antifoundationalist theory, writing center theory has resisted social constructionism despite the fact that it has had more staying power than other theoretical frameworks in writing centers. Bruffee's work on collaborative learning in particular has influenced writing center pedagogy. However, and as the discussion below indicates, this stronger framework has not sustained writing center practice.
Bruffee's work on collaborative learning proved relevant to writing centers in part because Bruffee advocated conversation—talk—in the act of writing (the "conversation of mankind"). And, as evidenced by "Peer Tutoring and the 'Conversation of Mankind,'" Bruffee (1984) made direct connections between collaborative learning and peer tutoring: "As a form of collaborative learning, peer tutoring is important because it provides the kind of social context in which normal discourse occurs: a community of knowledgeable peers. This is the main goal of peer tutoring" (9). Collaboration and tutoring have since become well-associated over the last decade (Harris 1992, 1995; Brooks 1991; Gilliam 1994; Shiftman 1995; Powers and Nelson 1995; Lunsford 1991; Evertz 1996). For example, Murphy and Sherwood (1994) characterize tutorials as collaborative: "In the tutoring session, two people work together toward a common goal; they collaborate." (1). Andrea Lunsford (1991) also acknowledges the collaborative nature of tutorials. To accommodate collaboration, Lunsford suggests that writing centers function as "Burkean Parlours" that engage students not only in solving problems set by teachers but in identifying problems for themselves; not only in working as a group but in monitoring, evaluating, and building a theory of how groups work; not only in understanding and valuing collaboration but in confronting squarely the issues of control that successful collaboration inevitably raises; not only in reaching consensus but in valuing dissensus and diversity. (41)

Despite the support for collaborative learning as a theoretical framework for tutoring, some scholars have uncovered some major problems with social constructionism—collaborative learning in particular—as a base for writing center pedagogy. For instance, while collaboration in tutoring has been described largely as a positive activity ("a supportive, working relationship"), literature reports that the word "collaboration" also poses a threat to tutoring. One of the
dangers of calling tutoring collaborative is that some believe that tutors who "collaborate" with students end up writing student papers or that students plagiarize the ideas suggested by tutors (Formo and Welsh 1995; Brooks 1991; Cogie 1995; Haynes-Burton 1995). This concern has alarmed many scholars (Lunsford 1991; Clark 1985; Trimbur 1989) who have asserted that tutors must be careful and responsible about collaboration in writing centers. Another shortcoming of social constructionism is raised by Christina Murphy (1994), who asserts that perhaps not all writing center practice is collaborative:

Social constructionism would have us believe that, in the classroom or the writing center, students learn more through collaboration and group work than they do as individual learners. For many theorists, this is a dubious proposition and one that requires further investigation before wholesale acceptance and application within curricula emphasizing critical thinking skills. (36)

The confusion in seemingly the most promising of theoretical frameworks—social constructionism—for some has resulted in frustration over the lack of a theoretical base for writing center pedagogy. For example, after discussing the inconsistencies in various collaborative frameworks for writing centers, Alice Gilliam (1994) asserts that "it is time we utilize theory to understand and interrogate the rich complexity of writing center practice and the protean forms of writing center practice to interrogate and reinterpret theory" (51). Despite Gilliam’s noted frustration, and the frustration of a few others (Clark 1988; Lunsford 1991) regarding the need for a unified theoretical base, there seems to be more support for upholding writing center theories rather than a single Theory.

While the struggle to espouse a single theoretical framework is characteristic of the writing center, this characteristic has encouraged writing
centers to focus on practice instead. In other words, writing center scholars often look at their tutoring experiences as a guide for writing center work. In doing so, I believe writing centers reflect the interpretive perspective's focus on language-in-use rather than foundational structures. Eric Hobson (1994) argues for this focus on practice when he suggests that "no single theory can dictate writing center instruction. Instead, we must reshape theory to fit our particular needs in the particular historically located situations in which writing center practitioners find themselves" (8). Murphy and Sherwood (1994) agree:

If there is any one truth about tutoring, it is that no single method of tutoring, no one approach, will work effectively with every student in every situation. Each tutor develops a style of tutoring primarily from experience, and experience is always a dynamic process of change. (1)

As a result of this emphasis on language-in-use in writing centers, tutoring literature often recounts stories of one-to-one, unique tutorials. Murphy and Sherwood (1994), for example, base the St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors upon various experiences of contributing authors:

. . . we hear many voices commenting on the practice of tutoring—the hows, whys, why nots, shoulds, and should nots—together with the lines of reasoning and the personal experiences that support these viewpoints. We hear of success and failure and starting over again, of the continual rediscovery tutoring represents as both a learning and a teaching experience. We hear the voices of theorists who are accomplished professionals in the field as well as the voices of beginning tutors who are new to the field. We hear the voices of students who have come to tutors seeking knowledge, assistance, and reassurance. Above all, we hear the essence of tutoring; conversation. (2)

The stories and experiences captured in tutoring literature contribute to what Eric Hobson (1994) has described as the "lore" of writing centers. Although Hobson acknowledges that lore may be a problem for writing centers (2), he
ultimately supports writing center lore as a guide to practice: "[W]e need to recognize and advertise the credibility of the knowledge we can produce as reflective writing center practitioners" (9).

I believe the "lore" of writing centers—the emphasis on language-in-use—reflects the interpretive perspective in additional ways. First, I believe that the many experiences reported in tutoring literature represent what Rorty would call "recontextualization." Rorty states that interpretations are contextualized and recontextualized in relation to previous interpretations. In a similar fashion, writing center lore continually reweaves and shapes current practice based on past experience. In this way, writing centers seem to reflect the interpretive perspective—the hermeneutic universalist perspective—that Rorty outlines.

Another reflection of the interpretive perspective in writing centers is the idea that the writing act is fluid and dynamic. As I have described in previous chapters, interpretation represents indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act. This indeterminate nature of communicative interaction matches the description of "individualized," one-to-one interactions that Murphy and Sherwood describe as the core of writing center practice. Tutorials are dynamic, and interactions vary from tutorial to tutorial. The interpretive perspective I have outlined provides for this dynamism. Consequently, the interpretive perspective suggests that dialogue cannot be codified in any structured, systematic way, and this assertion supports the nature of writing center tutorials described by writing center scholars.
The Interpretive Perspective Contributes Evaluation of Tutorial Dialogue

As I have just reviewed, the interpretive perspective emphasizes communicative interaction and suggests that this communicative interaction cannot be easily codified or structured. Writing center theory and the interpretive perspective seem to agree on these points; however, while scholarly discussions about writing center practice emphasize the dynamism and fluidity of writing center dialogues, a closer examination of writing center practice reveals more structure than one might expect. Although writing centers may not suggest a single theoretical perspective, they do suggest structured practices regarding (1) how tutorial dialogues should be generated; and (2) how tutors should respond to those dialogues. While these strategies help foster dialogues about writing, and while I credit these strategies for that goal, I argue that these strategies are problematic because they attempt to codify dialogue. That is, in a foundational fashion, these strategies attempt to structure and mold tutorial dialogue in conventional ways—ways that define "good" and "bad" tutor behavior. While these strategies can be helpful, they can also limit tutor dialogue to a code of behavior rather than a candid interaction about writing. These structured, codified behaviors counter the fluid, indeterminate nature of tutorials described in more theoretical discussions about writing centers; consequently, they also contradict the interpretive perspective.

I believe this contradiction between the interpretive perspective and writing center theory is problematic; however, it is also an opportunity to contribute to writing center literature about tutor-student interactions. Specifically, the interpretive perspective can offer insight into interpreting and evaluating tutorial dialogue rather than generating dialogue. In the sections
below, I describe in more detail the tutoring strategies that limit tutorial
dialogue, and I suggest ways in which they can be reshaped.

One way writing center dialogues are structured is through strategies used
to generate dialogues. While these strategies are helpful, the interpretive
perspective can contribute to these strategies by reminding writing center
practitioners that strategies are only conventions: they do not equal
communicative interaction. Examples of tutorial prompts, or ways to generate
dialogue, are plentiful in writing center literature. For instance, in Talking about
Writing Beverly Clark (1985) suggests ways in which tutors can foster writing
center dialogues by asking questions (126), modeling (128), reading aloud (129),
and "deferring to the student" (130). Many studies about one-to-one tutorials
describe general prompts that can be used during tutorials for various situations.
For example, in The Practical Tutor, Emily Meyer and Louise Z. Smith (1987)
compiled the following list of questions that tutors should ask students to help
them develop ideas (34):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Amplification:</th>
<th>Tell me more about</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification:</td>
<td>I'm not sure what you mean by ______; would you explain that a bit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification:</td>
<td>Which one did you have in mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where did that happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would you give an instance, please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification:</td>
<td>What exceptions can you think of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When was this not true?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase or Summary:</td>
<td>Let me see if I can sum up what you just said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this paragraph, you said that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You told me that (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar list of prompts is found in the strategy called "collaborative
planning." In collaborative planning, students converse with one another to
learn about rhetorical elements in composition (audience, purpose, and context). Playing the roles of writer and supporter, students take turns asking each other questions about the audience, purpose, and context for their writing. Students who engage in collaborative planning are given lists with suggested prompts such as the ones below (58):

- What do you see as your main point [purpose]?
- Who is your intended audience [reader]?
- What does the reader expect to read [learn]?
- What support [or evidence] will you use?
- What examples will you use? (58)

The questions about writing in both examples above are intended to help students talk about rhetorical elements and begin to use vocabulary associated with writing studies. And these strategies should, in fact, be credited for helping students talk about writing. But while these strategies can be helpful, they can become problematic if tutors and students confuse them for dialogues, rather than simply ways to facilitate them. We might recall here Davidson’s claim that conventions are only "crutches" for language, and that conventions emerge from language—not the other way around. For example, Thomas Kent suggests that conventions are important to language, but that conventions do not shape language. Dialogue strategies like the ones above are problematic if tutors confuse these strategies for more than they really are. Tutors and students must learn how to respond to these questions rather than simply ask them. In terms of the hermeneutic perspective, then, we must be careful to recognize these strategies only as conventional crutches—ways to facilitate dialogues about writing.

Like strategies that demonstrate how to facilitate dialogue, there are also recommended strategies that demonstrate how tutors should respond to student
dialogue. These strategies comprise another way in which writing center
dialogues are structured. I believe these strategies can become rather restrictive
for tutors by forming a sort of behavior code of dos and don'ts. As a result, these
strategies tend to focus on tutor responses rather than the joint intersection of
tutor and student responses. The interpretive perspective can contribute to these
strategies by looking at both tutor and student responses in dialogue. Below I
explain in more detail the "tutor code of behavior," and I suggest how we might
focus more on the intersection of tutor/student responses through the third
space.

Many studies about one-to-one conferencing describe actual transcripts
from tutoring sessions and demonstrate how tutors should and should not
respond to varying situations (See Harris 1985; Meyer and Smith 1987; Clark 1985;
Cogie 1995; Brooks 1991). For example, Meyer and Smith include several
examples of troubled dialogues and suggest ways in which tutors should and
should not respond to them. In the example below, taken from The Practical
Tutor, Gail (tutor) discusses a paper topic with Genevieve (student).

Gail: This seems like a good beginning, but it needs to be more
developed.
Genevieve: uh-huh. So what do you mean? Should I start over?
Gail: No, I didn't say that. I just meant you need to say more, you
know, give more details.
Genevieve: You mean, hmm, like what?
Gail: Like develop the idea that she would do anything for you.
Genevieve: Well, she would. I mean, she's that way. What do you want
me to say? (29)

Meyer and Smith use this example to demonstrate improper tutor response. In a
continuing excerpt, the authors point out the tutor's shortcoming:
Genevieve's paper does suffer from a lack of "development," but because she is an inexperienced writer, she does not know what that term means or what she ought to do to "develop" her paper. Gail fails to see that Genevieve is unaccustomed to talking about writing, anybody's writing, and that she is unfamiliar with vocabulary used to name or describe elements of composition. (30)

Meyer and Smith suggest that Gail rephrase her descriptive statements into questions that allow the student to provide information about the topic (30). Further, they suggest that Gail learn to translate her comments about writing into "everyday language" (30):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC TERMINOLOGY</th>
<th>EVERYDAY LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can you illustrate</td>
<td>Why do you think this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your topic sentence?</td>
<td>What makes you think so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see two things from these excerpts. First, the tutor is essentially scolded by the authors. Second, the authors focus on the tutor response by providing ways in which Gail can reshape her dialogue. Not at any point do they ask about the student response or how the student perceives of the interaction. I believe that this focus on tutor behavior ignores the joint responsiveness integral to the interpretive perspective.

Another example from Harris' *Teaching One-to-One* demonstrates one way that tutors should engage in dialogue—in this case, "perception checking" (57):

*Perception Checking:* guessing the student's basic message and asking for affirmation of that guess. As illustrated in the conference excerpt below, this is helpful in getting a student to bring vague thoughts into sharper focus:

**Teacher:** You have lots to say about hospitals. Let's try to bring it together. What would you say is the thesis of your essay?

**Student:** About how most people are afraid of hospitals because they're afraid of what doctors might do to hurt them.
Teacher: So, the thesis is "Fear of hospitals is caused by fear of pain."
Student: That's the big part. But also there's just not knowing what
will happen to them.
Teacher: O.K. Is that a part of the thesis? A second reason for the fear
of hospitals—anxiety or fear of the unknown. Is that part of
it too? (57)

In Harris' example of perception checking we see that tutors should ask
questions and reflect student responses. These are "proper" tutor behaviors.
Tutors should, according to Harris, ask questions rather than give directives; they
should reflect what tutors say rather than voice their own opinions. We could
characterize this "good" tutor behavior as inquiry. Harris asserts in a later article
(1995) that tutoring relies on this inquiry:

Tutors use talk and questioning and all the cues they can pick up in the
face-to-face interaction. The conversation is free to roam in whatever
direction the student and tutor see as useful. That is, the tutor can ask
about writing habits and processes, can listen to the student's responses to
various questions, and can use them as cues for further questions; and the
student can express concerns not visible in the product. (29)

Although Harris' suggestions may be helpful for tutors, according to the
hermeneutic perspective these strategies fail to identify the intersection of tutor
and student responses. Rather, dialogue is focused on what tutors should say
and do.41

The examples of tutoring dialogue and suggestions for tutor behavior in
one-to-one conferences, I believe, contribute to the "lore" that Hobson
mentioned. This lore—stories of tutorial experiences, excerpts of actual dialogue,

41Tutoring roles are also described in much tutoring literature—roles that contribute, again, to tutor
code of behavior. Common roles that are encouraged are coach or guide (Clark, Harris) and even a
counselor (Taylor 1993; check WLN). Clark (1985) explains: "Perhaps the hardest thing for a tutor
or teacher to learn is that he is a guide or coach or counselor, not a dictator. The tutor or teacher
thus needs to learn restraint. He should not make corrections but help the tutee to correct and
improve himself" (110). Clark even likens the role of a tutor to that of Peace Corps volunteers,
"who seek to make themselves dispensable, by helping their hosts to help themselves" (5).
and suggestions for how one-to-one conferences should be conducted—shapes conventions and rules that are accepted in the writing center community. But more than that, they form a code of behavior. I believe this code strays from hermeneutic perspective primarily because the code is focused on the tutor, not the student. Consequently, these rules and tutor conventions tell us a lot about how tutors should interpret and respond in tutorials, but they do not tell us much about how students interpret or respond in tutorials. An interpretive perspective might add helpful insights to this practice.

Instead of focusing on how to produce one-to-one dialogues (such as providing students with prompts for questions), or on how tutors should respond to these dialogues, an interpretive perspective would focus on the intersection of tutor and student responses. Important questions might include: How do students understand tutors' questions? How do tutors' responses influence student responses? How do tutor and student understand one another? The third space concept reminds us to focus on students' as well as tutors' interpretations of the questions, comments, suggestions, or criticisms that are produced in dialogue. In an investigation of interpretation in dialogue of one-to-one interactions about writing, a researcher might observe tutor-student interactions and interview tutor and student separately to compare their interpretations of the dialogue.

The concept of the third space can be especially helpful here because it focuses on the intersection of varying interpretations in a one-to-one interaction. This intersection of student and tutor interpretation invites us to look more closely and carefully at student responses as well as tutor responses. We can perhaps learn more from tutorials this way by acknowledging that student
interpretations and responses influence tutorial dialogues just as much as tutor interpretations and responses.

**Implications of the Interpretive Perspective for Writing Center Pedagogy**

As I outlined above, the interpretive perspective matches writing centers in some ways. Writing centers' avoidance of a foundational theory aligns with the interpretive perspective, and writing center practice—like the interpretive perspective—emphasizes communicative interaction. However, the dialogic strategies advocated by writing centers do not align as much with the interpretive perspective. I mentioned that the interpretive perspective can contribute to these strategies by focusing on student as well as tutor responses. In this section, I describe how and why writing centers might alter their view of student-centered tutorials. In addition, I further explain how we might examine tutorial dialogue through the lens of interpretation.

**Reconsidering Student-Centered Tutorials**

I mentioned that structured dialogic strategies often focus on tutor, rather than student, response in tutorial interactions. Many times, these strategies are designed to create a "student-centered" pedagogy in writing centers. This pedagogy suggests that tutors should encourage students to talk about their writing and refrain from offering direct suggestions during tutorials. However, interpretation, when connected to writing centers, challenges the student-centered philosophy that writing center tutorials should focus only on student contributions to dialogue. According to the interpretive perspective, interaction in the writing center would focus on all contributions to dialogue. In fact, the
interpretive perspective relies on the interplay—the communicative interaction—between dialogue participants.

The lore that I described earlier regarding tutor code of behavior suggests that tutors should respond in certain ways to students during tutorials to support a student-centered pedagogy. These suggested behaviors are shaped in large part by Stephen North's (1984) argument in "The Idea of a Writing Center" that students must be guided, not dictated, by tutors. North argues that students should be allowed to voice their thoughts and concerns and ideas, and that tutors should not interfere. This argument meshed with the process movement—particularly, North's argument is a response to the claim that writing centers are "fix-it shops" rather than writing centers. The fix-it shop model, a representative of the current-traditional movement, suggests that the writing center is a place for students to correct their written papers. The fix-it shop model specifically focuses on grammar and mechanics as well as proofreading papers that have already been written; consequently, this model encourages students to focus on product rather than process. Instead, the student-centered argument suggests that writing centers are a place where students come for help several times during the process of writing their paper. In this process-based model, students may receive help brainstorming paper topics, developing main ideas, or revising their papers. North advocates the process model, and he connects this model to a student-centered pedagogy through which students can learn about their own writing process, not about how to "fix" a paper by simple proofreading.42

While benefits of process over product models of writing are clear, student-centered pedagogy has created certain implications for tutor code of

---

42Proofreading is a sore spot for writing centers even today. Many writing centers mention on their advertising materials that writing centers WILL NOT proofread student papers; they will, however, help teach students how to proofread.
behavior that restrict tutors' roles in writing center dialogue. For example, in order to foster a student-centered environment, Harris (1995) suggests that tutors should refrain from offering direct advice or suggestions in tutorials. Beverly Clark also carefully describes the role of a tutor as guide, not dictator. And several writing center scholars have suggested that tutors should play a "minimal" role in tutorials. For example, Jeff Brooks (1991) advocates "minimalist tutoring" in which a tutor acts as a soundboard, repeating and reflecting students thoughts and ideas, and helping students to further develop ideas. Jane Cogie (1995) argues as well that tutors must not correct student papers through proofreading but rather teach them how to make corrections themselves.  

Despite strong support for a student-centered or non-directive approach in writing center literature, I argue that, according to the interpretive perspective, the student-centered approach to tutoring is misleading. The term "student-centered" suggests that dialogues focus on one participant in the dialogue—the student. According to the interpretive perspective, no tutoring dialogue can be student-centered. Any dialogue involving more than one person automatically involves all participants whose interactions influence the dialogic interaction. The interpretive perspective emphasizes the interaction of all communicators at a specific moment and time. Student-centered tutorial approaches sometimes downplay tutor involvement to the point that tutors are restricted from offering advice or concrete suggestions. I believe this restriction of tutor behavior is unnecessary. Furthermore, I believe that an interpretive perspective within tutoring accommodates any type of tutor response because it is interpretation that matters. The interpretive perspective is concerned with how tutor and

[^3] Cogie's argument is especially focused on ESL student learners who visit the writing center.
student understand one another rather than the kind and type of responses a tutor provides. Given this perspective, we might fully embrace the idea that each writing center tutorial is unique and that no single strategy can dictate or predict the direction of all tutorials (such as student-centered strategies).

**Incorporating Interpretation in Writing Center Dialogues**

Besides emphasizing both student and tutor responses in tutorials, viewing tutorials for interpretation requires attention to the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in tutoring dialogues. The concept of the third space accomplishes this by focusing on passing and prior theories in communicative interaction. Passing theories demonstrate the questions, doubts, and uncertainties that are expressed in communicative interaction. To supplement the idea of third space, I review another helpful (and uncommon) study on tutorials and interpretation, as well as Davidson's comments about passing and prior theory.

Although few writing center studies look at interpretation as a way to understand tutorials, one noteworthy article by Mary Abascal-Hildebrand (1994) entitled "Tutor and Student Relations: Applying Gadamer's Notions of Translation" suggests how tutorials might be examined for interpretation. In this article, Abascal-Hildebrand describes interpretation as a process of translation involved in "reflective tutoring." According to Abascal-Hildebrand, reflective tutoring "... enables both tutors and students to leave a tutoring event thinking and acting differently as writers [and] enables them to renew themselves as persons." (172). Abascal-Hildebrand's idea of reflective tutoring relies on a process of interpretation that she calls "translation," meaning that tutors take time to understand students' utterances in tutorials. Abascal-Hildebrand
grounds the idea of translation in Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics (172). This translation does not require tutors to apply a codified dialogic strategy:

Reflective tutors interpret and translate more consciously; however, conscious translation is neither a method nor an arrangement that can be settled ahead of time between tutors and students. Rather, translation is something that happens to an interpreter in the process of using reflective judgment to simultaneously interpret and translate what she understands. When this something happens in speech, an interpreter becomes a translator. (173)

Abascal-Hildebrand's idea of translation challenges codified tutoring strategies because it suggest that this act cannot be codified, categorized, or planned ahead of time. Because interpretation is indeterminate, as Abascal-Hildebrand suggests, we may learn more from this approach than codified strategies are able to tell us about tutoring. To strengthen this idea, she borrows from Gadamer the idea that "understanding, even when acquired, is always limited." (173) Abascal-Hildebrand affirms this idea by suggesting that "... understanding is a never-quite-fully-accomplished activity ... partial understanding and misunderstanding are inevitable" (173).

Davidson's explanation of passing and prior theories also reinforce the point that interpretation is indeterminate. In "A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs," Davidson makes the point that structured, conventional language, such as generative grammar, may shape a person's intention to communicate, but may not completely explain how the process of communication occurs. We might relate this point to tutoring by questioning the ability of codified dialogic

"Abascal-Hildebrand's choice of the term "translation" is interesting. Although she bases the term on Gadamer's idea of "partial understanding," the term also bears resemblance to the Rogerian dialogue strategy that encourages counselors to act as sounding boards and avoid directive or corrective comments. I believe Abascal-Hildebrand intends the term translation to represent the indeterminacy of interpretation rather than the simple act of translating meaning."
approaches such as codified approaches that shape tutorial conversations in a
certain way. According to Davidson, instead of codified language structures,
interpretation takes the form of the passing theory, or a person's attempt to
understand someone else, and Davidson stresses that passing theory is not a
foundational convention. Passing theory is a temporary construction that occurs
in the process of communicative interaction. Therefore, Davidson argues that
despite our prior theories about how we communicate (i.e., conventional
language structures or tutorial dialogic strategies), passing theory is the only
thing that matters:

What must be shared for communication to succeed is the passing theory.
For the passing theory is the one the interpreter actually uses to interpret
an utterance, and it is the theory the speaker intends the interpreter to use.
Only if these coincide is understanding complete. (442)

We can connect Davidson's idea of passing theory to Abascal-Hildebrand's
description of translation. Consider the passage below:

Tutors as speakers must be aware of [the presumption that two speakers
speak the same language] so that they can recreate greater opportunities to
grasp more of students' intended meanings. They can re-learn to re-
question themselves and the students they tutor, re-respond, re-attend to
signs, marks, and gestures, and re-clarify expressions. Tutors can become
interpreters and translators. (180)

As tutors re-respond, re-question, and re-clarify, I suggest they form
passing theories to understand students better. Abascal-Hildebrand suggests that
students, as well as tutors, should engage in this process: "Moving students to
new realms through engaging them in translating what they know into their
papers can open doors into disciplines for students and promote teachers' belief
in a transformative approach to writing and to writing center tutoring" (182). As
both Davidson and Absacal-Hildebrand suggest, interpretation is an indeterminate activity, and this activity is the result of interaction between participants in dialogue. I believe these suggestions are useful in understanding how indeterminacy is present writing center tutorials.

As I have reviewed in this chapter, because writing centers involve one-to-one interactions in their daily practice, they are a valuable site for investigating the role of interpretation in the production of discourse. However, some aspects of writing centers correspond to the interpretive perspective, such as discussions about multi-faceted theories, while other aspects such as emphasis on structured dialogue strategies do not correspond to the interpretive perspective. The interpretive perspective therefore can contribute to writing center literature by suggesting ways in which tutorials can be examined for interpretation, rather than for ways to generate tutoring dialogue. In focusing on interpretation, we may discover the indeterminate nature of the writing act that emerges through communicative interaction about writing. Furthermore, we may come to understand that tutorial strategies cannot predict tutorial dialogue.

Examining tutorial dialogue for indeterminacy means focusing on the intersection of tutor and student responses and exploring the ways in which responses influence interaction. This type of examination would involve observation of one-to-one interactions and interviews of all participants. Important questions involved in this examination include: How do participants understand one another? How do dialogue responses in a tutorial influence a student's written work? What does the student understand from the tutorials? The third space identifies the intersection of student and tutor responses and provides helpful support for this type of investigation.
In the next chapter, I examine actual tutor-student dialogues for interpretation using the concept of the third space. This investigation focuses on a tutor-student pair that worked together throughout a semester in a writing center. Through examinations of various dialogues, traces of the tutoring strategies I described in this chapter can be found. However, these approaches are not the focal point of my examination. Rather, I examine both tutor and student responses—particularly their interpretations—of writing knowledge and subject matter knowledge, and I discuss how their varying interpretations reflect indeterminacy of meaning as well as how those interpretations influence the tutorial and the student's final paper.
In the previous chapter, I suggested that the writing center was an appropriate site to examine the role of interpretation in the writing act. In this chapter, I examine the role of interpretation in actual tutor-student dialogues in the writing center. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, writing center literature has been concerned with dialogic strategies and the roles tutors should play in those dialogues. While these strategies can be helpful in fostering tutorial dialogues in the writing center, I suggest that these strategies cannot predict or control dialogue in any determinate fashion. In addition, these strategies are limited because they do not demonstrate how dialogues influence the writing act. By examining tutorial dialogues for interpretation, we may learn more about the indeterminacy of the writing act and the ways in which interpretations influence student writing.

The writing center dialogues that I examine in this chapter come from a semester-long examination in which tutorial sessions of a tutor-student pair were observed. The student in this investigation was assigned to write an argumentative paper about a topic of her choice. The topic of this student's paper concerned the issue of white supremacy in relation to a campus debate that was occurring at the time she was writing. The student was assigned to work with the same writing tutor throughout the semester to help develop her argumentative paper.

In examining the dialogues that occurred in these student-tutor sessions, I focus on episodes of the third space that demonstrate mismatches of interpretations between the tutor and student. Through these third space
episodes, I attempt to demonstrate how indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness emerged from communicative interaction between the tutor and student and how the student’s written paper was influenced by this communicative interaction. In my investigation, I found that the third space episodes materialized in two general categories: knowledge about writing (i.e., topic sentences, organization, using quotes to support claims), and knowledge about subject matter of the student’s paper (in this case, subject matter included understanding the concept of white supremacy). I also found that specific tutoring strategies used in the dialogues did not create predictable results. I believe these results reflect the indeterminacy of meaning in communicative interactions about writing; further, these results show how interpretations influenced the student's final paper. (See Appendix C, Figure 2, for a copy of the student's final paper.)

Before moving into a description of this investigation, I believe it is necessary first to situate this investigation in a discussion of specific tutoring strategies that emerged in the dialogues. Below, I discuss two specific strategies—directive and non-directive—and issues related to these strategies in writing center literature.

**Tutor Dialogic Strategies**

I mentioned in the previous chapter that tutoring literature encourages strategies that help tutors generate tutorial dialogue as well as help tutors respond to tutorial dialogues. For me, these strategies raise an important issue about tutoring dialogue that I feel has not been resolved: tutoring literature is dominated by the suggestion that tutors should assume passive, “non-directive” roles in tutorials (the student-centered model). Some popular strategies tend to
ignore the types of directive, constructive comments that tutors can make in
tutorials that might help students improve their writing. Below I discuss this
issue in more detail by describing directive and non-directive models and their
implications in current writing center pedagogy.

Strategies of tutorial dialogue can be classified into two general categories:
non-directive and directive. In non-directive tutoring, tutors are discouraged
from showing any kind of authority (Harris 1995), such as by making suggestions
on text or comments on expression or mechanics. A response to criticism that
writing centers focused only on written products (student papers), non-directive
tutoring models encourage a process-based approach to tutoring to help improve
writers, not papers (North 1984). In this non-directive model, then, tutors are
encouraged to ask questions, listen, reflect student ideas (much like a Rogerian
dialogue model in psychology), and play the role of a coach or guide for the
student (Clark 1985; Harris 1986; Harris 1995). For example, in Talking About
Writing, Beverly Clark asserts that "a student learns more if she is active rather
than passive, doing rather than simply listening" (1). According to Clark, the
role of the tutor is to ask questions that allow the student to talk and control the
conversation. Clark describes this tutor dialogue strategy as serving "as a
sounding board" (121). Being a sounding board means that a tutor listens,
encourages talk, mirrors students thoughts, confirms problems that students
sense, and even partakes in silence as a way to draw out student conversation
(124-125). Clark also advises tutors to ask questions, read aloud sections of a
student's paper, and model thought processes for students (128-129).

In contrast to non-directive tutoring, directive tutoring encourages a tutor
to offer suggestions for improvement and make mechanical and grammatical
corrections. In this direct approach, described as "teacher-centered" by Reigstad
and McAndrew (1984), tutors openly offer direct, authoritative comments. Reigstad and McAndrew suggest that this approach might be used for proofreading, in which the tutor indicates places that need to be corrected and a student corrects those places:

In a teacher-centered conference, the student tends to sit passively as the tutor reads through the draft and, pen in hand, corrects mechanical errors or supplies alternative, improved sentences and paragraphs. The tutor asks few questions, and the questions are usually closed or leading. A teacher-centered tutor issues directives for specific revisions to be made. There is some talk about ideas, usually to allow the student to clarify a point, but off-the-paper talk is restricted. (31)

Reigstad and McAndrew describe the teacher-centered or directive approach as only an option that tutors might find helpful to use at times (28). However, Reigstad and McAndrew suggest that a non-directive option is more desirable for the student because "it encourages the writer to do most of the talking and most of the work on the paper" (29).

Of these two categories—non-directive and directive—non-directive models have become standard in writing center practice, according to Linda Shamoon and Deborah Burns. In "A Critique of Pure Tutoring," Shamoon and Burns (1995) refer to the non-directive approach as part of the "writing center bible" (135): "This bible contains not only the material evidence to support student-centered, non-directive practices, but also codes of behavior and statements of value that sanction tutors as a certain kind of professional, one who cares about writing and about students, their authentic voices, and their equal access to the opportunities within sometimes difficult situations" (135). Shamoon and Burns refer to non-directive approaches as the "orthodoxy [that] permeates writing center discourse" (135), and that orthodoxy is: "process-based, Socratic, private, a-disciplinary, and nonhierarchical or democratic" (137).
The non-directive orthodoxy raises for me an important issue about the role of tutors in writing center dialogues. The orthodoxy suggests that tutors should act as sounding boards for students and refrain from offering concrete, direct suggestions that may help improve student writing. I disagree that tutors should be restricted in their dialogic contributions to tutorials; instead, I believe tutors should offer suggestions for improvement and, if necessary, corrections to help improve student writing. The suggestion that non-directive tutoring discourages direct tutor feedback, I believe, merits closer examination.

The strong support for non-directive tutoring, I believe, is the product of the writing centers' deep support for student-centered, process-based pedagogy. This pedagogy has been so accepted by writing center scholars in the last decade that I believe it has stifled discussion about student learning and development in writing centers. In the last chapter I explained that writing centers, in the past two decades, have endorsed process-based, rather than product-based, writing. Both the process movement and use of non-directive tutoring strategies in the writing center were a response to the image of writing centers as "fix-it shops" (North 1984).

In addition to correlation between non-directive approach, process, and student-centered pedagogy, the non-directive orthodoxy is favored because it seems to provide answers for issues such as authority and plagiarism in the writing center. In terms of the first issue—authority—the non-directive orthodoxy provided assurance that tutor authority would not threaten students seeking help at the writing center. The idea that tutors are not authority figures reflects the argument that tutors should not prescribe advice to students who come to writing centers. Instead, tutor authority is downplayed in non-directive tutoring models in order to embrace student-centered learning and grant student
agency. Muriel Harris suggests, for example, that if tutors refrain from direct 
comments, students will participate more in tutorials and feel freer to participate 
in the conversations: "The collaborative atmosphere of the tutorial, the sense of 
being with someone who does not assume any authoritative posture, seems to 
relieve that strain or eliminate that fear [that students have of showing their 
writing to someone]" (36). The non-directive, "non-authoritative" model, 
according to Harris, refocuses attention on student writing development rather 
than on a student's paper. In contrast, Harris suggests that when tutors offer 
direct suggestions, they dominate writing tutorials, suppress student 
contributions to the tutorials, and even silence students in some cases.

The non-directive approach also seems to address the concern of 
plagiarism, for by refraining from direct suggestions, tutors avoided the 
possibility of plagiarism (Brooks 1991; Cogie 1995; Formo and Welsh 1995; 
Haynes-Burton 1995). Jane Cogie (1995) suggests, for example, that while tutors 
may be tempted to provide written edits that may help students in the "short 
run," they must resist the urge through the non-directive approach: "With 
instruction almost always involved to some degree or another in writing center 
collaboration, the desire to help the student in the short run becomes not only 
more tempting than usual but also more important to resist" (167). If tutors were 
to offer direct suggestions, the assumption is that those suggestions will wind up 
in students' papers, thus encouraging the "fix-it shop" image of writing centers 
as well as the unethical behavior of plagiarism. Such concern has risen over 
plagiarism in writing centers that even the act of collaboration during tutorials—
an activity that has become a hallmark tutoring activity (Lunsford 1991; Harris; 
Cogie 1995)—has been critiqued for encouraging plagiarism in tutorials. For 
example, in a discussion about collaboration in tutorials, Formo and Welsch
(1995) observe that as collaboration has been encouraged in writing center tutorials, cases of plagiarism have increased in number: "While we are certainly not arguing that collaboration is the main cause of plagiarism. . . we cannot ignore the way these debates are surfacing at the same time that collaborative practices are becoming more common" (109). Consequently, the fear of plagiarism has encouraged some to take a "minimalist," non-directive approach (Brooks 1991) in which tutors refrain from all editing or written comments during tutorials and instead help students focus on structural concerns like organization and logical reasoning.

While the reasons for supporting the non-directive orthodoxy address writing center issues like process pedagogy, authority, and plagiarism, these reasons neglect the constructive value of tutor contributions in a writing center tutorial. The consequence of advocating non-directive tutoring is a limiting binary of tutoring models—directive as bad, non-directive as good.45 In the case of authority, the orthodoxy asserts, for example, that directive (authoritative) strategies are potentially harmful to students. If tutors use a directive approach, one in which tutors express their expertise, tutors are assumed to show their authority over the student or to write student papers for them. If tutors use a non-authoritative approach, it is assumed that tutors create a more democratic environment in which the tutor does not dominate his or her authority over the student. Clearly, the orthodoxy favors non-directive approaches because they encourage—according to a perspective of authority—a more student-centered environment. But the orthodoxy does not consider the possibility that tutor

---

45Thomas J. Reigstad and Donald A. McAndrew present tutoring options that are not restricted to the non-directive binary. They classify tutoring talk into three options: student-centered, which resembles the non-directive approach, collaborative, and teacher-centered (directive approach). They recognize that different approaches might be useful at different times.
comments may be constructive and helpful to the student. Instead, tutor contributions are viewed as negative.

Furthermore, the deep entrenchment in process-based, student-centered pedagogy ignores the interactive component that is essential to writing center dialogues. The claim that non-directive tutoring is non-authoritative is problematic because it assumes that authority can be controlled, reduced, or even eliminated by the tutor through his or her ability to craft the dialogue in a certain way. Such an approach ignores the student contribution and interpretation of dialogue that may influence a tutorial in ways beyond the tutor's control. Instead of focusing on the idea that tutors can control authority through a non-directive approach, I find it more valuable to focus on interpretation—the ways in which students and tutors interpret each other in active writing center dialogues through questions, discussions, and suggestions.

We might also consider the value of direct tutor comments in writing center tutorials by examining Irene Clark's (1988) argument that directive tutor comments are helpful to students. Clark suggests that tutors should play an active role in tutoring sessions to model thinking processes for students (6)—that is, that tutors can model their writing expertise for students. The idea that tutors should play a more active role in tutorials through a tutoring dialogue is unpopular, and for reasons Clark acknowledges: "Writing, as opposed to other disciplines, has always been viewed as a solitary rather than as a collaborative activity, and therefore collaboration in any form is regarded with mistrust" (90). However, Clark responds that "overconcern with issues of ethics often results in a withholding and a rigidity which inhibits the creation of a writing community and is antithetical to the flexibility which ought to characterize a collaborative environment" (91). In other words, Clark argues that upholding the non-
directive orthodoxy may actually stifle a writing community. Borrowing from Vygotsky's theory of proximal development, Clark suggests that an active tutor role may help rather than hurt students:

Thinking in terms of the 'zone of proximal development,' tutors might find it useful to 'show' a student how to develop examples, correct an awkward sentence, maybe rephrase something, even help a student with a few spelling corrections. . . . Certainly, forbidding this sort of assistance and generally creating a set of 'injunctions' or 'prohibitions' as part of established writing center policy do not seem pedagogically sound. (93)

Clark's argument in support of directive tutor strategies is very much the minority in writing center literature, as this brief review of literature shows. However, I believe there are important reasons to value tutor contributions to writing center tutorials. If we are to examine the intersection of tutor-student dialogue, we must also examine the genuine contributions that tutors make in these dialogues.

I this section, I have suggested that the non-directive orthodoxy has portrayed a negative dichotomy between non-directive approaches and directive tutoring approaches; further, the non-directive orthodoxy has neglected the value of tutor contributions. In the next sections, I describe more completely the investigation that I conducted to examine tutor-student dialogues. I begin by providing background about the writing center, the student and tutor involved, and the topic of the student's paper.

The Writing Center

The writing center in which my investigation took place was housed in the English department at Iowa State University. This center customarily serves first-year writing students taking introductory composition courses; occasionally
tutors in the center work with students taking upper-level courses outside of the department of English. The center accommodates somewhere around 1,000 students per academic year (in 1996-1997, 1,337 students were served). During the 1996-1997 academic year, the center staff consisted of three graduate student tutors and one writing center director. All writing center duties were divided between these four staff members.

At the time this investigation was conducted, the writing center had recently expanded its accommodations. Because of a grant the center had been awarded, the center doubled its size and also received several new computers for students and tutors to use. The center had also developed an on-line tutorial for students to access the writing center from a distance.

According to the writing center director, the philosophy of this particular writing center was influenced by composition theory and social constructionist theory. Suggested tutoring methods guided tutor behavior in terms of greeting students, ending tutorials, and using questions to foster dialogues (much like prompts I reviewed in chapter five). The graduate student tutors were trained regularly in the use of these conferencing methods (see Appendix C, Figure 1). Tutors were also encouraged to observe one another and evaluate their tutorials according to the types of questions that were asked in tutorials.46 Although the writing center director mentioned that tutors were trained to use a variety of conference strategies, she advocated the use of a student-centered pedagogy in which tutors would act as a guide and refrain from offering direct suggestions.

46 The tutoring guide for this writing center mentioned the following categories of questions (see Appendix C):

- closed: has only one answer
- open: has many possible answers
- leading: has an answer already known by the consultant
- probing: helps the students see possibilities
- yes/no: requires only a yes or no answer
For example, she specifically mentioned Stephen North's argument that tutorials should be student-centered.

**Student and Tutor Background**

The student in this examination was required to go to the writing center over an entire semester to complete an argument paper for a freshman composition course in argumentation. The student, Kathy, had received a final grade lower than a C- and was asked by her instructor to sign a contract that required her to go to the writing center the following semester to raise her final composition grade to a C+ or higher. To fulfill the contract with her instructor and receive credit for this second composition course, Kathy had to go to the writing center once a week to work with a tutor. At the time Kathy started going to the writing center, her college writing experience was limited to a previous, introductory English composition course and periodic written reports that she had completed for a biology class that she had taken earlier that year.

In the writing center, Kathy was assigned to work with Tori, a tutor who was a graduate student in the English creative writing program. Tori had extensive writing experience, both on the academic and professional level. A published poet, she had also written for a local newspaper, had written several technical documents for a local police department in which she was employed, and was interested in pursuing a Ph.D. in creative writing after completing her masters program in creative writing. Although Tori had extensive experience in writing, she had never had a composition course in college, and in fact this was her first year tutoring and teaching composition.

In order to raise her final grade to a C+, Kathy had to write a well-researched, documented argument paper on a controversial topic. She chose to
write a paper about a controversial issue on campus at the time: the re-naming of a building on campus after a female alumnus of the university. In fall 1995, administration at this university dedicated and re-named a building on campus after Carrie Chapman Catt, a leader in the early 1900's who fought for women's suffrage. Catt's name was chosen for the newly renovated building because of her contributions to women's voting rights and also her alumni connection to this large university.

But the Catt re-naming caused great controversy on campus. Renaming this hall became controversial because as Catt's accomplishments were examined more closely—particularly her speeches that were given in the south for women's suffrage—several questionable remarks against African Americans and other ethnic groups were discovered. In response to this discovery, a group called "The September 29th Movement" formed on campus and began to protest the naming of this hall after Carrie Chapman Catt. Claiming that Catt was a white supremacist, the September 29th Movement declared that the university had a moral and ethical responsibility to change the name of the building. The debate escalated when the September 29th Movement conducted an official nonviolent demonstration in the main administrative building on campus in order to get the university president's attention; as a result of this demonstration several members of the September 29th Movement received citations. Ultimately, this issue has caused a moral, political, and legal uproar at this university, where some students believe the university has neglected its commitment to diversity by endorsing the building in Catt's name, while others believe that Catt's arguments have been interpreted incorrectly.

Although this controversial issue received a lot of attention during the months that Kathy wrote her paper, Kathy's knowledge of the debate was
When she chose this topic, Kathy knew very little about this debate other than it was a heated issue on campus among students and administration. Kathy had not formed an opinion about the debate, and in fact Kathy struggled with the meanings of phrases such as "white supremacy" as she wrote her paper. In contrast, her tutor Tori not only was aware of the issue but (unbeknownst to Kathy) was herself a member of the September 29th Movement and had participated in the non-violent demonstration. In addition, Tori revealed to me in an interview that she had been engaging in "radical introspection" concerning her heritage—her ancestors had been slave holders—and Tori was exploring this ancestry in writings that she was working on. For Tori, the racial issue raised in the Catt debate held not only academic but also personal interest for her. Although Tori was clearly committed to a point of view about the re-naming of Catt Hall, she tried very hard not to let her bias show or to overwhelm Kathy, who had not yet made up her mind about the Catt topic.

The background of the student, tutor, and Catt Hall debate show that Kathy and Tori had different prior theories about both writing and the Catt Hall debate. In terms of prior theories about writing, Tori had opportunities to develop her writing ability through professional and academic experiences; Kathy's knowledge of writing was limited to academic writing experiences she had had in two classes during her first college semester. In addition to the different prior theories that Tori and Kathy had in terms of writing experience, they also had different prior theories about the subject matter of Kathy's paper. Kathy's prior theory of the Catt Hall debate was limited to a recognition that the topic was a debate on campus. Tori, on the other hand, was actively involved in the debate and was one of the leaders of the September 29th Movement. This
background provided ample opportunity to explore varying interpretations in a third space analysis.

Data

Most data I collected in this investigation consisted of transcripts from tutorial sessions and interviews with both Tori and Kathy. Specifically, data consist of two recorded tutorial sessions, my written observations of these tutorial sessions, and interviews with each participant following each tutorial session. Data also include drafts of the argumentative paper that the student wrote throughout the tutorials. Transcripts of the tutorials, interview questions used in the individual interviews, and copies of the student's paper are found in Appendix D.

Because I was interested in looking at the intersection of interpretations between a tutor and student within tutorials, I conducted an analysis of these dialogues using the concept of the third space. I selected episodes within their communicative interaction that I thought resembled mismatches of communication. Given the differences in prior knowledge between Tori and Kathy about writing and the Catt Hall debate, I was particularly interested in evaluating these transcripts for evidence of interpretation about writing knowledge and about the Catt Hall debate. Within these episodes, I examined the passing and prior theories that may have contributed to misunderstandings in communicative interaction. I was also interested in the particular dialogue

---

47Originally, two tutors from the writing center were involved in this project; at the beginning of the investigation I recorded and observed tutorials that both tutors conducted. After these observations were made, one tutor withdrew from the investigation because the student she had been working with failed to come to the writing center for his appointments.

48Originally, three sessions were recorded but only two were examined for this investigation. The third session was not included in this investigation because it did not pertain to the Catt Hall debate.
strategies the tutor used in these sessions, for sometimes traces of these dialogue strategies emerged in the excerpts that I selected. When this occurred, I looked for ways in which the student responded to these tutorial strategies.

I compared all analyses of selected excerpts with interviews from participants about the excerpts in question. In addition, I compared these interpretive analyses with the student's written paper to see how or if the dialogues influenced the student's writing.

Below I report the results of my investigation. I categorize the third space episodes according to the session in which they occurred and according to the focus on either writing knowledge or subject matter knowledge.

Results

As I mentioned earlier, the results of this investigation showed that the third space foregrounded interpretations in two areas: knowledge about writing and subject matter knowledge. Interpretations of these areas emerged in two sessions that I observed and recorded. Below I detail excerpts from these two sessions that pertained to writing knowledge and subject matter knowledge.

Mismatched Interpretations in Session I

In the first tutoring session I observed, Kathy had written a draft of her argument paper and brought a copy of the paper on disk to use on one of the computers in the writing center. In this session, I selected two third space episodes in which mismatches of interpretation were addressed by tutor and student prior theories about writing and the Catt Hall debate. The first episode describes mismatched interpretations about writing, particularly how to use

---

49During all the sessions I observed, Kathy and Tori worked on the computer as Kathy brought a copy of her paper on disk.
sources to back up general claims. The second episode describes mismatched interpretations about the Catt Hall debate, particularly the meaning of the term "white supremacy." I indicate passing theories in these episodes using boldface type.

**Writing Knowledge: Using Sources**

This first third space episode illustrates the ways in which Tori and Kathy attempt to negotiate their different interpretations about using sources. For this tutorial session, Kathy had already collected several sources on the Catt debate (articles in the student newspaper, local newspaper, and Catt's actual writings) and in previous sessions she and Tori had discussed many of these sources. But Tori noticed early on in this tutoring session that Kathy consistently had trouble using examples from her sources to back up claims in her argument. In the excerpt below, Tori verbalizes this problem to Kathy:

T: What's the, the, in that somewhere, they've undoubtedly, at some point, actually said what statements that there are that are bothering them. So what you need is an example of. . you said, you said xenophobic and racist remarks twice in those two paragraphs, but you haven't given me, your reader, an example of what you mean.

T: So this is the place where you put that in.

K: OK

T: Yeah, OK. Here's your introduction

K: OK, OK . . .

K: I think I had, that (stuff about suffering?)

T: Um hm

K: I did, like, ah, before, (?) I think I had some of this in here

T: Um hm

K: About oh, um, like, that, Carrie Chapman Catt, asking the American people are (if they believe it yet (?)

T: OK, but there's an actual quote from her in that sentence that you're talking about. So that's the concrete example that we're talking about. . . . . . . . . . . Let's see. What about in that stuff that Jane Cox gave you, or that stuff about, wasn't there some stuff highlighted there in that information you brought in?
K: Oh, in um, at the church council (?)
T: No, the other one, the packet, that you showed me.
K: Oh....
T: That one. OK. This is all stuff that Carrie Chapman Catt wrote, right?
K: Right. . . .
T: Like this. See this is what she says if the south really wants white supremacy it will urge the unenfranchised (?). OK, so she's saying she gives women the vote then, ah, that will keep the black people down. That's the sort of thing that . . . . here's another one. That you had highlighted already. I think that that's. What does that other paper that you had say? Does it get to actually what she said?
K: This one?

This third space episode demonstrates Tori and Kathy's mismatched interpretations of using sources. Notice that Tori's prior theories about using sources are particularly strong. Tori identifies the problem she sees in Kathy's paper "you said xenophobic and racist remarks twice in those two paragraphs, but you haven't given me, your reader, an example of what you mean." This comment is a statement of Tori's prior theory about writing—the idea that a writer must follow a claim with an example or evidence. Tori has a clear idea what source Kathy might use to back up her claim. Kathy, on the other hand, forms several passing theories in attempt to understand Tori. She clearly does not know exactly what Tori is looking for or asking for. To understand Tori, Kathy makes guesses—passing theories—about things that she has included in her paper that might be evidence: "I think I had some of this in here about oh, um, like, that, Carrie Chapman Catt, asking the American people are (if they believe it yet)?" But Tori is looking for something else, and she helps Kathy look through the sources one by one to find a quote that would support that point. Notice how Kathy keeps guessing about which source Tori is referring to, trying to grasp Tori's meaning (i.e. "Oh, in um, at the church council?" "This one?").
In doing so, Kathy is working hard to interpret the tutor's request. In contrast, Tori is not trying much to interpret Kathy, nor does she acknowledge Kathy's difficulty in understanding her request. Instead, Tori is focused on her prior theory about what Kathy should include in her paper. This interaction shows how Kathy's understanding of how to properly use sources is indeterminate, but it also shows her attempt to resolve this indeterminacy through passing theories.

By looking at Kathy's revised paper after this session, we can see better how Kathy's attempts to resolve indeterminacy influenced her final paper. The paragraph below shows Kathy's attempt to provide examples to back up a claim.

Carrie Chapman Catt, a woman who contributed to society by giving women the right to vote, is now facing some controversy by her saying racist and xenophobic remarks. These kinds of remarks were the tactics aimed at the disenfranchisement [sic] Blacks, that African American [sic] were unworthy of the vote and that is [sic] was forced upon them. Catt claimed that Latino [sic] were of a lower civilization, and their opposition to woman suffrage would be "more bitter and vindictive". She also claims that Native Americans were savages.

In the paragraph above, Kathy repeats the argument that some people believe Catt was racist and xenophobic, and then she explicates that claim by including Catt's remarks about African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans. Although Kathy has not provided documentation for these quotes, one can see the effort Kathy has made to use examples to back up a claim, and one might conclude that her interpretation of Tori's request affected the way in which she wrote the paragraph. Nevertheless, Kathy's understanding of sources still appears a bit unclear. The lack of clarity about sources was evident in both the third space episodes and in the above excerpt from her final paper.
Subject Knowledge: White Supremacy

A second third space episode from this session demonstrates indeterminacy about subject matter knowledge (the term "white supremacy") that emerged from communicative interaction in the tutorial. This episode clearly demonstrates different interpretations of the term as well as attempts made by Tori and Kathy to understand each other. In the following excerpt, Kathy is clearly unfamiliar with the phrase "white supremacy" and its meaning for the Catt Hall debate.

T: What do you think white supremacy means when she uses it then?
K: Um, that most people are white.
T: OK, that's how you read that, that most of the people are white?
K: She wants to talk about that (?)
T: OK, when she's talking about guaranteeing white supremacy
K: Um hm
T: Have you heard of like, white supremacist organizations like Aryan nation and that kind of thing? Never heard of em. Well, see, I grew up out west so we heard about em, because out west it attracts all kinds of kooks, everybody from earth firsters to the... my family. Everybody, right? ha ha. And one of the things that separates white supremacists, people who believe in white supremacy are people who just understand that there are white people, and they think that the white people should be in charge. OK? So when she uses the term white supremacy, she's not just saying that there's just more of us, she's saying that anyone who's not white isn't qualified to be in charge. That's a whole different thing, isn't it?
K: Um hm, I noticed that. I was reading through these and she does say, Like if you're not white, then you're nobody. Like you have to white to be a leader.
T: She nailed on the Irish, too, that there a bunch of drunks, you know. So what she's talking about in her white supremacy is not just that everybody who's white, but a certain kind of white people. That's what it says in Erin's article. So, looking at it that way,
K: And you could. I mean I could make an argument or a statement that tells um, maybe what this statement is about?
T: Yeah, that's what you did in that other paragraph, you explained what she was saying. OK. Where would you put that?
K: Um, right here?
T: Yes, that's a good place. That's right before you go into the business of how it hurts white people too.

This third space episode shows that the tutor and student have different prior theories of the term "white supremacy." Because Catt herself is accused of being a white supremacist, knowing what white supremacy means is essential to this debate. As the excerpt shows, Kathy's prior theory of white supremacy is simply thinking "that most people are white." Tori, who not only has different prior theory of the term white supremacy but who strongly disagrees with white supremacy, explains the term using her own experience. This third space episode, then, captures the mismatched interpretations of the term white supremacy.

But this episode also demonstrates Kathy's attempt to resolve the misinterpretation. The student responds to Tori's prior knowledge in this excerpt by forming passing theories about Tori's explanation of white supremacy. She first agrees with Tori, building on the idea of supremacy: "Um hm. I noticed that. I was reading through these and she does say, Like if you're not white, then you're nobody. Like you have to white to be a leader." And then she guesses (passing theory) about what she could do to express that idea in her paper: "And you could. I mean I could make an argument or a statement that tells um, maybe what this statement is about?" Tori confirms Kathy's guess, and they continue from there discussing how Kathy could develop her argument. Notice that Tori begins this episode, too, by forming passing theories in order to better understand Kathy. But she quickly shifts her passing theories to prior theories (which she presumes are correct) and stops attempting to understand Kathy's interpretation. Consequently, in this third space episode we see Kathy doing most of the work to resolve the mismatched interpretation. Kathy's
utterances in dialogue indicate that she has formed a new understanding of the term, and her paper revisions after this session reflected that she acknowledged the two sides of the argument.

In [sic] despite of [Catt's racist comments], the building on Iowa State campus was named Catt Hall. Some people agree or disagree with renaming the building. The September 29th Movement wants to change the name of a prestigious building. There can be two sides to every story.

However, while this written passage demonstrates that Kathy moved from having no opinion about the debate to understanding the two sides of the debate and the meaning of the term white supremacy, Kathy had not formulated an argument of her own on the issue. Her reluctance to formulate an argument suggests that her understanding of the "white supremacy" argument is still unclear. The communicative interaction between Tori and Kathy may have influenced Kathy's written paragraph above, but her understanding of the argument is not definite. This episode demonstrates how uncertainty about the term of "white supremacy" influenced Kathy's paper, and how interaction around the uncertainty led to Kathy's revisions.

Mismatched Interpretations in Session II

A week later, Tori and Kathy met for a second tutoring session. In this tutoring session, Kathy had finished her draft and had begun the revision process. By this time, Kathy examines both sides of the issue of the Catt Hall debate in her paper, complete with examples and quotes from her various sources. However, as the tutor noted in a later interview, Kathy's paper still lacks a line of argument because she has not decided how she feels about the issue. In Tori's eyes, this is a major problem because the argument paper that
Kathy must complete to end her writing center contract must show a line of argument. Instead of showing her own opinion in the paper, Kathy examines the arguments both for and against the Catt Hall debate, keeping her opinion out of it. Below, I include two third space episodes from this session. The first episode concerns mismatched interpretations about writing—specifically, what constitutes an ethical argument. The second episode concerns mismatched interpretations about the Catt Hall debate.

**Writing Knowledge: Ethical Argument**

In the following third space episode, Kathy and Tori discuss argument strategies—particularly what constitutes an ethical argument. This excerpt illustrates varying interpretations about the meaning of the ethical argument as well as Tori’s attempts to resolve these differences through passing theories. The episode begins as Tori reads the following sentences from Kathy’s paper:

As indicated earlier, Catt mostly likes white people because she thinks other ethnic groups are inferior in her eyes. This type of argument is a [sic] ethos or fair play. Using the expression of only liking "white people" is working because people around campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her.

T: Um. OK. So you think she's making an ethical argument because she says that other ethnic groups are inferior? Let's talk about what we think she's saying.
K: Yea
T: OK when she says that non-whites are inferior, that's an ethical argument?
K: Yes
T: OK. So how does that relate to, first off, how is that an ethical argument?
K: That could be that if she thinks that non-whites are inferior, then she could, um, um, the way I feel it could be wrong
T: That statement could be wrong or right?
K: Yeah, that it could be a fair play argument that is right or wrong, but
T: Oh I see what you mean, I think. Keep going.
K: Um, because if she thinks that non-whites are inferior, that they can't be leaders, then if I was out in the audience I would think "wait a minute, that's not right." But in her eyes she thinks that she's right and I would be wrong.

T: OK
K: Does that make any sense?

As this third space episode shows, Tori is trying to understand Kathy's idea of an ethical argument through passing theories by asking questions and repeating her understanding of Kathy's ideas. Tori's use of passing theory in these ways shows how she is attempting to translate Kathy's ideas. Kathy, on the other hand, is concerned with her prior theory about the arguments on either side of the Catt debate. She describes an ethical argument as one that can be either wrong or right, depending on how you look at it. By asking questions and encouraging Kathy to talk ("Oh, I see what you mean, I think. Keep going"), Tori allows Kathy to express her prior theory on the paper topic. On the surface, Tori's behavior in this excerpt resembles the non-directive approach because Tori asks questions to draw out Kathy's thoughts. However, Tori is not asking questions just for the sake of drawing out Kathy's ideas; she is asking questions to understand for herself how Kathy is interpreting the meaning of an ethical argument. Tori is translating in this excerpt.

However, as the continuing excerpt shows, after Tori translates Kathy's idea, she articulates her own prior knowledge about ethical arguments, which is different from Kathy's understanding of an ethical argument.

T: OK. So we had talked about ethical arguments as being a right or wrong argument and that (?) this is the right thing, and so as an audience member you're saying "wait a minute that's not right" but she's saying that it is.
K: Um hm
T: So that makes it an ethical argument? Hm. Well, I think what's hanging me up, is that, I can see where you're getting that because
of the way we described ethos, you know we described it as this fair play, do the right thing sort of thing.

K: Um hm
T: And in that sense, I think you're probably right in that Catt would say it's an ethical argument because it's only fair for white women to have the right to vote

K: Um hm
T: So that is from her point of view a fair play argument. From our point of view it's almost an opposite sort of fair play argument because we're saying that what she's says is NOT right.

K: Um hm

As we can see through this continuing excerpt of the third space episode, Tori has stopped translating. She no longer forms passing theories. Tori articulates her translation, but then moves to discussing her prior theory about an ethical argument. We could classify this move as a directive tutoring move. The tutor is correcting the student's understanding and making what she believes is a better suggestion. We could also read this move as Tori's attempt to resolve the mismatch of interpretation. However, in this case, the student shows no evidence of resolve—there is no indication that she is struggling with the correction Tori made, or that she even understands it. She simply replies "um hm." And in fact, a paragraph from her final paper does not demonstrate that Kathy resolved the mismatched interpretation enough to alter her ethical argument much at all:

As indicated earlier, Catt mostly likes white people because she thinks other ethnic groups are inferior in her eyes. This type of argument is a [sic] ethos or fair play. Catt is saying that white woman [sic] should have the right to vote because white women are the leaders, and the white women are looking down upon the non-white women.
I believe this third space episode suggests that Kathy and Tori have not resolved their varying interpretations. Furthermore, Kathy still seems to have an indeterminate understanding of ethos and the fair play argument.

I find it interesting that by expressing her prior theory in the second part of the episode, Tori seems to discount Kathy's interpretation of an ethical argument seen through Catt's eyes. Even though Tori has actively translated Kathy's idea, she ultimately corrects Kathy by suggesting that Catt's ethical argument is wrong. Furthermore, she then imposes her opinion on Kathy by saying "From our point of view . . . we're saying that what she says is NOT right." Tori has tried to resolve the misinterpretation by imposing her point of view. There is probably more going on here than the transcripts can show; perhaps Tori is so influenced by her prior theory about the debate that she can't see past it. In fact, Tori revealed to me in a later interview that she became very frustrated after this tutoring session because Kathy "wasn't there yet" in terms of understanding the arguments in the debate. In this way, this analysis suggests that Tori tries to understand Kathy's interpretation as well as to change it.

It is also interesting to note that this third space episode illustrates Tori's use of a variety of tutoring dialogue strategies. In this second part of the excerpt, Tori seems more directive; in the one immediately before it, Tori used a non-directive questioning approach. That these two styles appeared in an excerpt of tape less than one minute long demonstrates the fluidity of dialogue here, as well as the difficulty of maintaining one dialogue approach (such as directive or non-directive) in all situations. Instead, by looking at passing theory and the third space, we gain insights into tutor and student interpretations and how those interpretations can (or cannot) influence a student's paper. In the excerpts so far, for example, we can speculate that the tutor's passing theories materialize
when she feels the need to translate Kathy's ideas. Kathy's passing theories materialize when trying to respond "correctly" to Tori. Furthermore, we could hypothesize from this analysis that Tori is heavily influenced by her prior theories, and that while she is able to translate Kathy's ideas, those translations do not affect her own (Tori's) prior theories about writing or about the Catt Hall debate.

To check out these speculations, I interviewed both the tutor and student about this session. In an interview with Tori, Tori revealed that she was frustrated with Kathy's progress. Part of her frustration, she said, had to do with the fact that she and Kathy had reviewed the same material and discussed the same ethical arguments in previous sessions, and Kathy still had problems understanding the arguments. As a result of Tori's frustration, she perceived that there was a gap between her prior theories and the student's prior theories about both writing and the Catt Hall debate. In fact, she became so frustrated after this session that she went to talk to a specialist in learning disabilities; she seriously considered the possibility that Kathy had slight learning disabilities, primarily in reading comprehension. Tori's comments confirmed for me what I had suspected about Kathy's indeterminate understanding of ethos or the fair play argument.

In the meantime, Kathy revealed to me in her interview that she did not perceive a gap or mismatch of interpretation but rather perceived that she was learning more about the arguments in the debate and the Catt issue as a whole. She articulated several times, in fact, the point that the debate could go "either way," which was different from her initial understanding of the Catt issue at the beginning of the project.
From these interviews and my observations, I concluded that the third space demonstrated widely different interpretations of both writing knowledge and subject matter knowledge, and that Kathy's writing act reflected indeterminacy about writing and subject matter. While different interpretations were expressed in communicative interaction during the tutorials, little evidence suggests that Tori and Kathy understood each other, or that they resolved their interpretive differences. Instead, Kathy's paper seemed to reflect little change, and Tori experienced frustration with Kathy's interpretations (to the point that she tried to change these interpretations).

Subject Knowledge: White Supremacy

Another third space episode from the second session illustrates how indeterminacy in the writing act was further manifest. As I have already suggested, in this session Kathy had moved from having no opinion to understanding there could be two sides to the Catt debate. The third space episode below shows, however, that she is still struggling to interpret the different arguments in the debate. Here, Kathy is still working through the concept of white supremacy, and she confuses the reasons that the September 29th Movement is angry with Catt.

T: Now the second part of this paragraph is where you talk about how people on campus feel about that. OK. Now what was the actual words that she said. She didn't say only liking white people. What were the words she said?
K: Um, did she say non-white?
T: Remember we looked it up last week?
K: White supremacy?
T: Right. OK. So I would, in this next sentence, I would substitute this direct quote with what she said using the expression of white supremacy instead of your paraphrase.
K: [typing] ah..
T: (Reading from paper) "Is working because people on campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her or that she thinks they're inferior." You said they think they are inferior. And I don't think they think they're inferior at all, do they?
K: No
T: ha ha ha ha. that
K: Could I say that they think that she she's, they think that she is inferior?
T: Is that what they think?
K: No
T: What do they think?
K: (silence)
T: It's not a test, relax ha ha. OK, if someone says women are inferior, and we get angry, is it because we really think we're inferior?
K: No?
T: It's because they're wrong. They think we're inferior. Right? OK. So, I see your wheels turning here.
K: laugh
T: You know what you mean, it's just a question of stating it that way, right? Now how would you phrase it if you wanted to make it clear that they're angry about what she thinks because it's wrong?
K: um, (reading from paper) um, that she says that they're inferior?
T: um hm. She did say that they were inferior, that's it. That's why they're angry.
K: OK.

Here Kathy tries to explain the argument against Catt: "People on campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her." Confused, and in an act of resolution, Tori asks what Kathy means here. This episode demonstrates mismatched interpretation of the Catt debate. When Kathy tries to explain it a second time, Kathy says: "Could I say that they think that she she's, they think that she is inferior?" Tori clearly has something in mind and Kathy begins to guess how she has gotten things "wrong." She is making passing theories to understand Tori's idea better. We can see ways in which Kathy makes guesses to understand Tori. Her response "no?", for example, ends in a rising inflection, indicating her uncertainty. Even her final guess in this excerpt, though it is the
right one according to Tori, is stated in an inquisitive way: "Um, (reading from paper) um, that she says that they're inferior?"

In this third space episode, we can clearly see the indeterminacy that emerges in the writing act. For example, Kathy understands that there are two sides to this debate, but this episode shows that she is still struggling to understand what those two sides are. This episode reveals Kathy's attempt to resolve the mismatched interpretations about the debate, and we can see the difficulty of this process. Tori, however, overlooks that difficulty and makes the mistake of voicing her assumption that Kathy has the arguments clear. As she and Kathy discussed the phrasing of the sentence (who was inferior of whom), Tori said "you know what you mean, it's just a matter of saying it." I indicated this comment as a passing theory because I believe Tori was attempting to resolve their interpretive differences by suggesting how Kathy should think about the issue. In fact, Kathy didn’t know what she was saying or how to put it, and she sought Tori's help. Tori then gets frustrated and drives Kathy to silence in this excerpt, pressuring Kathy to answer her questions. Again, Tori is operating from her prior theory about where Kathy should be and what she should understand. I believe this excerpt illustrates that indeterminacy in the writing act exists even in the midst of directive tutoring comments. Furthermore, despite Kathy's attempts, this episode does not demonstrate a resolve of their varying interpretations.

In another attempt to resolve this difference about the argument, Tori uses an example of gender discrimination in the excerpt—the example of women being thought of as inferior—to relate the concept of white supremacy to Kathy. When asked later in an interview about this excerpt, Tori said that she was trying to relate to Kathy's experience as a woman, but, unlike the other times
she used stories or examples, she admitted that she didn't think this example worked at all. At this point working with Kathy, Tori suspected that not only was the concept of white supremacy foreign to Kathy, but the concept of discrimination was foreign to her as well:

"[Kathy] comes from a white, midwest, middle class background with little or no exposure to other cultures. Here everybody believes in the level playing field, that everyone is treated the same no matter what color they are. What she doesn't understand is that everyone isn't treated the same in this culture. I tried to use the example of discrimination against women to illustrate this to her, but I bet if you ask her if she's ever been discriminated against because she's a woman, she'd say no."

And, in fact, in a later interview, I did ask Kathy if she had ever been discriminated against as a woman, and she said: "No, I don't think so." Tori's attempt to relate the issue of racial discrimination to gender discrimination was therefore unsuccessful, just as Tori had suspected. This example reveals to us, again, Tori's strong prior theories about discrimination, about white supremacy, and about the Catt Hall debate. To Tori, discrimination was a fact of life. She was making the assumption that her prior theories about discrimination were correct and that Kathy's prior theories were naive and misinformed. Their differences, once again, were not resolved.

However, I find more interesting the fact that despite Tori's very direct comments and suggestions, Kathy's understanding of the arguments about discrimination were still very unclear. This lack of clarity influenced her argument in the final paper. After this session Kathy did change the problematic sentence in her paper, and it reads:

Using the expression of only liking white supremacy is working because people around campus are angry that Catt said they were inferior.
Here she has replaced the words "white people" with "white supremacy," and she changed the last subordinate clause to "people around campus are angry that Catt said they were inferior" rather than "people on campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her." Although these changes reflect the argument more accurately, they don't tell us how Kathy perceives the issue of discrimination in this case. Her paper, in accordance with the third space episode, reflects her uncertainty about the Catt argument.

Discussion

In this analysis of tutor-student dialogue in terms of the third space, I report the following conclusions: (1) different interpretations of both writing and subject matter knowledge emerged in communicative interaction; (2) unresolved interpretations found in the third space episodes as well as Kathy's paper reflected uncertainty in the writing act.

Clearly, these excerpts show that different interpretations emerged on almost all accounts. Kathy and Tori expressed different interpretations about documentation, the term white supremacy, the idea of ethos, and the Catt Hall argument. In addition, my interviews with Kathy and Tori reflected differences in interpretation about the success of the tutorials. From Tori's viewpoint, Kathy fell far short of writing an effective argumentative paper. Kathy, however, believes that she has made great progress, and she was very excited about her work. In fact, in contrast to Tori's frustration, Kathy was so excited about this paper that she "wanted to show everybody this paper and all the hard work I've done." Kathy is proud of the progress she has made. Why does Tori feel defeated, and why are these differences unresolved?
Perhaps Tori felt frustrated and defeated because she saw these tutoring conversations in terms of her own prior theories—as a professional writer, poet, academic, and a member of the September 29th Movement. Because Kathy wasn't understanding the issues and arguments in the same way Tori was, Tori felt endlessly frustrated. Tori was so frustrated, in fact, that she believed she needed to reshape her role as a tutor from one who helps improve critical thinking to one who is simply a resource person.

T: Actually in many ways I guess the frustration doesn't surprise me. Because I see a very active mind there that doesn't seem to be able to make those connections between what she reads and the real world. She's not able to pick out the main points, and that's not something I can give to her. What I can give her are strategies for writing, what I can give her are ways to, a template to make a good paragraph, what I can give her is a comma sheet, what I can give her is a transition sheet, and some tools to use those, but I can't help her to become a critical thinker, you know, so I'm kinda feeling at a loss there.

I think Tori sells herself short here, and she does so because she is focusing only on her prior theory about writing and about the Catt Hall debate. The concept of the third space helped to identify these varying interpretations about communicative interaction during the tutorials and reflections made after the tutorials.

A second result of this investigation is that Kathy and Tori's passing theories did not resolve their differences, and ultimately these unresolved differences reflected the indeterminate nature of the writing act. The student's interpretations/passing theories in the tutorial discussions appeared to influence her final written paper, but they also reflect Kathy's uncertainty about the topic. While Kathy made some revisions based on interactions she had with Tori, these revisions did not necessarily reflect Kathy's argument about the debate. In
fact, and as Tori noted throughout, Kathy's opinion and argument were absent in all the drafts they reviewed in tutorial sessions. And, as I interviewed Kathy after the final tutoring session, she told me that she wasn't sure how she felt about the debate yet.

Implications

I believe this analysis using the concept of the third space has certain implications for writing center pedagogy. One implication is that the third space can help us focus on ways in which students respond to tutorial dialogue as well as how tutors can respond to dialogue. For example, from this analysis we learned how Kathy interpreted the progress of the sessions and how she interpreted various suggestions that Tori made throughout the sessions. We learned that Kathy's interpretations sometimes differed from Tori's interpretations. This finding is important for one-to-one tutoring because it reveals more about tutoring interaction than simple tutor prompts in dialogue. Recall that current tutoring literature suggests ways in which tutors can foster or prompt dialogue; however, this literature does not often discuss how students respond or interpret tutor comments. The results of this chapter contribute to our knowledge about how students respond to tutorial dialogue.

Another implication is that the third space can reveal how prior theories can influence tutorial interaction as well as stifle attempts to resolve mismatched interpretation. We learned from this investigation that the tutor had very strong prior theories about both writing and about racial issues. These prior theories often surfaced in her tutorial contributions, sometimes strongly. In addition, the student's prior theories about writing and about racial issues also emerged in dialogue, and through the third space we were able to identify how
her prior theories differed from Tori's. But these strong prior theories inhibited attempts to resolve their differences.

A final implication is that the third space can demonstrate the indeterminacy of the writing act, despite the use of codified tutoring strategies like directive or non directive comments. As I have reviewed in this chapter and the previous chapter, tutoring literature suggests that directive tutor comments create a "fix-it shop" model that bases writing on product, instead of process. I believe this investigation shows that even when directive tutor strategies were used in the tutorial, the student did not plagiarize the tutor's suggestions; nor did she adopt her argument. The results were unpredictable. This finding suggests that in this tutor-student communicative interaction, interpretation in tutorial interaction was dynamic and indeterminate. Current tutoring dialogue strategies do not account for this indeterminacy in the writing act. Future studies might examine the use of directive strategies on students' papers and ways in which indeterminacy influences student writing.
In this dissertation I have discussed the role of interpretation in the production of discourse, and I have suggested that interpretation, which embodies indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness, is central to the act of writing. This hermeneutic definition of writing radically redefines the idea that writing is a structured, codified process or series of activities that can be taught in a writing classroom. In addition, this hermeneutic definition of writing is grounded in specific arguments regarding postmodern pedagogy and the reception and production of discourse. I would like to briefly review those arguments here.

In chapter one I reviewed several problematic pedagogies that claimed to apply postmodern or antifoundationalism to writing instruction. Many of these attempts grew out of postmodern and antifoundationalist theories in which indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness are characteristics. Because these pedagogies are grounded primarily in theory, there is little research available to support these pedagogies, and I suggested that these pedagogies be investigated more closely. I argued that current attempts to develop a "postmodern pedagogy" are unsuccessful—even paradoxical—and that indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act can be explained more clearly through the lens of interpretation.

The connection between interpretation and writing pedagogy, however, has been largely ignored because many scholars connect interpretation to the reception of discourse (i.e., reader response) instead of the production of discourse. Among discussions about interpretation exists a constant debate about the limits of interpretation between hermeneutic contextualists and
hermeneutic universalists. While hermeneutic contextualists suggest that interpretation is shaped by community and conventions, hermeneutic universalists suggest that interpretation has no limits. I suggested in chapter two that this latter position—hermeneutic universalism—fits interpretation in the production of discourse. In this universalist perspective, interpretation is thought to "go all the way down," meaning that interpretation is always situated among previous interpretations and cannot be codified or structured in any way. In this way, interpretation is indeterminate and situated. I believe that these characteristics of hermeneutic universalism coincide with pedagogical attempts to capture indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act.

Hermeneutic universalism is linked with the writing act through communicative interaction. Donald Davidson, for example, explains that interpretation derives from communicative interaction because we cannot know in advance the mental states of others before we engage in communicative interaction with them. (Davidson describes this emphasis on communicative interaction more fully in his explanation of prior and passing theories.) In connecting interpretation to communicative interaction and, therefore, to the writing act, I suggested that the writing act also involves cooperation with others, particularly in dialogues about writing that occur in classrooms (i.e., student-student peer review and teacher-student conferences). I suggested that if we look at these interactions about writing more closely, we might see how indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness in the writing act emerge, and I employed the concept of the "third space" to describe and to evaluate these interactions.

As I explained in chapter two, the third space is a theoretical concept that helps us to see the interplay of interpretations that exists between a writer and
audience during the act of writing as well as how these interpretations are reflected by the uncertainties conversants express in dialogues about meaning. In chapter two, I also pointed out that my concept of the third space derives from Donald Davidson's concept of "passing theory." Davidson maintains that during communicative interaction, passing theories represent momentary, partial interpretations that occur between speakers, and these passing theories incorporate indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness. The third space is an extension of Davidson's conception of the passing theory, and I believe that the third space provides a tool that teachers and researchers can use to evaluate the effectiveness of communicative interaction in the writing act. I attempted to demonstrate the usefulness of this tool in chapters four and six, and I explained how interpretation operated in a technical communication classroom and a writing center tutorial exchange. My examinations of these situated writing acts demonstrated how indeterminacy arises in communicative interaction and how interpretations can affect documents such as pamphlets, brochures, and argumentative papers.

Consequently, I believe that understanding writing as a hermeneutic activity has significant implications for how we understand and teach the writing act. In the remainder of this concluding chapter, I would like to outline these implications for writing teachers by addressing certain questions that teachers may have about the third space and the interpretive perspective required by the concept of the third space.

What Can the Interpretive Perspective Contribute to Writing Pedagogy?

The interpretive perspective asks us to accept the difficult notion that the writing act cannot be neatly sequenced, structured, codified, and then relayed to
students. Rather, this perspective suggests that the writing act is complicated by individual situations and the indeterminate interplays of communicative interaction, and that these complications cannot be routinely predicted in a writing process. Although the interpretive perspective embodies uncertainty, it does not invalidate all of our current ideas about writing pedagogy. For instance, it does not deny that there are stages in the writing act that may occur or reoccur; it simply suggests that these stages do not comprise the entire writing act. Instead, the hermeneutic perspective suggests that there is more to the writing act than a structured process. That 'something more' is the indeterminacy of meaning and situatedness that occur during communicative interaction. Therefore, the contribution of the interpretive perspective to writing pedagogy is the realization that interpretation—an indeterminate, situated activity—influences the writing act in ways we cannot codify. In this way, the interpretive perspective tells us more about the writing act than process notions of pedagogy have described.

What Can We Do with the Knowledge that the Writing Act Is Indeterminate?

One answer to this question, following Stanley Fish, is that we can do "nothing" with the knowledge that the writing act is indeterminate. Recall that in "Antifoundationalism, Theory Hope, and the Teaching of Composition," Fish (1989) suggested that "Being told that you are in a situation will help you neither to dwell in it more perfectly nor to write within it more successfully" (35). Similarly, the argument that writing incorporates indeterminacy suggests that this indeterminacy occurs whether or not we draw attention to it. But a second answer to this question suggests that this knowledge helps us realize the
indeterminate quality of the writing act. I believe that this realization suggests two very concrete implications about our views about writing instruction.

First, if we agree that writing is an indeterminate, hermeneutic act, we should recognize that the writing act constitutes more than understanding or applying academic or rhetorical conventions to writing pedagogy. In chapter four, I mentioned that the first half of the technical communication course I taught relied on textbook notions of communication such as formats for writing (i.e. correspondence, reports, instructions), as well as rhetorical principles such as audience, purpose, language use, and design. While these conventions and rhetorical principles for writing can be extremely useful for students in structuring their writing assignments, these conventions should not be confused with the writing act. In chapter four, I tried to demonstrate that while students made use of these conventions in their clinic projects, communicative interaction also influenced the writing act—particularly the discussions between students and the physician from the clinic. This communicative interaction influenced the writing act in ways that process-oriented pedagogies could not have predicted or described.

Understanding the indeterminacy inherent in the writing act also means that our efforts to structure dialogues about writing may not be all that useful. In my investigations, I focused quite obviously on communicative interaction that occurred in classrooms and writing centers. As I discussed in chapters five and six, writing centers in particular have suggested a number of dialogue strategies that might create a "student-centered" environment and allow students to learn more effectively. However, as I attempted to show in my discussion of writing center dialogues, these strategies do not determine student response in one-to-one interactions about writing. When we consider the role of interpretation in
communicative interaction, we may realize that no dialogue strategy can guarantee any particular environment (such as a "student-centered" environment) or results (assimilation of writing knowledge through the use of directive strategies).

How Would the Interpretive Perspective Alter or Influence Writing Instruction?

The primary way in which the interpretive perspective would alter current writing pedagogy is by moving beyond the process model. As I explained earlier, this move does not mean that we should reject the idea that writing may seem in retrospect to involve some sort of process; however, it does mean that we should reject the idea that the writing act can be codified neatly into a process. This dissertation suggests that the writing act cannot be easily structured or codified, for writing is a complex, indeterminate, and situated activity.

Moving beyond process means that we might investigate specific "post-process" perspectives of writing pedagogy; namely, the idea that writing is a communicative, interpretive act rather than a systematized process. For example, a rising emphasis among post-process scholars is the emphasis on dialogue in the classroom. I argued in chapter three that this emphasis on dialogic activity in the classroom improves communicative interaction between students and teachers as well as mentoring relationships in writing instruction. Although ideally effective writing instruction might occur more frequently in one-to-one mentoring relationships, as Kent (1993) suggests, this type of mentoring may not be realistically accomplished in colleges and universities. Still, this mentoring can occur to some degree in writing instruction. This dialogic pedagogy might be achieved through writing assignments that involve a public audience. Through "public" assignments, teachers can act as mentors to
their students who write for audiences outside of the classroom. In chapter four I illustrated a public interaction assignment through a project with a local clinic. As that investigation showed, the communicative interactions between students, myself, and a physician from the clinic were integral to the project, and interpretations of these interactions clearly influenced the written products that students completed.

**Will Understanding the Interpretive Perspective Help Students Become Better Writers and Produce Better Writing?**

This dissertation has been devoted to (1) explaining the interpretive perspective and (2) illustrating the interpretive perspective through investigations of pedagogical situations. While my investigations have had an illustrative purpose, they do not explain how student writing is improved through the hermeneutic perspective. Future studies may focus on this very point. However, the investigations I conducted in chapters four and six—particularly chapter four, the clinic project—suggest that the focus on communicative interaction did help students recognize ineffective writing. Furthermore, by interacting directly with Dr. Chmura and by regularly inquiring about his needs for the clinic documents, students vividly understood that audience needs are crucial to a document's design and content. In their direct interactions with Dr. Chmura, they compared their interpretations of audience concerns with Dr. Chmura's interpretations of the same concerns. Although these interpretations sometimes differed, the practice of identifying audience concerns proved valuable in this project, and students learned about expressing meaning in ways that they would not have learned in a traditional academic paper.
Similarly, through the interpretive perspective, students may better understand the implication of situatedness in writing. That is, they may learn that writing is a highly situated activity and that communicative interaction uniquely influences that activity. For example, both investigations that I discussed in this dissertation illustrated how the writing act was uniquely situated. In chapter four, the writing act was situated in the clinic project and involved classroom and workplace expectations for technical communication. In chapter six, the writing act was situated in the student's and tutor's knowledge about the Catt hall debate. These two analyses were quite different from one another because the writing acts were uniquely situated. We might conclude that the interpretive perspective encourages students to more fully examine situations surrounding writing acts as well as specific content knowledge necessary to complete a writing act.

**How Can Teachers Employ the Concept of the Third Space in the Classroom?**

The third space, as I have described and illustrated it in this dissertation, is primarily an evaluative tool—a tool to examine interpretation of communicative interaction within the classroom. Through my application of the concept of the third space, I have illustrated how prior and passing theories emerge in dialogue, and I have demonstrated the interplay of interpretations that occur during communicative interaction.

I believe that the concept of the third space is valuable for teachers and tutors of writing who are in the position to evaluate critically the dialogues between themselves and their students. As I described in chapters five and six, one shortcoming of "dialogue strategies" created for tutorial or conference situations is that they do not focus on student response to dialogue. Without
considering the student's response, teachers and tutors of writing may not interpret effectively a student's utterance. The concept of the third space is a tool that writing instructors can use to acknowledge student interpretations and response, and to recognize the prior knowledge that students bring to a writing center or classroom. The third space can be a helpful concept for students as well—particularly for professional communication students who engage in public writing assignments. As my investigation in chapter four illustrates, the third space highlighted different classroom and workplace expectations for clinic documents. Understanding these differences may help students understand the complexities of classroom and workplace communication.

The students in the clinic project and the writing center project were not aware of the concept of the third space; however, instruction employing the concept of the third space is an intriguing idea. As I mentioned above, students might use the concept of the third space to identify varying expectations for documents, as well as to compare audience and writer concerns for documents. This task may be a useful practice for students.

What Are the Problems with the Interpretive Perspective?

In spite of the unique insights that the interpretive perspective and the concept of the third space can provide, there are some problems with this approach to writing pedagogy. One problem is methodological. As a researcher, I have based my analyses in this dissertation on communicative interaction that occurs in the act of writing, and I have identified utterances within that interaction that reflect interpretation. However, my evaluation is selective. The analyses are quite detailed, and because of this depth I am unable to quantify findings from the third space episodes that I selected. Researchers must take this
problem into account when trying to investigate interpretation in communicative interaction. 50

Another problem with the interpretive perspective concerns the argument that writing cannot be taught. As I mentioned earlier, the interpretive perspective radically redefines writing as an interpretive, communicative act rather than a structured, codified process. As such, the indeterminacy involved in the writing act cannot be easily represented. Some writing instructors interpret this claim as a suggestion that writing instructors can do nothing to help students learn how to write. I do not believe this complaint about the interpretive perspective is accurate. The interpretive perspective, as I explained earlier, does not take away anything from writing pedagogy as we know it; rather, it contributes to it. That is, the suggestion that writing is an interpretive act does not reject process as a part of the writing act; it rejects the idea that a codified process defines the writing act. I believe that Joseph Petraglia (forthcoming) explains this point most clearly when he writes: "Of course, the fundamental observation that an individual produces text by means of a writing process has not been discarded. Instead, it has dissolved and shifted from figure to ground" (63).

There are still plenty of tasks that we as writing instructors can do in the classroom. In fact, much of what we do might not change at all as a result of adopting the interpretive perspective. It is how we understand the writing act that might change. In adopting the interpretive perspective we would define the writing act as an indeterminate, communicative activity instead of defining the writing act as process, or conventions, or the application of rhetorical principles.

50Similarly, another difficulty in researching interpretation is that the researcher imposes a certain interpretation on the communicative interaction being studied. Researchers must be very careful to reflect dialogue and interviews about that dialogue accurately without imposing their interpretations (except, perhaps, as they synthesize the results of such an investigation).
We might teach a process, or conventions, or the application of rhetorical principles, but the hermeneutic approach to writing that I advocate here suggests that we cannot teach the writing act if we define that act as indeterminate and interpretive. This recognition of the writing act and its emphasis on communicative interaction suggest that as teachers we are required to act as mentors to our students by becoming part of our students' writing acts.

What Are Some of the Research Directions Suggested by the Interpretive Perspective?

If we accept the argument that writing is a communicative, interpretive activity, and not a codified process, then future research might explore a whole new arena of writing pedagogy involving interpretation. Further research might explore the indeterminate nature of the writing act in a number of situations. (In this dissertation, for example, I have explored only two situated writing acts). More studies about the indeterminate nature of communicative interaction would help researchers draw comparisons and conclusions about the role that interpretation plays in the writing act.

In addition, future studies might compare the indeterminate nature of the writing act with the written work that students produce. Investigations of this sort would help researchers answer the question: "Does the interpretive perspective make students better writers?" These studies might also investigate whether or not instruction employing the concept of the third space helps students become better writers. Future studies might explore how the third space might be taught to students and how this instruction might strengthen their written work.
Finally, because the interpretive perspective emphasizes communicative interaction, future studies might investigate the varying forms these interactions could take. I have already explored some of these interactions through the different contexts of the writing classroom and the writing center tutorial (student-student, teacher-student, nonacademic professional-student, nonacademic professional-teacher); however, the interactions that I have examined are all oral interactions. Electronic interactions made through synchronous (chat rooms) and asynchronous (electronic mail) mediums make up another site for interactions about writing that I have not yet explored. Sites for researching these interactions include distance education and on-line writing centers. Because writing is taught on-line in these sites, they form a rich and largely untapped site of communicative interactions about writing.

This dissertation has explored the role of interpretation in the writing act by investigating indeterminacy in communicative interaction. While my investigation has been exploratory in nature, I believe that the concept of the third space can help us more closely examine the fascinating interplays of interpretation that occur in the writing act, and consequently, the third space may demonstrate ways in which the writing act is indeterminate. I hope that in some way the third space moves us closer to understanding the impact of the interpretive perspective on writing pedagogy.
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Figure 1. Evaluation Criteria Sheet

# Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content** | Is all necessary information included?  
               Is the content appropriate? |
| **Context** | Does the writer address issues in ways appropriate to the discipline (what are conventions)?  
               Does the communication meet the necessary requirements for the assignment?  
               What is the situation requiring the communication? |
| **Audience** | Does the writer address/acknowledge the audience (who is the audience—primary and secondary)?  
               Has the writer adapted the material so that the audience(s) can easily understand it?  
               Are appropriate language and vocabulary used to communicate with the audience—language they will understand? |
| **Purpose** | Is the purpose clearly stated (to inform, persuade, argue, etc.?)  
               Is the purpose evident throughout (are there places that stray from the intended purpose)?  
               Is the purpose (indicated by the author) appropriate?  
               How will the document/paper be used by its reader?  
               Is information tailored to suit that intended use? |
| **Organization** | Is the information organized clearly:  
               By section? Are headings included to separate sections of information?  
               By paragraph? Do paragraphs have clear topic sentences and express a cohesive line of thought? Are transitions included between paragraphs?  
               By visuals? Are visuals (charts, tables, graphs, etc.) clearly indicated in the text and/or by captions near the visuals? |
| **Support** | Is support included—details, facts, evidence—to illustrate main points?  
               Is support appropriate?  
               Is support documented correctly (according to style manual)? |
| **Expression** | Does the writer use correct punctuation, grammar, and spelling?  
               Are sentences clear and concise? Wordy?  
               Does the writer use appropriate vocabulary?  
               Is the writer documenting sources correctly? Plagiarizing? |
| **Design** | Is the paper visually effective—balance of white space/margins, headings, visuals/graphs, type size, font, and style?  
               Is the paper neat and easy to read? |
Figure 2. English 314 Syllabus and Policy Sheet

English 314 Syllabus
Lee-Ann Kastman, Instructor
Office: Ross 424 Phone: 294-0908


This is a computer-enhanced section of English 314. We will meet in computer lab Ross 115 every Tuesday starting on January 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Jan 14</td>
<td>Introduction to the course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce Assignment #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss Writing Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Define Technical Communication</td>
<td>Read Ch 1, 19 Burnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Discuss Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet in Ross 115</td>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>Log in Work Day (Assignment #1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 23</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Bring Draft of Assignment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Introduce Assignment #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>Jan 28</td>
<td>Correct Memo/Effective Communication</td>
<td>Exercise #1 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 4, 8</td>
<td>Assignment #1 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 30</td>
<td>Review Criteria 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 4, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>Collaborative Exercise: Direct Mail</td>
<td>Exercise #2 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 6</td>
<td>NO CLASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Review Criteria 5-8</td>
<td>Read Ch 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 11</td>
<td>Work Day (Assignment #2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 13</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Bring Drafts of Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Assignment #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Instructions</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>Introduce Assignment #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Presentations</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>In a dyad, write instructions</td>
<td>Exercise #3 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss Definitions and Descriptions</td>
<td>Assignment #2 Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
<td>Test Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Exchange Instructions and Read</td>
<td>Exercise #4 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 27</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Discuss Document Testing and Presentations</td>
<td>Read Ch 11. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Work Day (Assignment #3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Bring Drafts of Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Assignment #3 Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 20</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 27</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Report and Collaboration</td>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>Introduce Assignment #4</td>
<td>Exercise #5 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Do Collaborative Exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 3</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Discuss Collaboration, Feasibility Reports, and Proposals</td>
<td>Ch 5, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Group Day: Proposals/ Agendas</td>
<td>Meet with me in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td>Ch 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Group Day: Revision of Proposal</td>
<td>Exercise #6 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 17</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Group Day</td>
<td>No class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Group Day: Progress Report</td>
<td>Exercise 7 (in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 24</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Group Conferences with me: Progress Update</td>
<td>Meet in groups in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise 7 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 29</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Group Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Group Day</td>
<td>Assignment #4 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>Finals!</td>
<td>Group Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome....

As students attending Iowa State University, you may be taking this class for one of several reasons: you may be taking the class because it is required for your major or because you want to learn more about technical communication. Whatever the reason, you are here because you need or want to improve your communication skills. This class will introduce you to a variety of communication tasks that you may encounter in the workplace. However, whereas I can introduce professional communication in general, I cannot instruct forms of communication specific to each of your disciplines. Therefore, this course will require a collaborative effort. I need you to inform me and the class about your technical field and the types of professional communication included in it.

Course Objectives

My course objectives include introducing you to written, oral, and visual communication tasks that you may encounter in your future careers. In this course, you will receive regular feedback and assistance from me and your peers. The objectives of the course are to help you:

• Improve written, oral, and visual communication skills
• Write and present interesting documents that pertain to your discipline
• Participate and effectively utilize collaboration
• Use word processing computer technology to facilitate your communication

Units/Assignments

There are three major units included in this course, though some of those units include more than one assignment. Below is a description of the units and assignments included in each unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Introduction to Technical Communication</th>
<th>II. Technical Instructions and Presentations</th>
<th>III. Feasibility Report and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this unit you will be introduced to effective technical communication and types of correspondence. You will write a memo to me describing technical communication in your field. You will also analyze a document for effective technical communication.</td>
<td>This unit introduces both technical instructions and how to give presentations. You will write a set of technical instructions and present those instructions to the class. You will also be asked to complete document testing on instructions written by your peers.</td>
<td>In a group, you will plan, prepare, write, and present a feasibility report that studies a real-world problem. This project requires your group to write a proposal and a progress report during the process of your 5-week collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computer Enhancement

Because this course is computer enhanced, all written work must be type-written on computer. We will meet in Macintosh Computer Lab Ross 15 every Tuesday of class. Familiarity with Mac computers is beneficial but not required. Minimal computer instruction will not be offered in the course; you should already have knowledge of basic computer skills (i.e., typing, saving, printing, etc.). The lab days of class will give you an opportunity to learn Mac computers and share and/or receive your knowledge with others. We will primarily make use of word processing, but we may also use graphics or spreadsheet programs to enhance documents. Talk programs (E-mail, Daedalus) may also be set up for the class. More direction on these programs will be offered as we move along in the course. Remember that I am not a computer expert. If you have problems, I can refer you to the lab monitor or to your computer manual.

Other Exercises and Activities

In addition to the assignments, other exercises and activities will be required.

Readings
Readings include several chapters of Burnett’s text, Technical Communication (4th edition). Although you are responsible for completing the readings and I expect you to have readings completed, we will not always cover the material in class. I would like class time to be devoted to practicing and reviewing your writing. However, having the readings completed on the assigned day will greatly clarify your understanding of the course material and will only benefit you. Your work will easily reflect whether or not you have done the reading in Burnett’s text.

Presentations
Oral communication is important to technical communication; therefore, I have provided several opportunities for you to present information orally. Some of these presentations are informal and will not be graded. Other presentations will be graded. Class discussions (which we will have frequently) also provide another opportunity to develop your oral communication skills.

Computer Exercises
Several computer exercises will be required in this course. These exercises should help prepare you for assignments we are working on in the class. Some of these exercises will be done collaboratively; others individually. You must complete these exercises in class on computer days. I prefer that you turn in these exercises electronically through my drop box (more info on that later). You may turn in a copy in print as well if you like.

Peer Review
An activity you may find in your future workplace is reviewing other colleagues’ work and having your own work reviewed. In this class, you will participate in peer review before documents are due. These peer review sessions will not be held in the computer lab. I prefer that you work with a print copy and discuss your work with others face-to-face.

Collaboration
As I already mentioned, some computer exercises will be completed collaboratively, as will the peer review sessions. The final assignment of this course, the feasibility report, will be completed collaboratively as well. We will go over effective collaborative strategies and discuss the process of collaboration frequently throughout the course.
Policies
Policies create and establish an environment and culture unique to our class; learning to follow policies may help you as you enter other organizational cultures. Policies in this class pertain to punctuality (attendance and assignments), conferences, and evaluation (grading scale and criteria).

Attendance
Punctual attendance will be required and expected in this course. Because of the rigorous nature of the course, class attendance will be essential. In case of absences, however, I will enforce the following policy. Each student will receive a maximum of 2 absences. Missing more than 2 class days will inevitably affect your grade, AND IF MORE THAN 6 DAYS ARE MISSED YOU AUTOMATICALLY FAIL THE COURSE. If you must be absent for activities (and/or more than 2 class days), I ask that you please notify me in advance.

Assignments
Completed papers will be expected on the day they are due. Papers will be collected during the class hour. If completion is impossible by class time, PLEASE CONTACT ME PERSONALLY, through phone or office visit BEFORE THE PAPER IS DUE—NOT ON THE DUE DATE, and you may have until 5 PM of the class day the paper is due to complete the assignment. Anything turned in after the class hour (or in case of a rare exception, 5 PM) on the day the paper is due will be considered LATE. I will dock late papers a full letter grade each class day they are late.

Conferences
One-to-one conferences with me will be held once during the semester. During that time we can talk about your progress in the course and any concerns you may have with assignments, etc. You are welcome to schedule a conference at any time during the semester. If there is anything you would like to discuss about the course with me, please give me a call or schedule a conference time with me.

Evaluation
Major assignments, daily work, and policies will all account for your final grade. Each assignment will be evaluated on a percentage system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Scale</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100-93%</td>
<td>Correspondence 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A- 92-90%</td>
<td>Document Analysis 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+ 89-87%</td>
<td>Technical Instructions 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 86-83%</td>
<td>Presentation 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- 82-80%</td>
<td>Feasibility Report 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+ 79-77%</td>
<td>Class Participation 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 76-73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- 72-70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+ 69-67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 66-63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- 62-60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 59% and below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation will be based on your attention to the following rhetorical elements: content, context, purpose, support, audience, organization, expression, and design. Note that these criteria pertain to written work; criteria for presentations are slightly different and will be discussed in class.
Figure 3. Letter to Dr. Chmura

Dr. Chmura 
Allergy Clinic 
1215 Duff 
Ames, IA 50010 

February 18, 1997 

Dr. Chmura: 

You may remember me as an allergy patient who thought she was allergic to cats but in reality was only allergic to mold and dust mites. (I visited the clinic on February 12.) You also may remember that I teach technical writing at Iowa State University. I'm writing to see if you'd be interested in allowing me and my students to redesign your informational document about allergies (see enclosure). 

We discussed this document in passing when I left the clinic on February 12; however, we had talked about the possibility that I would redesign the document for pay. As I thought about this some more, I realized that the document provided a perfect project for my students. Each semester I require students to find a real application for a technical writing project rather than an assignment I create. In this particular case, I would ask students to form teams and revise this document. The teams would compete with each other to create the most suitable document for you, and at the end of the project you would have as many as 6 designs to choose from. 

If you were to agree to this project, I would need your permission to use the document (any names and addresses on the document can be changed if you wish). I would also need to talk with you briefly about the document to get more information about its intended use, audience, information, design preferences, etc. (I'd prefer talking in person so we could look at the document together, but we can also do this over the phone or on e-mail if you have access to the internet. I know you are extremely busy.) 

I realize this all may seem like a strange request, but I believe this project could have several benefits. For you, this project would be a minimal time commitment, and you may receive a document that you plan to use in the future (and at no cost to the Allergy Clinic!). My students would receive the benefit of working on an interesting and worthwhile technical writing project. And I would benefit from the experience of forging a project that attempts to bridge community and university (a goal that is important to me as a teacher and future college professor). 

If you are at all interested in this project, please feel free to contact me at school (294-0908) or at home after 5pm (292-1452). I am also on e-mail daily (lkastman@iastate.edu). Thank you for considering this project. I hope to hear from you soon. 

Sincerely, 

Lee-Ann Kastman 

enc.: "Allergy Department"
Figure 4. Patient Consultation Document
ALLERGY - IMMUNOLOGY & PEDIATRIC PULMONOLOGY

ALLERGY CONSULTATION

Please fill out this form and bring it with you for your appointment which is scheduled: _______ or Doctor _______ at _______. Allergy skin testing may be done at this time. Please do not take antihistamines such as Actifed, Seldane, Chlor-Trimeton, Iscolor, Rondec seventy-two hours (3 days) prior to your appointment time. Hismanal six weeks or Claritin for 1 week prior to your appointment time. Asthma medications such as Theophylline, Proventil Repetabs, Inhalers and/or cortisone products may be taken. If you cannot keep your appointment, please call at least 72 hours ahead of time so we can offer your time to someone else.

NAME __________________________________________ AGE _______ BIRTHDATE ____________

Last First Middle

Parent's Name __________________________________ Home Phone ____________

Address ________________________________________________

Referring Physician _______________________________________

I. SYMPTOMS, COMPLAINTS, OR CHARACTERISTICS that apply to you. Circle terms that apply.
   2. Chest symptoms: Chest pain, daily cough, wheezing, recurrent attacks of asthma, shortness of breath on exertion, shortness of breath at rest, chronic recurrent bronchitis, recurrent pneumonia.
   3. Skin symptoms: Recurrent hives, eczema, itching, tingling, burning, swelling of eyes, hives associated with difficulty swallowing or tightness of chest, skin rash.
   4. Eye symptoms: Itching, watering.
   5. Ear symptoms: Recurrent ear infection, itching, hearing loss, stopped up, fluid in ears, dizziness.
   6. Gastrointestinal symptoms: Colic, diarrhea, constipation, frequent indigestion.
   7. Insect sting reaction.

II. Age at onset of symptoms _________________

III. Do you have symptoms year around or just certain times? ________________

   What times? ________________

   What months are worst? ________________

   What months are best? ________________
IV. Are symptoms affected by: (Please mark "N" if Nasal; "C" if Chest; "NC" if both Nasal and Chest; leave blank if not affected).

- weather change
- time/day (morning; night)
- change in residence
- trips
- heat
- cold
- foods-specify
- riding in country
- vacuuming
- others (please be specific)
- infections
- rain
- dampness
- fumes/odors
- tobacco smoke
- fabrics
- dusting
- fatigue
- lakeside
- furnace (when turns on)
- plant/grass
- rain
- flowering trees
- basements
- insect bites
- raking leaves
- mowing lawns
- around barns/hay
- exercise
- emotions
- (tension, excitement)
- school/work
- insecticides

V. MEDICATIONS:

1. What medications are you taking at the present time and how often?

2. List previous medications you used and if they helped your problem.

3. List any medications you are allergic to or medications which have caused side effects (i.e. Penicillin, sulfa).

Describe the reaction:

VI. PAST MEDICAL HISTORY:

1. Have you ever had allergy skin tests? Yes____ No____
   Where____________________ When____________________

2. Have you ever received allergy (shots) hyposensitization injections? Yes____ No____
   Where____________________ When____________________
   How long____________________ Effect on symptoms____________________
Figure 5. Welcome Document
Welcome:

We welcome you to our Allergy and Pulmonary Practice. We wish you improved health and dedicate ourselves to satisfy this goal.

Purposes

The practice is devoted to the total care of allergy and respiratory disorders.

We treat primarily asthma, hay fever, food allergy and intolerance, eczema, hives, insect sting reactions, "sinus" headaches, and drug allergies. We evaluate and treat asthma, cystic fibrosis, recurrent pneumonias, croup and immune deficiencies.

You may see us by calling for an appointment. A new patient work-up and testing date generally can be obtained within 4 weeks. A regular follow-up visit may take up to 2 weeks before the appointment. Sick patients will be seen right away. For everyone’s sake, an appointment is advisable.

The First Visit to the Allergist

The first time you visit your allergist, he or she will spend time getting a thorough history of your illness from you. You will be asked questions about your home and work environment, your diet, and your living habits. The allergist may also do a physical examination and perform skin tests to determine the substances to which you are allergic.

Skin tests are performed by scratching the skin with small danders, molds and foods. Within 10-20 minutes, the substances that you are allergic to, if any, will be evident. The area of the skin where the substance was placed will be inflamed like a mosquito bite or small welt and will usually feel itchy. These reactions will pass within several hours of receiving you tests.

By getting your health history and performing laboratory and skin tests, your allergist can determine the most effective treatment plan for you.

Cancellations

PLEASE DON'T BE A "NO SHOW"! We arrange for your coming and expect equal courtesy from you. If you must miss an appointment with the doctor, be the good person you are and call well enough ahead (24 hours in advance) to allow another to be seen instead. We have set aside 1 hour of my time, solely for you.

Telephone Calls - 515-239-4402

1) Office Hours - A receptionist will answer. Please be patient. She is the busiest person in the office. Kindly be explicit and considerate. She will try her best to help by answering your questions or transferring the call to the nurse. If this is an emergency call, please let the receptionist know this and she will interrupt me.

After Office Hours

2) If medical assistance is needed after regular clinic hours, please
Figure 6. Allergy Information Document
Environmental control recommendations for: ______________________

The above named patient was found to be allergic to the items circled below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Molds - year round, S. S. F</td>
<td>7. Cat - exposure, year round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ragweed - Aug-Sept</td>
<td>10. __________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALLERGY AND ASTHMA: WHAT THEY ARE

Allergic diseases are prevalent throughout the United States and can be potentially serious. An allergy is an overreaction to substances which are ordinarily harmless. Allergy reactions are due to excessive amounts of a natural antibody - antibody E. Allergic individuals produce too much antibody E and as a result may experience symptoms of allergy. Common allergens are pollens, molds, dust mites, animal dander and saliva, chemicals, foods, medicines, and venom from insect stings.

**What are the allergic diseases?**

Hay fever is caused by allergy to the pollen of trees, grasses or weeds or the spores of molds. The name is actually a misnomer, since hay is not a common allergen and no fever occurs. Depending on the section of the country and pollinating periods, the hay fever season may occur in the spring, summer or fall, and may last until frost. The sufferer has spells of sneezing, itching and watering eyes, running nose, burning palate and throat. Asthma is sometimes a complication.

Allergic rhinitis is a general term used to apply to anyone who has nasal congestion, sneezing and a running nose due to allergies.

This may be a seasonal problem as with hay fever or it may be a year-round problem caused by other allergens, such as house dust, animal danders and perhaps some foods. Frequently this problem is complicated by "sinusitis"
and patients with constant nasal symptoms should have an allergy evaluation.

Asthma is a condition characterized by coughing, wheezing and difficulty in breathing. It is frequently associated with a family history of allergy. Any of the above-mentioned allergens may cause asthmatic attacks. Infections of the sinuses or bronchial tubes may also be important factors. Asthma patients are also affected adversely by irritants such as air pollutants, cigarette smoke, exhaust fumes, etc.

Allergic dermatitis (eczema) is a non-contagious, itchy rash which often occurs in the creases of arms, legs, and neck, although it can cover the entire body. This condition is frequently associated with allergies, and substances to which a person is sensitive may aggravate it. Foods may be an important cause of this problem.

Contact dermatitis is a rash which comes from direct skin contact with many substances. The most common causes of contact dermatitis are poison ivy, metals and jewelry and cosmetics.

Urticaria (hives) is an outbreak on the skin of itchy welts of varying size. When the swellings are large and invade deeper tissues, they are called angioedema. They may develop on the face, lips, tongue, throat, eyes, ears, or internally. Allergies to food or drugs are well-known causes of these conditions, but they may also result from an underlying disease state or occur after exercise.

Is any age particularly prone to allergy?
Anyone may develop an allergic reaction and at any age. Even infants may show the characteristic signs of allergy. These signs and symptoms include recurrent ear infections, continuously runny nose, sneezing fits, wheezing, bronchitis, and the classic allergic shinners or blueish discoloration beneath both eyes.

Is early diagnosis important?
Absolutely yes. Asthma in childhood, if neglected, may lead to serious complications later in life. The majority of cases of childhood asthma can be controlled and relieved with proper medical care. Early diagnosis and treatment in both children and adults can increase the chances for improvement and relief of the asthmatic condition.

What is the treatment for allergic disease?
Allergens should be removed from the patient's environment. If foods are the cause of the difficulty they must be eliminated from the diet.

The proper use and timing of medications is important in treating allergic disease. The doctor must determine the appropriate medications and their dosage if symptoms persist despite the proper use of medications and the
removal of allergens from the environment, then immunizing injections. Allergy immunotherapy, may be necessary to control the disease.

Immunotherapy (desensitization, hyposensitization, allergy shots) is used in the treatment of allergic patients with respiratory symptoms. In this form of treatment, injections of allergenic extract are given in gradually increasing amounts over a period of months. The goal is to induce tolerance to the allergens and to bring about a decline in the symptoms and medication requirements.

Is general health care important?
Yes, a well-balanced diet and a well-rounded program of exercise, recreation and rest are helpful. Smoking is indeed very harmful and must be avoided. In general, the allergic patient is better in a calm atmosphere. Parents of asthmatic children should try to maintain an attitude of calmness and reassurance. The child should be encouraged to be self-reliant and participate in all the activities of his/her peers as much as possible.

Is the change of climate beneficial?
Hay fever sufferers may find relief by going to areas of the country where their particular allergen is not present. Some asthma sufferers may benefit from a warm, dry climate. However, before any change of climate can be recommended for an individual, a thorough and comprehensive study of the condition must be done. The important factor is the removal of the allergen where possible and proper treatment. Air-conditioning and other protective devices, such as electronic air cleaners in the home, may be helpful.

Can allergic disease be prevented?
Those who are aware of their problem can minimize exposure to the offending allergen by avoiding drives in the country during the pollen season as well as drafts and exposures to cold and damp air; keeping away from house dust and other types of dust; trying not to breathe fumes from paint, insecticides or products containing irritants; and trying not to use and come in contact with certain cosmetics, dyes and strong cleansers. They should strive to keep in good physical condition and avoid emotional tension and fatigue.

Avoidance Measures:
Avoidance for common household inhalants is an essential part of the treatment program. This includes:

**HOUSE DUST:** House dust Allergy is caused by minute organisms that live in it called mites, can be an important source of year-round allergic symptoms. Therefore, measures that permit dust avoidance have fundamental importance in a treatment program. Reduction of dust exposure requires both control of dust sources and removal of dust deposited on surfaces.
The following instructions are especially designed to reduce dust exposure in your bedroom.

"ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROLS" - FOCUSING ON BEDROOM:

Bed: 1. Air tight mattress encasings for mattress and box spring of all beds in room.
2. Synthetic blankets and pillows that can be easily washed.
3. Avoid quilts and cotton stuffed bedspreads - Keep it simple and washable.
4. No stuffed toys in the bed at night - replace with something of soft plastic or something easy to wash frequently!

2. Mold grows around all window sills where warm and moist - wash with lysol or similar cleanser.
3. During pollen season keep windows closed.

Floors: 1. Ideal is NO RUGS. Shag rugs are especially difficult to clean.
2. Damp mop is preferable to vacuum as less dust is spread.
3. Carpets should be vacuumed at least weekly.

Closets: 1. Closet is essentially a part of the bedroom and should not be considered a storage area for unused materials (old clothes, old books...) or for vacuum.
2. Only clothes and shoes regularly used should be in closet. Clean closet floor as floors in rest of the room.

Forced Air: 1. Heating vents should be sealed off or filter used.

Heating Vents: 2. Cheese cloth can be used to cover vents.

Shelves: 1. Open shelves with books or collections (cans, planes, dolls) accumulate dust easily. All favorite collections should be in cupboards (behind glass or plastic if possible).
2. Dresser tops and cabinets should be as free as possible of "collections".

General: 1. Avoid plants in bedrooms.
2. No pets in bedrooms.
3. Avoid heavy framed pictures and pennants on walls.

HOUSEHOLD PETS: Animal dander is the microscopic particles of shed skin (not just hair). It becomes airborne, inhaled, and can cause allergic symptoms. The presence of the animal itself is not essential, only the dander that remains from the animal's prior presence. It may take months after removal of an animal for the animal dander to be eliminated from the home. Allergic reactions to cats are caused by a specific element in the cat's saliva rather than by the cat's fur or dander. Some suggestions to help allergic cat owners deal with the problem are:
Use a wet towel to wipe down the animal every day to remove much of
the saliva and the loose hairs containing it.
- Shampoo the cat every two weeks with a good pet shampoo and rinse its
cloth with a solution of 1 tablespoon of fabric softener to 1 quart of
water.
- Brush the cat two to three times a week with a soft brush. (Stiff
brushes can scratch the cat's skin and make the problem worse.)

What is mold?
Molds are parasitic, microscopic plants without stems, roots or leaves.
They contain no chlorophyll. Their spots float in the air like pollen.
Mildew is caused by molds. Outdoors they can be found in soil, vegetation
and rotting wood. Inside, molds are found in attics, basements, bathrooms,
refrigerators, garbage containers, carpets, and upholstery.

Outdoor mold spores begin to appear after a spring thaw and in the northern
United States reach their peak in either July, August, September, or
October. Molds can be found all year long in the south.

What are pollen and mold counts?
Pollen and mold counts measure the amount of airborne allergens present.
Counting methods vary and, because of the lack of standardization,
inaccuracies and variations can occur.

A pollen count of 100 is considered a low reading, 100-500 is moderate,
500-1000 high, and 1000 and over very high.

Exposure to molds can be reduced by these precautions:

1. It is very important that the house should not be musty. A bulb kept
burning in the closet will keep it dry. Do not allow fruits and
vegetables to spoil. Keep basement and storage rooms clean and dry.
The flour in wallpaper paste has a high content of mold spores and ma
be a source of mold growth under warm and humid conditions. (Sprayin
or painting moldy areas with 1 oz. Zephirin concentrate to 1 gallon o
water will help).
2. Avoid country drives with open windows during harvest and on windy
days.
3. Avoid mowing grass, playing in or handling hay or straw, raking or
burning leaves and weeds.
4. Avoid contact with utensils stored in musty places. Luggage and yard
and play equipment should be put away dry.
5. Try to stay indoors on stormy and windy days. Stay indoors in cool e
evening during the mold season.
Some do's and don't's to follow during the pollen and mold season:

**DO** keep windows closed at night. Use air conditioning, which cleans, cools and dries the air.

**DO** minimize early morning activity when pollen levels are highest (between 5:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m.).

**DO** keep your car windows closed when driving.

**DO** stay indoors when the pollen count or humidity is high and on windy days when dust and pollen are whipped about.

**DO** take a vacation during height of the pollen season to a place more pollen free (such as the beach or the sea).

**DO** take the medications prescribed by your allergist.

**DON'T** rake leaves (they also stir up molds).

**DON'T** hang sheets or clothing out to dry as pollens and molds may collect in these items.

**DON'T** grow too many indoor plants; wet dirt causes molds to form.
Figure 7. Document Suggestions by Dr. Chmura

Document: Allergy Consultation Form

Purpose: to help patients identify their symptoms and to get patients thinking about symptoms they might not have thought of before.

Audience: parents of children who are allergy patients; adults

Status of document: standard document that all patients receive

Changes and/or Additions

1. Demographic Information
   Audience includes children (parents of children) to adults. Phrase words so that document is not geared to children (or parents of children) alone. Try to be all-inclusive in the language.

2. Symptoms (Part I)
   Patients have to circle symptoms that they are experiencing. It would be easier to have two-word symptoms on the same line (i.e., "sneezing attacks"). Add 7th point: "Facial Pain" (?)

3. Frequency of Symptoms (Part III)
   Questions are wordy. Also make the questions parallel.

4. Categories of Nasal and Chest (Part IV)
   Symptom influences could be categorized (i.e., "dust," "mold," "pollens," "animal danders"). They could also be divided into "non-allergic" and "allergic" categories. He says this section is "a mess." May have to do research on categories to make sure they are exclusive.

5. Medications (#3)
   Add information "when did reaction occur?"

6. Past Medical History (Sections VI)
   OK

7. Environment (Section VIII) See page 195 of Roy Patterson's information
Document: Allergy Information

**Purpose:** to educate patients about their allergies

**Audience:** all patients who have been diagnosed as having allergies

**Status of Document:** widely used document; all diagnosed patients receive it

**Changes**

1. **Format** (booklet form; brochure, handout)

2. **Text design** (font/page margins)

3. **Additional information:** none. Don't want to give patients so much information that they won't read the document. Make the document appealing (not too big) and inviting. It should not repeat information in the other booklets they receive.
Figure 8. Student Version of Patient Consultation
Age at onset of symptoms ________________

Do you have symptoms year-round or just certain times? ____________________________

What months are worst? __________________________________________________________

What months are best? __________________________________________________________

II. Symptoms Are Affected by:

(Please mark “N” if Nasal; “C” if Chest; “NC” if both Nasal and Chest; leave blank if not affected).

___ vacuuming  ___ antique stores  ___ infections
___ dusting    ___ lakeside      ___ emotions
___ dampness   ___ cats         ___ tobacco smoke
___ barns/hay  ___ dogs         ___ fabric stores
___ freshly cut grass ___ other pets/animals ___ potpourri
___ raking leaves ___ exercise    ___ other strong smells
___ basements  ___ cold air     ___ cleaning solutions
___ musty smells

other: (please specify) ____________________________________________________________

III. Medications

What medications are you taking at the present time and how often?

List previous medications you used and if they helped your problem.

List any medications to which you are allergic and the approximate date of reaction (i.e. Penicillin, sulfa).

Describe the side effects caused by any medications.

IV. Foods

Do any foods cause symptoms? Yes _____ No _______

If so, please list foods and symptoms.
Allergy Consultation

Please fill out this form and bring it with you for your appointment which is scheduled on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Allergy skin testing may be done at this time. Please see the enclosed list of antihistamines that you need to discontinue using prior to your appointment. You can continue taking asthma medications, such as Theophylline, Proventil Repetabs, Inhalers, and/or cortisone. If you cannot keep your appointment, please call at least 24 hours ahead of time so we can offer your time to someone else.

Name ____________________________  Age _____  Birth date _____

Last  First  Middle

Parent’s Name (if minor) ____________________________  Home Phone ____________________________

Address _____________________________________________________________________________

Referring Physician ____________________________

I. Symptoms, Complaints, or Characteristics

Check the box for terms that apply to you. Circle the characteristics that apply.

- **Nasal symptoms**: Itchy nose, nasal congestion, nasal polyps, sinus trouble, hay fever, frequent head colds, long-lasting colds, sneezing attacks, runny nose, post-nasal drainage.

- **Chest symptoms**: Chest pain, daily cough, wheezing, recurrent attacks of asthma, shortness of breath on exertion, shortness of breath at rest, chronic recurrent bronchitis, recurrent pneumonia.

- **Skin symptoms**: Recurrent hives, eczema, itchy skin, burning, swelling of eyes, hives associated with difficulty swallowing or tightness of chest, skin rash.

- **Eye symptoms**: Itching, watering, redness.

- **Ear symptoms**: Recurrent ear infection, itching, hearing loss, popping and cracking, fluid in ears, dizziness.

- **Gastrointestinal symptoms**: Colic, diarrhea, constipation, frequent indigestion.

- **Insect sting reaction**: (Please specify) _____________________________________________________________________________

- **Sinusitis symptoms**: Forehead pain, cheekbone pain, pain going to teeth, yellow/green nasal discharge, bloody nasal discharge.
V. Environment (Circle appropriate responses)

Location of home: city suburb rural farm near factory grain elevator

House or apartment

Age of house/apartment How long at present location?

Where was previous location?

Type of heat

Air conditioning: window central none

Humidifier: portable central none

Air purifier system: portable central none

Where does patient spend day-time hours?

Bedroom: Sleeps alone or shares

Location of bedroom Number of beds in room

Type of floor covering Type of rug pad

Types of pillows Type of mattress

Bedding: wool blanket quilt comforter other

Windows: drapes curtains shades blinds shutters

Other: bookcase stuffed toys wall hangings stuffed furniture in bedroom

Living room: Type of floor covering Type of rug pad

Type and age of furniture (upholstered?)

Window coverings

Basement: finished unfinished damp dry

General: Number of house plants Number and type of pets

Did you previously have a pet? If so, what and when:

Do you have a fireplace? Where is wood stored?

Number of smokers in household:
VI. Family History
Is there any family history of asthma, hayfever, eczema, allergies? 
If so, please state relationship to patient.

VII. Past Medical History
Have you ever had allergy skin tests? Yes ___ No ___
What clinic/hospital? ____________________________ When ____________
Have you ever received allergy (shots) hyposensitization injections? Yes ___ No ___
What clinic/hospital? ____________________________ When ____________
How long ____________________________
Effect on symptoms ____________________________
List past hospitalizations, operations or serious illnesses (please give date or year if possible):

How many emergency room visits for allergy and/or asthma related problems in the past year? ________
How many visits to your physician for allergy and/or asthma related problems in the past year? ________
How many days of school/work have been missed for allergy and/or asthma related problems in the past year? ________

VIII. Miscellaneous
What are your expectations for this allergy consultation?

List patient’s and/or family members’ hobbies:

Are patient’s immunizations up-to-date? ______________
Does patient receive yearly flu shot? ______________
Patient’s occupation: __________________________________
Parents’ occupation (if patient is minor): ____________________________
Other occupation in household: __________________________________
Antihistamines

The patient should stop taking the following antihistamines four (4) days prior to appointment unless otherwise specified.

Brand Name Index

- A.R.M.
- Actidil
- Actifed
- Alka-Seltzer Plus
- Allerest
- Allerest Children's
- Allerest Headache Strength
- Allerest Timed Release
- Ambodril Kapseals
- Atarax — off 5 days
- Benadryl
- Benadryl Kapseals
- Benadryl w/ Ephedrine
- Bonine
- Brexin
- Bromfed Syrup
- Cheracol Plus
- Chlor-Trimeton
- Chlor-Trimeton Decongestant
- Chlor-Trimeton Repetabs
- Chloramate Unicelles
- Claritin — off 1 week
- Claritin-D — off 1 week
- Clistin
- Clistin R-A
- Comtrex
- Coricidin
- Coricidin D
- Coricidin Demilets
- Coricidin Medilets
- Coricidin Sinus Headache
- Corforte
- Corylin Infant
- Coryban-D
- Coryzaid
- Decapryn
- Deconamine SR
- Demazin
- Demazin Repetabs
- Dimetane
- Dimetane Decongestant
- Dimetane Extentabs
- Dimetapp
- Dimetapp Extentabs
- Disophrol
- Disophrol Chronotabs
- Doxipan — off 1 week

Dristan
Dristan-AF
Drixoral
Extendryl
Fedahist
Fedahist Gyrocaps
Fedrazil
Flogesic
Forhistal Lontabs
Hismanal — off 6 weeks
Hista-Clopane
Hista-Vadrin T.D.
Histalet
Histalet Forte
Histaspan
Histaspan-D
Histaspan-Plus
Hydroxyzine — off 5 days
Isoclor
Leder-Tuss Sequels
Lederade Sequels
Ledertap Sequels
MSC Triaminic
Medi-Flu
Naldecon
Napril Plateau
Nolamine
Novafed A
Novahistine
Novahistine Fortis
Novahistine LP
Novahistine Melet
Novahistine Sinus
Optamine
Omade 2 for Children
Omade Sequels
Omaker 2 for Children
Omaker Sequels
PBZ
PBZ Lontabs
PBZ w/Ephedrine
PBZ-SR
Phenergan
Phenergan Compound
Phenergan-D
Polaramine
Polaramine Repetabs
Polyhistamine-D
Pyrrozate
Quadnite
Remsed
Rhinolar
Robitussin Night Relief
Rondec Drops
Rondec Syrup
Rondec Tablet
Ru-Tuss
Ryna
Rynatan
Rynatan Pediatric
SK-Diphenhydramine
Seldane
Seldane-D
Semprex-D
Sinarest
Sinarest: Extra-Strength
Sine-Off
Sine-Off AF Extra-Strength
Sinequame — off 1 week
Singlet
Sinubid
Sinutab
Sinutab Extra-Strength
Sudafed Plus
Symptom 3
Tacaryl
Tavist
Tavist-1
Teldrin
Temaril
Temaril Spanules
Triaminic
Triaminic Infant
Triaminic Juvelets
Triaminicin
Triaminicin Allergy
Triaminicin Chewable
Tylenol PM
Tylenol Sinus
Ursinus
Vicks Formula 44M
Vicks NyQuil
Visterai — off 5 days
Zyrtec — off 1 week
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After Office Hours

If medical assistance is needed after regular clinic hours, please call the general McFarland Clinic at 239-4400 and you will be connected to "First Nurse" who can contact Dr. or Dr. If you must speak to Dr. or Dr. immediately, call 239-2011.

Emergency Situations

Occasionally immediate attention is required to reverse a condition. Acute asthma attacks and severe allergic reactions often require emergency care. If we're not immediately available, it is all right for the doctor on call to initiate treatment. Emergency Room visits should be followed up with a phone call to our office the following morning in order to schedule a recheck visit.

Note: Please notify your doctor that we are treating you. If an allergy problem arises, call us. It is generally advisable to contact your own physician first if you are unsure whether a particular inter-current illness is an allergy or not.

Your staff,

Certified by the American Board of Allergy and Immunology
Ph. (515) 239-4482
Welcome

We welcome you to our allergy and pulmonary practice. We wish you improved health, and we dedicate ourselves to satisfying this goal.

This practice is devoted to the total care of allergy and respiratory disorders.

We Treat:

- asthma
- hay fever
- food allergy and intolerance
- eczema
- hives
- insect sting reactions
- "sinus" headaches
- drug allergies
- cystic fibrosis
- recurrent pneumonias
- croup
- immune deficiencies

Appointments

You may see us by calling for an appointment. A new patient work-up and testing date generally can be obtained within four weeks. Patients with severe symptoms will be seen right away. (See "Telephone Calls" for more information.)

Your First Visit to the Allergist

Prior to your first visit, refrain from using the medications found on the enclosed antihistamines list.

The first time you visit your allergist, he or she will spend time getting a thorough history of your illness. The allergist will also do a physical examination and may perform skin tests to determine the substances to which you are allergic.

Skin tests are performed by scratching the skin with a small amount of common allergen extracts such as various pollens, animal danders, molds and foods. Within 10-20 minutes, the substances to which you are allergic, if any, will be evident. The area of the skin where the substance was placed will be inflamed like a mosquito bite or small welt and will usually feel itchy. These reactions will pass within several hours of receiving your tests.

By getting your health history and performing laboratory and skin tests, your allergist can determine the most effective treatment plan for you.

Cancellations

Please avoid cancellations. If you must miss an appointment, please be courteous and call at least 24 hours in advance, so another patient can be seen instead. We have set aside one hour of time solely for you.

Telephone Calls

During Office Hours

A receptionist will answer during regular office hours. She will try her best to set up an appointment quickly or to answer your questions. Please have relevant information readily available to assist in the evaluation of your situation. Please be patient. It may be necessary to transfer your call to a nurse or doctor.

Office Hours

Monday - Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Saturday 8 a.m. to 12 p.m.
(515) 239-4482

Emergency Calls

If your call is an emergency, please let the receptionist know and she will interrupt the doctor.

Sick Calls

We ask that you have pencil, paper and a list of your medications (and recent doses) on hand before you telephone.

Medicine Renewals

Please think ahead. Try not to call after office hours. Have the name of the drug, dose, and pharmacy number ready when you call.
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ALLERGY DEPARTMENT

Allergy - Immunology & Pediatric Pulmonology

1215 Duff
Ames, Iowa 50010
515-239-4482

Allergy Consultation

Please fill out this form and bring it with you for your appointment with Dr. Dr. which is scheduled for the following date and time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you cannot keep your appointment, please call at least 72 hours ahead of time so we can offer your time to someone else.

Allergy skin testing may be done at this time.

CAUTION: CERTAIN MEDICATIONS WILL ALTER TEST RESULTS. FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE LAST PAGE OF THIS FORM REGARDING SUBSTANCES TO AVOID PRIOR TO THE APPOINTMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>M.I.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birthday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent's Name (If patient is under 18)</th>
<th>Home Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referring Physician</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I. Symptom occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at onset of symptoms</th>
<th>____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have symptoms year around or just certain times?</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What times?</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What months are worst?</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What months are best?</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Symptoms, complaints, or characteristics that apply to you. Circle terms that apply.

1. **Nasal symptoms**: Itches, congestion, nasal polyps, sinus trouble, hay fever, frequent head colds, long-lasting colds, sneezing attacks, runny nose.
2. **Chest symptoms**: Chest pain, daily cough, wheezing, recurrent pneumonia, recurrent attacks of asthma, shortness of breath on exertion.
3. **Skin symptoms**: Recurrent hives, eczema, itching, tingling, burning, hives associated with difficulty swallowing or tightness of chest, swelling of eyes, skin rash.
4. **Eye symptoms**: Itching, watering.
5. **Ear symptoms**: Recurrent ear infection, itching, hearing loss, stopped up, fluid in ears, dizziness.
6. **Gastrointestinal symptoms**: Colic, diarrhea, constipation, frequent indigestion.
7. **Insect sting reaction.**
8. **Sinusitis**: Facial pain

III. Are symptoms affected by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allergic (Directly)</th>
<th>□ dust</th>
<th>□ foods-specify</th>
<th>□ flowering trees</th>
<th>□ insect bites</th>
<th>□ mold</th>
<th>□ plants/grass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ change in residence</td>
<td>□ trips</td>
<td>□ heat</td>
<td>□ cold</td>
<td>□ weather change</td>
<td>□ time of day</td>
<td>□ riding in country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ dust</td>
<td>□ foods-specify</td>
<td>□ flowering trees</td>
<td>□ insect bites</td>
<td>□ mold</td>
<td>□ plants/grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allergic (Indirectly)</th>
<th>□ dampness</th>
<th>□ fumes/odors</th>
<th>□ tobacco smoke</th>
<th>□ fabrics</th>
<th>□ near barns/hay</th>
<th>□ insecticides</th>
<th>□ school/work</th>
<th>□ school/work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ change in residence</td>
<td>□ trips</td>
<td>□ heat</td>
<td>□ cold</td>
<td>□ weather change</td>
<td>□ time of day</td>
<td>□ riding in country</td>
<td>□ vacuuming</td>
<td>□ infections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| □ dampness | □ fumes/odors | □ tobacco smoke | □ fabrics | □ near barns/hay | □ insecticides | □ school/work | □ school/work |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ dusting</th>
<th>□ fatigue</th>
<th>□ rain</th>
<th>□ lakeside</th>
<th>□ wind</th>
<th>□ basements</th>
<th>□ exercise</th>
<th>□ exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ dusting</td>
<td>□ fatigue</td>
<td>□ rain</td>
<td>□ lakeside</td>
<td>□ wind</td>
<td>□ basements</td>
<td>□ exercise</td>
<td>□ exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. Medications

1. List present medications and frequency of use.

2. List previous medications you used and their effectiveness.

3. List any medications you are allergic to or medications which have caused side effects (i.e., penicillin, sulfa). Describe the reaction (include time for reaction to occur).

### V. Environment

1. Location: City, suburb, rural, farm, near grain elevator, near factory. Home, apartment (Circle all appropriate responses.)

2. Age of home or apartment ______ How long at present location? ______

3. Type of heat ______ Type of air conditioning ______

   - Humidifier: ☐ portable ☐ central ☐ none
   - Air filter: ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Bedroom

   - Sleeping conditions: ☐ sleeps alone ☐ shares bed
   - Number of beds in room ______ Type of floor covering ______
   - Type of rug pad ______ Type of pillow ______
   - Type of mattress ______

   - Bedding: ☐ wool blanket ☐ quilt ☐ comforter ☐ Other ______

   - Window coverings: ☐ drapes ☐ curtains ☐ shades ☐ blinds ☐ shutters

   - Other: ☐ bookcase ☐ stuffed toys ☐ wall hangings ☐ stuffed furniture

5. Rest of house

   - Type of floor covering ______ Type of rug pad ______

   - Type and age of furniture (upholstered?) ______

   - Window coverings: ☐ drapes ☐ curtains ☐ shades ☐ blinds ☐ shutters

   - Number of plants _____ Number and types of pets ______

   - Did you previously have a pet? If so, what and when? ______

   - Do you have a fireplace? If so, where is wood stored? ______

   - Smokers in household? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - Basement: ☐ finished ☐ unfinished ☐ damp ☐ dry

6. Work/school (daytime environment)

   - Where does patient spend day-time hours? ______

   - Type of heat ______ Type of air conditioning ______

   - Humidifier: ☐ portable ☐ central ☐ none

   - Air filter: ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - Type of floor covering ______ Type of rug pad ______
### VI. Past medical history

1. Have you ever had allergy skin tests? □ Yes □ No
   If so, where? 

2. Have you ever received allergy (shots) hyposensitization injections?
   □ Yes □ No If so, where? __________ when? __________
   How long? __________ Effect on symptoms __________

3. List past hospitalizations, operations or serious illnesses (please give date or year if possible):

4. How many emergency room visits for allergy and/or asthma related problems?

5. How many visits to your physician for allergy and/or asthma related problems in the past year?

6. How many days of school/work have been missed in the past year for allergy and/or asthma related problems?

### VII. Family History

1. Is there any family history of asthma, hayfever, eczema, allergies?
   Please state relationship to patient.

### VIII. Foods:

1. Do any foods cause symptoms? □ Yes □ No
   If so, please list foods and symptoms.

### IX. Miscellaneous:

1. List patient's and/or parent's hobbies.

2. Patient's occupation.
   Other occupations in household.

3. Are the patient's immunizations up-to-date? □ Yes □ No
   Does patient receive yearly flu shot? □ Yes □ No

4. What are your expectations for this allergy consultation?
ANTHISTAMINES

The patient should stop taking the medications listed below four (4) days prior to appointment unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRAND NAME INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.R.M. Actidil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actifed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alka-Seltzer Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerest Children’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerest Headache Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerest Time Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambodryl Kapseals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atarax (off 5 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benadryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benadryl Kapseals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benadryl w/Ephedrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brexin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromphenol Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheranol Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlor-Trimeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlor-Trimeton Decongestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlor-Trimeton Repetabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloramate Unicelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claritin (off 1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claritin-D (off 1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clistin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clistin R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comvex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricidin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricidin D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricidin Demilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricidin Medilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricidin Sinus Headache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coriforte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corilin Infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coryphan-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coryzaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconamine SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demazin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demazin Repetabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimetane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimetane Decongestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimetane Extentabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimetapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimetapp Extentabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disoprophel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disoprophol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disoprophol Chronotabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxipan (off 1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dristan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dristan-AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drixoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extendryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedahist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedahist Gyrocaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedrastil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flogesic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forhistal Lontabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hismanal (off 6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hista-Clopane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hista-Vadrin T.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histalet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histalet Forte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histaspan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histaspan-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histaspan-Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxyzine (off 5 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoclor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leder-Tuss Sequels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lederade Sequels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LederTan Sequels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMC Triaminic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Flu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naldecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napril Plateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novafed A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novahistine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novahistine Fortis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novahistine LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novahistine Melet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novahistine Sinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornade 2 for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornade Spansules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBZ Lontabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBZ w/Ephedrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBZ-SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PediaCare Night Cough &amp; Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenergan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenergan Compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenergan-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaramine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaramine Repetabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyhistamine-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrloxinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadnute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remsmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robitussin Night Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondec Drops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondec Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondec Tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-Tuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynatan Pediatric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK-Diphenhydramine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldane-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepmax-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinarest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinarest: Extra Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sine-Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sine-Off AF Extra Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinequain (off 1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinubid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinutab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinutab Extra Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudafed Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacaryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavist-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teldrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temaril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temaril Spanules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminic Infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminic Juvelets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminicin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminicin Allergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaminicin Chewable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyleanol PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyleanol Sinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicks Formula 44M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicks NyQuil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visteral (off 5 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zyrtec (off 1 week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some Do's and Don'ts

During the pollen and mold season:

Do

Keep windows closed at night.

Use air conditioning, which cleans, cools, and dries the air.

Minimize early morning activity when pollen levels are highest (between 5:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m.).

Keep your car windows closed when driving.

Stay indoors when the pollen count or humidity is high and on windy days when dust and pollen are whipped about.

Take a vacation during height of the pollen season to a place more pollen free, such as the beach or the sea.

Take the medication prescribed by your allergist.

Don't

Rake leaves, they also stir up molds.

Hang sheets or clothing out to dry as pollens and molds may collect in these items.

Grow too many indoor plants; wet dirt causes molds to form.

If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact:

Allergy-Immunology - Pediatric Pulmonology

1215 Duff Ames, Iowa 50010
515-239-4482

ALLERGY & ASTHMA DEPARTMENT

Allergy-Immunology - Pediatric Pulmonology

Environmental control recommendations for:

(Patient Name)

The above named patient was found to be allergic to the items checked below:

- Dust mites - year round
- Other weeds - July - Sept.
- Molds - year round, Sp, S, F
- Cats - year round
- Trees - early spring
- Dogs - year round
- Grass - May - June
- Feathers - year round
- Ragweed - Aug - Sept.
- Other ___________________
Closets:
- Consider the closet a part of the bedroom and not as a storage area for unused materials (old clothes, books, or vacuum).
- Store only regularly used clothes and shoes in the closet.
- Clean closet floor as often as floors in rest of the room.

Shelves:
- Open shelves with books or collections (cans, planes, dolls) accumulate dust easily. All favorite collections should be in cupboards, behind glass or plastic if possible.
- Keep dresser tops and cabinets free as possible.

General:
- Avoid plants in bedrooms.
- Do not allow pets in bedrooms.
- Avoid heavy framed pictures and pennants on walls.

Household Pets
Animal dander is the microscopic particles of shed skin, not just hair. It becomes airborne, and if inhaled, can cause allergic symptoms. The presence of the animal itself is not essential, only the dander that remains behind. It may take months after removal of an animal for the animal dander to be eliminated from the home. Allergic reactions to cats can be caused by a specific element in the cat's saliva rather than by the cat's fur or dander. Some suggestions to help allergic pet owners deal with the problems:

- Keep the pet out of the bedroom.
- Run a HEPA filter in the bedroom.

Contact Dermatitis is a rash that comes from direct skin contact with many substances. The most common causes of contact dermatitis are poison ivy, metals, jewelry, and cosmetics.

Urticaria (hives) is an outbreak on the skin of itchy welts of varying size. When the swellings are large and invade deeper tissues, they are called angioedema. They may develop on the face, lips, tongue, throat, eyes, ears, or internally. Allergies to food or drugs are well-known causes of these conditions, but urticaria may also result from an underlying disease state or occur after exercise.

Frequently Asked Questions

Is any age particularly prone to allergy?
Anyone may develop an allergic reaction at any age. Even infants may show the characteristic signs of allergy. These signs and symptoms include: recurrent ear infections, continually runny nose, sneezing fits, wheezing, bronchitis, and the classic allergic shiners or bluish discoloration beneath both eyes.

Is early diagnosis important?
Absolutely yes. Asthma in childhood, if neglected, may lead to serious complications later in life. The majority of cases of childhood asthma can be controlled and relieved with proper medical care. Early diagnosis and treatment in both children and adults can increase the chances for improvement and relief of the asthmatic condition.

What is the treatment for allergic disease?
Allergens should be removed from the patient's environment. If foods are the cause of the disease they must be eliminated from the diet. The proper use and timing of medications is important in treating allergic disease. The doctor must determine the appropriate medications and their dosage. If symptoms persist despite the proper use of medications and the removal of allergens from the environment, then allergy immunotherapy, may be necessary to control the disease.

Immunotherapy (desensitization, hyposensitization, allergy shots) is used in the treatment of allergic patients with respiratory symptoms. In this form of treatment, injections of allergenic extracts are given in gradually increasing amounts over a period of months. The goal is to induce tolerance to the allergens and to bring about a decline in the symptoms and medication requirements.
Is general health care important?
Yes, a well-balanced diet and a well-rounded exercise program, recreation and rest are helpful. Smoking is very harmful and must be avoided. In general, the allergic patient is better in a calm atmosphere. Parents of asthmatic children should try to maintain an attitude of calmness and reassurance. The child should be encouraged to be self-reliant and participate in all the activities of his or her peers as much as possible.

Is a change of climate beneficial?
Hay fever sufferers may find relief by going to areas of the country where their particular allergen is not present. Some asthma sufferers may benefit from a warm, dry climate. However, before any change of climate can be recommended for an individual, a thorough and comprehensive study of the condition must be done. The most important factors are the removal of the allergen, when possible, and proper treatment. Air-conditioning and other protective devices, such as electronic air cleaners in the home, may be helpful.

Can allergic disease be prevented?
Those who are aware of their problem should try to minimize exposure to the offending allergens. Avoid drives in the country during the pollen season. Avoid drafts and exposures to cold and damp air. Keep away from house dust and other types of dust. Try not to use or come in contact with certain cosmetics, dyes, and strong cleaners. Strive to keep in good physical condition. Avoid emotional tension and fatigue.

What are pollen and mold counts?
Pollen and mold counts measure the amount of airborne allergens present. Counting methods vary, and because of the lack of standardization, inaccuracies can occur.

- A pollen count of 100 is considered a low reading.
- A count of 100-500 is moderate.
- A count of 500-1000 is high.
- A count of 1000 and over is very high.

Allergen Avoidance
Avoidance of common household inhalants is an essential part of the treatment program. This includes:

House Dust
House dust allergy is caused by minute organisms that live in it called mites and can be an important source of year-round allergic symptoms. Therefore, measures that permit dust avoidance have fundamental importance in a treatment program. Reduction of dust exposure requires both control of dust sources and removal of dust deposited on surfaces.

The following instructions are especially designed to reduce dust exposure in the patient's bedroom:

Beds:
- Use air tight mattress encasings for mattress and box spring of all beds in room.
- Use synthetic blankets and pillows that can be easily washed.
- Avoid quilts and cotton stuffed bedspreads - keep it simple and washable.
- Do not have stuffed toys in the bed at night - replace them with something of soft plastic or something easy to wash frequently!

Windows:
- Use washable curtains. Pretty sheets are easily made into children’s curtains.
- Wash all window sills with Lysol or similar cleaner. Mold grows around windows that are warm and moist.
- Keep windows closed during pollen season to prevent mold from growing.

Floors:
- Avoid using rugs or carpeting in the bedroom if possible.
- Use a damp mop to clean the floor to reduce the spread of dust.
- Vacuum carpets at least once each week.
Allergy and Asthma: What are They?

Allergic diseases are prevalent throughout the United States and can be potentially serious. An allergy is an overreaction to substances that are ordinarily harmless. Allergic individuals produce too many allergy antibodies and as a result may experience symptoms of allergy. Common allergens are pollens, molds, dust mites, animal dander, chemicals, foods, medicines, and venom from insect stings.

Allergic Diseases

*Hay fever* is caused by an allergy to the pollen of trees, grasses or weeds, or the spores of molds. The name is actually a misnomer, since hay is not a common allergen and no fever occurs. Depending on the geographical location and pollinating periods, the hay fever season may occur in the spring, summer or fall, and may last until frost. The sufferer has spells of sneezing, itching and watering eyes, running nose, and burning palate and throat. Asthma is sometimes a complication.

*Allergic rhinitis* is a general term used to describe the condition of anyone who has nasal congestion, sneezing, and a running nose due to allergies. This may be a seasonal problem, like hay fever, or it may be a year-round problem caused by other allergens, such as house dust, animal danders, and perhaps some foods. Frequently this problem is complicated by "sinusitis". Patients with constant nasal symptoms should have an allergy evaluation.

*Asthma* is a condition characterized by coughing, wheezing, and difficulty in breathing. It is frequently associated with a family history of allergy. Any of the allergens mentioned above may trigger asthma attacks. Infections of the sinuses or bronchial tubes may also be important factors in the severity of the asthma attack. Asthma patients are also adversely affected by irritants such as air pollutants, cigarette smoke, and exhaust fumes.

*Allergic dermatitis* (eczema) is a non-contagious, itchy rash that often occurs in the creases of the arms, legs, and neck; however, it can cover the entire body. This condition is frequently associated with allergies. Substances to which a person is sensitive may aggravate it. Foods may also be an important cause of this problem.

Molds

Molds are microscopic. They contain no chlorophyll. Mold spores float in the air like pollen. Mildew is caused by molds. Outdoors, molds can be found in soil, vegetation, and rotting wood. Indoors, molds are found in attics, basements, bathrooms, house plants, refrigerators, garbage containers, carpets, and upholstery.

Outdoor mold spores begin to appear after a spring thaw and in the northern United States they reach their peak in July, August, September, or October. Molds can be found all year long in the southern United States.

Exposure to molds can be prevented by these precautions:

- Reduce the mustiness in the house. Running a dehumidifier in a damp basement will help keep it dry.
- Keep basement and storage rooms clean and dry.
- Spray or paint moldy areas with 1 oz. Zephrin concentrate to 1 gallon of water to reduce mold growth in the wallpaper paste in warm and humid weather.
- Do not allow fruits and vegetables to spoil.
- Avoid country drives with open windows during harvest and on windy days.
- Avoid mowing grass, playing in or handling hay or straw, and raking or burning leaves and weeds.
- Avoid contact with utensils stored in musty places. Luggage, yard equipment, and toys should be put away dry.
- Try to stay indoors on stormy and windy days. Stay indoors in cool evenings.
- If a patient allergic to mold has a bedroom in a musty basement, try to move them upstairs.
APPENDIX B

CLINIC PROJECT TRANSCRIPTS

Tape: L1

Class Discussions

LA: What are you guys working on?
J: I don't know. ha!
A: We're trying to define the word "sick."
LA: What do you mean?
A: Um, well, we don't like this sentence, but we don't know how to clarify it, so we're talking about that.
LA: What's the sentence.
A: "Sick patients will be seen right away."
J: In an allergy clinic wouldn't everybody be sick?
A: We're wondering how sick you have to be in order to be sick enough to be seen right away.
J: instead of scheduling that—
D: Do they actually do that?
J: "Terminally ill patients will be seen right away."

[break]

LA: What else does it say about "sick"? What does it say before and after that?
A: We just changed before that. . . it's talking about when, um, the ah, new appointments can be made and everything . . . what time span . . . it deals with weeks . . . we could say "a regular follow up visit will take up to two weeks" unless you're going to die. ha ha

[laughter]

J: So is that what that sentence is referring to? A follow up visit? That if they find out in your initial visit that you're really sick then you'll be seen sooner?
A: Can you say, you know, two weeks . . . four weeks . . . but if you really need to go, we'll book you in?
B: How about "although sick patients can be seen right away,"
A: You see, I just, "sick." Everyone is "sick" or else they wouldn't be going to the clinic.
B: Yeah, well/../
Sh: It's just the degree of sickness
B: They're using "sick" to differentiate between/ /
S: If they can live with it
B: //between people who need attention right now.
D: "Those who need immediate attention"
B: I think that's fine. "can be seen right away."
S: "If you need immediate attention, you can be seen right away."
Tape: L1

Classroom Discussion
Questions about the project

LA: What questions do you have for the doctor?

D: Do they send these documents out all together? Right now we're assuming that our information sheet will be sent out with the questionnaire that basically asks about your medical history and it will also go out with a drug sheet that will tell which drugs you can't take prior to your first appointment. So we're assuming you'll have all of this information before your first appointment. You'll either get it in the mail or pick it up at the office at some point.

LA: But they don't specify when you get this information.

D: They don't specify why you're getting this information. Only we're assuming that this pertains only prior to your first visit. So we're assuming you'll get all of it and all at once.

LA: Alright. Good, so that's for the welcome document. What other questions?

L: We need to see what's actually included in the predocument um because he said he doesn't want it repeated and if he wants any of it repeated is there anything he wants emphasized?

LA: Do you need a copy of the pre document. Is that what you're saying?

G: That and

L: It says on this sheet of suggestions "do not repeat information from any booklets that all patients receive." what other booklets do all patients receive?

LA: um that all patients receive? OK?

L: right

LA: ah, that's a good question. I don't know. Um, I think the booklets he was referring to there are those booklets on childhood asthma or asthma in general—that you shouldn't repeat information that's there

L: But should it re-emphasize it. I mean should we keep the little paragraphs that describe like what hay fever is?

LA: Yeah, that's, um. The problem is, as I was looking over the document, the purpose of the post document—the purpose isn't real clear to me. It's not particular to a sickness, its' sort of a gloss over everything. So, I think part of the problem is gonna be defining the purpose in that document, you know just like the purpose and audience statement in the instructions. That little blurb in the beginning. That's really when this comes into play. So that people right off the bat know what the purpose is. And right now, I don't know what that is.

Ja: Just kind of like a summary, maybe of all the pamphlets he has? maybe this is an overview of each. I was looking at those pamphlets, one's on asthma, one's on childhood asthma, environmental controls for pets and household things and all those things were talked about in the post document—it gave an overview of each.

LA: Yeah, right right right right. yeah, it just glossed it all. But I don't know. From my point of view, I don't see a good sense of order, like why the questions are sequenced the way they are.

Ja: Oh I see
LA: The range of questions is very different from the other booklets so I don't think you need to worry about repeating information but if you want to check out each one of those booklets and see how different the purpose is... go ahead.

Tape: J1

Classroom Discussion

LA: Ok, um, this is what he said about that section. "Symptom influences could be categorized into dust mold, pollens, animal danders. It could also be divided into allergic and nonallergic categories. He says this section is 'a mess.' You may want to research some categories to make them exclusive."

Doug: This section what? I thought you said it was a mess about—

LA: Section 3, oh I'm talking about section 4. This one. Is that what you're talking about?

Doug: Oh, OK yeah (laugh)

LA: But are you saying it's redundant or what are you saying. Repetitive?

Doug: Well I just. To me these are clear boxes to mark some, something about you where it could go through N [nasal] and C [chest] and that. But when it doesn't go through N and C it stops being complete because we've got 7 different possibilities. Nasal, chest, [and if symptoms don't fall into these two categories], then what?

LA: Yeah, he, he did mention that those categories weren't complete. You know, they don't cover everything.

Doug: Yeah right. So do you think it would be easier. So just leave them in boxes and just mark it and put an X in it? To me it would be easier for the patient. He's probably going to know what, like you said, might affect your eyes and nose and what would affect your chest.

LA: Um, yeah. I think he's trying to do is match these allergens to—

Doug: To how it affects them.

LA: Right. So that's the N and C.

Doug: Right. But—

LA: Hm. Good point.

Doug: They've already said, you know, what kind of symptoms they get. So it's... to me it makes sense just to say what affects your symptoms than whether it affects your... without being specific, cause you could say three for this one and four for this one—

LA: Uh huh

Doug: It's gonna be, they're going to be more depleted in... if I was fillin this out and it said "mark which of these seven is affected by each of these 20 things here" I'm not going to, I'm going to look through it faster and not be as detailed so they could be more efficient and just have boxes set up and ignore the N and C stuff.

LA: OK

Doug: And that's my opinion.

[short break]

LA: Yeah, I don't know what to tell you about that.
Tape: J1

Class Discussions

A: This nasal/chest section
LA: hm, yeah
A: cuz like, ah, I don't know. it's kinda, I don't know. Things could be
LA: Oh, the nasal chest thing. 'member when he gave... take a look at this.
A: oh
LA: This is um, he thought this was a good example. That's why he gave this to us
A: Oh, I see, that's how
LA: And it would go this page and this page, he copied that so you could see it side by side.
A: Oh, um
LA: What does he say about that. "Symptoms could be categorized. ..." Um so that you could
divide this list into dust, mold, and list all those things
A: so, oh, so dust...
LA: But that would take some researching. um, "dust, mold, pollen, animal danders."
A: so, is that like nonallergic
A: does that mean a one time reaction to it?
LA: nonallergic. Let me see if I get this right. Um. Non allergic vs. allergic.
A: Like if you get a bee sting you just happen to swell up from
LA: Non allergic would be like smoke and hayfever. Let me think. I've got to have it in here
A: ?
substance that triggers an allergic attack. Abnormal sensitivity to substance." That's all
they have.
A: That's pretty much what an allergen is (laughing)
LA: Maybe to specify... nonallergic would probably be weather change. Time of day. that
would probably be one. From what I remember it was things that are outside of you, does
that make sense? That's what I remember him saying. Let's keep looking.
A: Like if its things you don't really have control over, that's not really true.
LA: Well if you go to a restaurant and someone is smoking
A: you sit in the nonsmoking section (laugh)
LA: Does our informational document have this
A: Is that the right thing?
LA: That's this [reading]. Um yeah, this will take some reading.
A: OK.
LA: If you want to categorize them by allergen then you could easily get that information from
any of these books
A: Well I mean, I don't know, I just. This seems just like a stupid section to me. Like something
the doctor should just ask about
LA: Well
A: Kinda well, I mean it kinda makes you think, I mean it isn't huge to go by. It's not like I get congestion or something like that.

LA: Well let's think about purpose again. The purpose of this is to get as much information as you can about the patient's symptoms.

A: Animal types, pets you've been around, see this section totally sucks.

**Tape: Consultations with Dr. Chmura**

R: We also researched this a little bit and we changed the symptoms and the environment block. And I'll let Doug talk more about that.

Dr: OK.

Doug: Ok, one thing that you mentioned was that you kinda wanted a separation between the two as far as direct allergies and indirect. and we're kinda trying to find a way to word it because we know you wanted to be able to distinguish between a direct cause such as the mold and the dust and the indirect. And we wanted. And the one way it was suggested to be stated made it kinda sound like this one wasn't important. We thought the patient wouldn't bother filling it out cuz it looked unimportant so we figured this was kind of a way where you could specify with the patient and go ahead and fill it out anyway there.

Dr: um hm

Doug: Ah, most of the, we put a lot more check boxes. This one we left as a circle, to circle the things that apply. But the 3 word ones are all on one line yet. and the other box where we made a lot of changes was in the environment. Ah, one thing that was mentioned was the audience, ah, being inclusive. Including all ages. And like Rodney had said like on the first page including parents' name if under 18. And one thing that was kind of confusing as we were gin through here is that it mentioned the such as where does the child sleep or where does child spend daytime hours. We wanted to include all ages for that.

Dr: all ages, such

Doug: And so what we did also it didn't really include work or school, it's kind of vague in terms of mixing up sleeping conditions, carpeting and things like this. so we have it down to bedroom and sleeps alone or shares a bed with others that's kind of a, we tried to clear that up as best we could there and include everybody. Ah,

[break]

Doug: One other thing that we did change about this ah, we weren't really sure how to do it. I didn't before mention, I think in the old one here about

Dr: Chest and nasal?

Doug: Yeah, right. And the problem we had with that is, what if it affects your sinuses, or something that isn't chest or nasal related?

Dr: Like skin for example.

Doug: Yeah, exactly. And without saying "mark all 1-8 that apply to each of these," we thought that would be too cumbersome for the patient and they wouldn't've put the time into giving up accurate information. And we thought that this was about the best way to just make this a simply check box because the main point is that you can get the information you want, and it's hard for the patient, and if it's hard for them to read they are not going to fill it out accurately. So this was the way what we came up with as far as handling that. I think
that with the boxes—I noticed a lot of applications anymore have these—a nice box where it groups the information together. It’s easier to fill out and to read... we feel it’s a lot easier to read. This original document gets a little, ya know, it looks a little cluttered in places when you try to read it through and ah, something like this is right there in front of you. So. I guess that’s ah...

[break]

Doug: Do you have any questions for us?
Dr.: Gosh, I don’t think so. It’s a nicely done document. Without me getting technical, the trigger thing is a confusing thing. I’ve not been happy with this for ah, the main reason you might, like you say the nose chest thing, it is, a little confusing. But also the triggers aren’t really stratified according to the types of triggers that there are. We talk about allergic triggers. We talk about triggers for asthma and allergies, and asthma and (?) nasal symptoms as being either allergic or nonallergic. And one of the ways I think I, I, you know I don’t know that I gave you guys the technical information you needed to recognize that and none of the other groups did either. And I think one of the things I will do when I revise this is stratify, you know, put the mold triggers, like mowing. You might think of it as a grass trigger but it’s really a mold trigger. It picks up the mold spores from the ground. Christmas trees are a mold trigger. Ah, ah, things like basements, barns are all mold triggers whereas vacuums, dust, dustmite triggers or seasonal things like pollen triggers and ah, the stratifying those allergic triggers from nonallergic triggers. Like something like cold air would traditionally bother you know, a characteristically asthmatic patient. Exercise would bother someone with asthma. Even though it’s not triggering allergen exposure. So probably

Doug: Is this kind of what we . . .
Dr.: Yeah, this is nice. You picked up on some of the nuance—that I didn’t give explicit information to really—but so far, I don’t think anyone has picked up on direct or indirect or intrinsic triggers, nonallergic triggers.

Doug: We were looking for something like under dust and then all categories that may affect it even though these can affect more of the mold and dust and things like that.
Dr.: Yeah, yeah put it in some broad categories such as allergic and nonallergic categories, and then substratify the allergic triggers into dust mold danders, and pollen. So that’s great. Thank you very much.

Tape: Consultations with Dr. Chmura

Ja: From the look at and the matter of audiences we kind of saw that there were two audiences: primary and secondary audience. And that the primary audience is the patient and if they’re younger it would be their parents. Um, and the secondary audience would be whoever this document affected: people in the household an um I guess (?) And then secondary audience would be parent

[break]

Ja: Do you have any questions for us about anything we did?
Dr.: Well I like your use of the cat
Ja: Some one thought about putting a picture of a needle there but we didn't want to scare anyone.
Dr.: Some people don't go for that.
Dr.: I could have seen a picture of a dust mite. That's sort of an entertaining thing.
M: or a cloud of dust.
Dr.: yea a cloud of dust.
Dr: This is great I think. it's a much easier document to use. Ah we pass out, we pay through the nose for these pamphlets that you were given as resource materials. I don't know if you're aware of that. You would have gotten a pamphlet, a lot of times it's not just a free bee from you know a given doctor. It's something we pay for. It's overhead and its' kind of a shame to have to give the money to you know somebody else to do these things when ah, ah, you guys did it for free.

[laughter]

[break]

Dr.: It's great you guys did a great job. It's a whole lot better. It's a lot easier to follow.
Joe: We decided on the booklet format because (?) otherwise you would have a lot of papers stuck together. And we couldn't get it on one page.
Dr: I'll tell you you'll also find. We probably still will plan on handing out some of the additional materials and we have a booklet on asthma and one on (?). And this is about the size of those. So this is great. This is terrific.
Ja: And we gave you a whole bunch of colors we didn't know what colors...
Dr: No this is great I think I actually like the green one because the print stands out and it's a nice contrast, so this is terrific. That fact that you have it on disk makes it really hard to make changes too.

Tape: Consultations with Dr. Chmura

Jack: One of the things I like about this, and the other documents that we've seen through the class, I've seen is that as a patient coming into an office and seeing this I mean, I might not have an idea of some of these things and so bold things directs you, you want to read and when you need to read it.
Ray: It directs your eye across the page and to what you need to read naturally does. And it focuses the document toward the audience. We tried to make it simple.
Dr: In fact that was one of the problems with the original document is that, ah, ah, it ah, a lot of times people would pick up the original form and say, you know, I'm not here for a kid, I'm here for myself, so... yeah this is nice.

[break]

S: Any questions?
Dr: Um, ah, gosh. ah, it's interesting you know this is a document, as much as I hate it, or hated the original format, ah, I've been staring at it for the past three years. Ah, and every time I get the invitation, I have to go back and review this old document. Ah, it's
kind of become sort of like an old dysfunctional friend. you know, it's kind of neat to see it have it get sort of a face lift. So that's great.

Dr: And so now if you want to reword it it's gonna be digitized and you can just

Dr: Yeah, that's nice, the last group did that too. This form really ought to be probably redone every couple of years, minimum. ah, so

Tim: Yeah, that's one of the things we noticed, especially like a the drug list there were 3 or 4 different drugs that were written twice on the sheet

Dr: found in there, yeah

Tim: It probably will be easier to do it now that it's on a disk

Dr: yeah, yeah, no, that's great. You know the um, the rules of medicine are changing. And ah, having forms like this included in your, your patients' encounter with you goes a long way towards satisfying the chart buggers that act like something has transpired in a patients' visit with you, you know what I mean?

S: um hm

Dr: They're interested in reviewing the content of your notes and so if you actually have some soft of function beyond ah, this form that the patient fills out. For example, there's a function beyond just letting me know. It lets somebody like the insurance company or Medicare or Medicaid know that we did something while they were here.

Dr: Do you have any questions for me, about how these forms are used?

Ray: Question about danders and cats.

Tape: L1 Class Discussion

L: Um, and I thought we could put spaces in between these

G: probably bigger font, we could go bigger font

L: not underlined because underline looks crappy

G: yeah, because once we get the checkboxes . . . then we won't need that

L: Right. So it goes down double-spaced, not underlined, and boxes.

G: We essentially have to redo this I think the only thing the doctor has to mark on is the front page [shows front page]. The rest is just . . .

L: Right. Exactly. Oh, "hi" [to camera]

C: We could put a graphic on it—seasons to show. . . I don't know, to show

L: We could find room for that

G: We could probably put it on the front. And what we could then use that for is then for a break

L: Do you mean in between? Because we're going to have extra room?

C: I was thinking that well, an illustration to show [interrupted]

G: //well yeah, in there but

C: //maybe show//

G: The, but, the question is, the thing is once you get too small you can't really distinguish the background

L: especially if they're going to photocopy this 20 times
G: that's another thing we'll have to figure... we'll have to plan this for photo copies. So we'll have to have a master copy

L: We're going to try to get a logo the logo and try to put it on here

LA: Can I see what you have here so far?

L: This is what—we typed it all in, and we put it in Adobe

LA: and which, um, which document is this

L: this is post

LA: OK. And what's Adobe

L: Adobe Pagemaker

LA: Ok. So it looks like you have a two column format in a booklet form?

L: We are going to have a booklet form in the end that folds over, but um, we need to, are going to cut and paste after we're done to get it in the right order. after we're done formatting

L: [to group] are we going to number pages?
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Figure 1. Guidelines for Observations of Writing Consultants
Guidelines for Observations of Writing Consultants

After reading the literature you received earlier this semester, each of you developed a list of criteria you might use in evaluating the observable performance of one of your peers. Based upon the compilation of your ideas, the following guidelines emerged. Respond to the following questions to enable us to analyze how well we prepare you to consult with students and how we can better assist you in perfecting your talents as a writing consultant.

A. The Greeting

Is each client greeted in a cordial, friendly, and affable manner and made to feel welcome? Also, is eye contact made between the two individuals?

In what way does the consultant's nonverbal behavior reinforce the verbal behavior of the greeting?

Subsequent to the initial welcome, does the consultant ask to see the student's actual assignment?

B. The Questioning Techniques

How does the consultant engage the student to focus initially on Higher Order Concerns (HOC as mentioned in Reigstad & McAndrews)? This should involve a discussion of thesis, organization, voice, and development.

If students exhibit weakness in any of the HOC areas, what suggestions are made to correct these weaknesses?

Is there an extensive use of questions by the consultant? (Indeed, the number of questions should outnumber the number of declarative statements.)

The intent of questioning is to enlighten, not intimidate. Is there a balance of questions between the open/closed type and between the Socratic/discovery type? Give several examples to illustrate.

What open questions does the consultant pose? For example, is the student asked to explain why he or she selected a particular example or written comment or organization? Is the student asked for additional clarification of ideas if passages or for additional clarification of ideas or passages or for additional options when a problem becomes apparent?

How does the consultant make the student an active participant rather than a mere spectator in the session? (Note several of the question examples on the B. L. Clark excerpt you possess.)

Does the consultant offer brief explanations then ask the student to perform a task to indicate his or her grasp of the concept or skill? Are there instances when this procedure would prove helpful to the student as well as the consultant?

Does the consultant wait at least five seconds between asking a question and offering additional comments?
Guidelines for Observations of Writing Consultants

Does the consultant encourage the student to read sections of the written document aloud or to mark the revisions? In other words, how does the student retain control and ownership of the document?

What Lower Order Concerns (LOC as mentioned by Reigstad & McAndrew) are discussed? How is positive feedback offered as well as discovery of weaknesses in these LOC areas? (LOC include sentence structure, punctuation, usage, and spelling.)

How does the consultant exhibit concern for and interest in the student's paper?

How does the consultant make the student aware of the criteria upon which this writing is most often evaluated?

C. The Closing

How does the consultant summarize the session for the student?

In what way is the closing sincere, friendly, and indicative of the consultant’s concern for the student? Indeed, students appreciate sincere interest in their well-being as well as their academic success.

D. Additional Comments

Describe the climate of the session:
- conversational/lecture like
- warm/cool
- student/teacher
- mutual effort/individual effort

Indicate who talked the most: consultant, student or equally divided

What types of questions were used during the session? Place a check in the appropriate row each time the consultant asks a question.
- a. closed: has only one answer
- b. open: has many possible answers
- c. leading: has an answer already known by the consultant
- d. probing: helps the student see possibilities
- e. yes/no: requires only a yes or no answer

Are the students actually taught how to edit, or does the consultant tend to complete the task for them? Explain.

In what ways was the student made to feel positive about the session and welcome to return?

Additional insights and summary:
Carrie Chapman Catt, a woman who contributed to society by giving women the right to vote, is now facing some controversy by her saying racist and xenophobic remarks. These kinds of remarks were the tactics aimed at the disenfranchisement Blacks, that African American were unworthy of the vote and that is was forced upon them. Catt claimed that Latino were of a lower civilization, and their opposition to woman suffrage would be "more bitter and vindictive". She also claims that Native Americans were savages. Carrie Chapman Catt didn't like foreigners because they came for poverty-ridden, ignorance-filled section of Europe. In despite of what she has said the building on Iowa State campus was named Catt Hall. Some people agree or disagree with renaming the building. The September 29th Movement wants to change the name of a prestigious building. There can be two sides to every story.

Carrie Chapman Catt, native of Charles City, Iowa, was a distinguished alumna of ISU. She successfully led the campaign to give women the right to vote, and founded the League of Women Voters. These are a few of Catt's many contributions to our society. In addition, later in Carrie Chapman Catt's accomplishments, she received the Centennial Memorial Foundations Award. This award is given every four years. According to biographers, Catt focused on expanding women's rights and political opportunities, encouraging citizen education and involvement in the political process, and supported programs dedicated to enhancing world peace and international cooperation. She also served as President of the International Suffrage Movement. Catt is the 12th recipient of the Iowa Award, which was created in 1951 by the Foundation of Trustees. As an illustration of her accomplishments, the Senate of the Government of the Student Body on November 18, 1974, proposed a resolution to name to new women's P.E. building after
Carrie Chapman Catt. "The new women’s physical education building needs a name and she graduated from Iowa State University, and not only was Catt active in getting the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution passed, but she helped start the first organized women’s physical activity on the campus," said the GSB in 1974. The Advisory Committee on naming of buildings recommended that the new women’s physical education building be named after Carrie Chapman Catt.

Furthermore, The Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women in Politics resulted from a recent meeting of a Political Advisory Board, made up of Iowa State political science alumni, in Washington D.C. Members of the advisory board noticed that there were no women on the board and they wanted to change that, said Richard Mansbach, professor of political science and a member of the Advisory Board. After the center was approved by the Board of Regents, it was officially announced as part of ISU’s partnership for Promise Campaign. The Committee got $94,000 in cash donations, which could be donated in specific amounts over several years. They also received $300,000 in deferred gifts. They decided to change the name to Catt Hall from “Old Botany” because they wanted a building named after a woman. They wanted her to be the first woman to have a building named after her at Iowa State University.

The September 29th Movement claims that Carrie Chapman Catt said racist and xenophobic remarks; that she was racist toward people from other ethnic groups. The people who are for changing the name of Catt Hall claims she has insulted people. They also want to know who is behind the constructing of Catt Hall.

As indicated earlier, Catt mostly likes white people because she thinks other ethnic groups are inferior in her eyes. This type of argument is a ethos or fair play. Catt is saying that white woman should have the right to vote because white women are the leaders, and the white women are looking down upon the non-white women. Using the expression of only liking white supremacy is working because people around campus are angry that Catt said they were inferior.
Should we look beyond when she made racist remarks, or should we be grateful that she gave rise for women to vote? We should look beyond for what she has done for the society and the realize that what she was saying was not racist to her when she was younger.

The Catt supporters think it was a good choice to name a building after her who fought for women the right to vote. They believe that you have to look for a good quality in a person, and a well known attribute they made to our society, just like Carrie Chapman Catt did by getting women the right to vote.

On the other hand, the September 29th Movement are angry for naming Catt Hall after a person they believe is a racist individual. They want the name changed so badly that they will keep on fighting until it is done. “Catt Hall will be renamed in very near future. They only question unanswered is the date,” says Milton McGriff, a member of September 29th Movement from the Uhuru newsletter (3). The September 29th Movement believe in the hearts that renaming Catt Hall is the only way to go. They want to beat the odds. They want you stand up for what you believe in and try to achieve you goals.

In conclusion, we should change the name of Catt Hall because Carrie Chapman Catt has said racist and xenophobic remarks, such as "the criminal, idiot and insane are not denied a vote in several states, and in most, a large class of ignorant un-American men with no comprehension of our problems, our history, or ideals, are conspicuous voters on election day" (Catt 70). Catt refers to Native Americans, the Sioux, as murdering, scalping savages. There is a problem with this argument because what if people said these statements have happened a long time ago, and we should move forward, and don't dwell on the past. For example, should we name a building after Mr. X if he said xenophobic and racist remarks back in the 1800's? We as a society probably would, but if we named a building after Mr. X today we probably would not because he would hurt the lives that he would have offended even more today then in the past. Catt's views on those of other
The September 29th Movement wants to change the name of Catt Hall because they believe that she has insulted people during the five year period of trying to get the 19th Amendment of the United States Constitution passed. This argument is a pathos or emotional argument. This situation is expressing the emotions they have toward Carrie Chapman Catt and what she said. This is working by making people angry and really expressing how they feel.

The students Iowa State University want to know who is behind in naming a prestigious building to Catt Hall. It is the Board of Regents. They are unhappy now that they changed it to Catt Hall. This is a pathos argument or emotional argument. This argument could be right or wrong to many people's opinion. The Board of Regents can be trying to compromise with the September 29th Movement, but the September 29th Movement wants the name to change, even if it is going to take a long time.

The situation of for and against the controversy of Carrie Chapman Catt deserves to be examined carefully. As we have seen, the situation involves a variety of arguments. We will now look at the main arguments being used by Catt's supporters and September 29th Movement.

There are people on Iowa State University campus who are Carrie Chapman Catt supporters. They believe that she was not a racist and that some of her statements were taken out of contexts. Professor Jane Cox said, in an interview with Campus Reader, "Catt's entire life should not be reduced to a sound bite or two, since she often spoke out against racism" (3).

Many people want to give Carrie Chapman Catt another chance. The things that she has said had happened along time ago. Kelly Powers makes her claim in the ISU Daily, by saying that "many people throughout history, even today, have been great people in certain areas, while lacking in others." One of her examples is that Thomas Jefferson owned slaves, but it didn't make him less of a person. Another example is when Malcolm X supported separatism. He did not particularly care for "white" people,
but does that make what he did to help African Americans gain much deserved rights, and freedoms obsolete? No. You again have to look past the wrongs and see the accomplishments.

Many people who are Carrie Chapman Catt supporters believe that Catt is a hero towards women. She has accomplished getting the 19th Amendment passed and earning women the right to vote. Alice Lukens states, "that Carrie Chapman Catt had made unethical claims in her lifetime, but she does believe it is unfair to judge Catt by a handful of statements she made in a five-year period (1915-1920) when was trying to get the 19th Amendment passed in all states, including at least two southern ones" (Campus Reader 3).

Some people of the September 29th Movement believe that Carrie Chapman Catt has said xenophobic and racist remarks, and that she mostly likes white people. Carrie Chapman Catt has said, "woman suffrage would so vastly increase the white vote. . .it would guarantee white supremacy if it otherwise stood in danger of overthrow" (Wondwosen 4). White supremacy means that certain white people are the leaders not the followers. The rest of the people are down towards the bottom of society. This kind of remark is a racist one because it discriminates against African American people. The people of the white population are hurt by it also because the African American people will be towards the bottom and the white population will not be able to meet with one another, and have a real friendship. We as a society have to look beyond white supremacy and try to come together as a whole and try not to make others feel inferior like Carrie Chapman Catt did.

Carrie Chapman Catt said remarks, but maybe saying remarks was right thing back then. Jane Cox from the Campus Reader, said "Catt did not openly speak out against racism. But she says that the original documents prove that Catt spoke out against racism both before and after that time" (Lukens 3). This is trying to say that Catt didn’t speak out against racism during the period of (1915-1920), but she did before and after that time.
races, in the last years of her life, has been spent for working for peace and railing against
the machinery of war—"it is important to note that ideas have a life, like viruses, growing,
adapt ing and mutating as they spread from host to host" (Marquart 12).

On the other hand, Catt only liked certain white people because they could be a
leader not a follower. White people were the only ones that could take in charge of the
society, this is called white supremacy. An example would be an "Smith was placed upon
a scaffold, six feet square and ten feet high, securely bound, within the view of all
behavior s. Here the victim was tortured for fifty minutes by red-hot iron brands thrust
against his quivering body. Commencing at the feet the brands were placed against him
inch by inch until they were thrust against the face. Then, being apparently dead, kerosene
was poured upon him, cottonseed hulls placed beneath him and set on fire. In less time
than it takes to relate it, the tortured man was wafted beyond the grave to another fire . . .
.Curiously seekers have carried away already all that was left of the memorable event,
even to pieces of coal" (Wells 166-7).

On the contrary these issues are incredible because it really makes you think about
them to come to your conclusion about renaming the building of Catt Hall. If we rename
the building of Catt Hall will it make people happy, or sad? The people in our society have
to think and fight for what they really want.
Tutoring Session 1

T=Torì (tutor)
K=Kathy (student)

Date: October 29, 1996
Time: 1pm

59 T: Do you want to, um, do you want to take a look at the stuff you've got in there and see how, how the proofreading's going?
K: Sure, I think when I left yesterday I think I was starting the, um, the right way to do this (?) I was starting the, um, right way to quote somebody.
T: Um hm
K: I think I was trying to do that.
T: OK, you have the general, the topic sentence and then the general statement and then the quote for support. Where are you looking at it?
K: Um, ...I don't know like if these, I don't think I have a quote.
T: OK, "Some people in the September 29th movement they believe that Carrie Chapman Catt has said xenophobic and racist remarks and that she mostly likes white people. The people who are for changing the name of Catt hall claims she hasn't solved the peace (?) problem. They also ought to (?) behind the constructing of Catt hall. In the illustration of the people who claim that Carrie Chapman Catt said xenophobic or racist remarks, this type of argument is a logical or logos situation. This statement is working by giving people an option to express what they feel and how to use it by having a rally of this issue by doing some research." OK where is your example of that?
K: My final, um, (?)
T: OK, you did the first one, and that worked out just right. OK. Um, you have all of your research on the September 29th movement?
K: Um hm
T: What's the, the, in that somewhere, they've undoubtedly, at some point, actually said what statements that there are that are bothering them. So what you need is an example of. you said, you said xenophobic and racist remarks twice in those two paragraphs, but you haven't given me, your reader, an example of what you mean.
K: OK
T: So this is the place where you put that in.
K: OK... OK...
T: Yeah, OK. Here's your introduction
K: I think I had, that (stuff about suffering?)
T: Um hm
K: I did, like, ah, before, (?) I think I had some of this in here.
T: Um hm
K: About oh, um, like, that, Carrie Chapman Catt, asking the American people are (if they believe it yet (?believing? confusing?)
T: OK, but there's an actual quote from her in that sentence that you're talking about. So that's the concrete example that we're talking about. Let's see.
What about in that stuff that Jane Cox gave you, or that stuff about, wasn't there some stuff highlighted there in that information you brought in?

K: Oh, in um, at the church council (?)

T: No, the other one, the packet, that you showed me?

K: Oh....

T: That one. OK. This is all stuff that Carrie Chapman Catt wrote, right?

K: Right. . . .

T: Like this. See this is what she says if the south really wants white supremacy it will urge the unfranchised (?). OK, so she's saying she gives women the vote then, ah, that will keep the black people down. That's the sort of thing that ....here's another one. That you had highlighted already. I think that that's. What does that other paper that you had say? Does it get to actually what she said?

K: This one?

T: This southern quote

K: (?)

T: OK, yeah, this is good, the attack on African Americans, this is where you got some of your support there. Right. . . .

K: I could use that?

T: Um hm. OK.

K: That remark that the "number of white women in the south is greater than the black women is (?)

T: Yeah, yeah ".....quote." OK, yeah, now you have to figure out how to cite that. I think that you should cite that to the Marin ? forces, right? Yeah, this is Marin's essay, OK?

K: OK. So I take this part out, or? Maybe that's backwards.

T: I think, well, no. Here's where you put it in. Because you're saying basically that Carrie Chapman Catt has said xenophobic and racist remarks and that she mostly likes white people.

K: Um hm

T: OK, so this is the place where I think you need, that you want to put in some support for why they think that. OK. So you could say the September 29th movement,

K: Um hm

T: And then how they are referring to this.

K: OK.

T: OK? . . . .

K: Typing.

T: OK. Now how are we going to cite this?

K: Um?

T: Are you starting back to, um, OK. There, we don't need the period there, because the period is going to go outside our citation. we just need the quote.

K: OK, um, space?

T: Quote then space then parenthesis, that's right. (?)

K: A comma, and then a space?

T: No, just the space, yeah.

K: (?)

T: Right.

K: I could put that there.

T: Yeah, now let's, better save that before the computer eats it. Let's go up and take a look at that paragraph that we did with Cox that was so quick (?) so we didn't
know how to do that(?) we should...OK. Oh, actually the Kelly Powers one, (?)
OK. "Many people gave Carrie Chapman Catt a chance. The thing that she had
said had happened a long time ago. Kelly Powers makes her point in the ISU
Daily by saying that "many people throughout history, even today, are great
people are certain areas, while lacking in others. Examples.....TJ, Malcom X,
(?)You again have to look past the wrong until you accomplish (?)" OK remember
we talked about what was going on here. You've got your topic sentence, you've got
a restriction of that topic sentence, explanation —those things happened long ago—
and then you've got your quote as support but you don't just leave your quote alone,
you analyze it. You give further explanation of why that quote is relevant, and
then you wrap it all up. So, how are we going to do that in this paragraph? OK.
Let's take a look at the whole thing here. How would you do that now?

K: Um, you put topic sentence, here's my statement, this is my (?)
T: Right that's your support, OK
K: And um
T: Now, how are you going to expand that? to make it clear that there's a
relationship between the quote and the topic sentence.
K: I could compare it?
T: Yeah, comparing it's a good way to show relationship. That's good.
K: So should I do this now?
T: I'd leave it alone for now. We'll do that stuff later. But I think that what you
need to think about is how you're going to make some sort of a comparison to show
the relationship between your quote and your topic sentence. I think, maybe the
first question is, do you think that's a racist remark?
K: (yeah?)
T: Do you think that the average reader would think that's a racist remark?
K: (yeah?)
T: ha ha. OK, so where do you go from there with it then?
K: Explain why it's a racist remark?
T: OK, good strategy. Another thing in terms of asking why it's a racist remark might
be trying to ask the question of why that would hurt the feelings of persons who are
not liked.
K: OK.
T: OK?
K: typing. (?)
T: Because one it's referring to the long remark.
K: OK
T: It's got an antecedent, so you're cool there.
K: typing.
T: "This kind of remark is a racist one because it discriminates the rights of especially
the African American population." OK let's take a look at just that sentence and
see how it's explaining or expanding on your quote. OK? How is it discriminating
against white people?
K: Um, because it could be because maybe there are some white people who do like
African American people, and if they were friends, then I wouldn't want them to
(?)
T: Oh, I see, OK ok. um, so it's kind of an indirect thing.
K: Um hm
T: Well you need to find a way to say that so it's clear that ...It sounds to me that
what you're trying to say is that discriminating against African Americans hurts
white people too?
K: Yes
OK, so how would you restructure that sentence so that that's what it says?

OK, well what about instead of trying to make it all one sentence what about trying to make two separate sentences? Because first you make the claim that its discriminating against African American people.

And then you make the second claim that when that happens it hurts white people, too. What about that?

I think maybe what's happening is that there is just too much goin on in this sentence.

Well, you know, this is a mouthful for a topic. Look at all the people who are saving stuff about it. This is a lot of topic.

typing

OK, now. Save it before the computer eats it.

OK, is that correct (?)

OK

OK now, take a look at the paragraph as a whole and remember we're comparing it to this one that you did before you came in the other day, that you did just right, OK. Look at the structure of that paragraph.

Maybe make a statement?

Are you ready to make a statement about what you think is the right thing to do here?

Or um, how they, she said no, and then the obsolete, and you know, (?) I don't know if that would go together

Well, I think that's the whole point I'm trying to understand what this argument is about, you know

Um hm

Is trying to see how it works from both sides. OK? What do you think white supremacy means when she uses it then?

Um, that most people are white.

OK, that's how you read that, that most of the people are white?

She wants to talk about that (?)

OK. When she's talking about guaranteeing white supremacy

Have you heard of like, white supremacist organizations like Arean nation and that kind of thing? Never heard of em. Well, see, I grew up out west so we heard about em, because out west it attracts all kinds of kooks, everybody from earth firsters (?) to the..my family. Everybody, right? ha ha. And one of the things that separates white supremacists, people who believe in white supremacy are people who just understand that there are white people, and they think that the white people should be in charge. OK? So when she uses the term white supremacy, she's not just saying that there's just more of us, she's saying that anyone who's not white isn't qualified to be in charge.

That's a whole different thing, isn't it?

Um hm, I noticed that. I was reading through these and she does say (?). Like if you're not white, then you're nobody. Like you have to white to be a leader.

She nailed on the Irish, too, that there a bunch of drunks, you know. So what she's talking about in her white supremacy is not just that everybody who's white, but a
certain kind of white people. That's what it says in Erin's article. So, looking at it that way,

K: And you could. I mean I could make an argument or a statement that tells um, maybe what this statement is about?

T: Yeah, that's what you did in that other paragraph, you explained what she was saying. OK. Where would you put that?

K: Um, right here?

T: Yes, that's a good place. That's right before you go into the business of how it hurts white people too.

end.
Tutoring Session 2

T=Tori (tutor)
K=Kathy (student)

Date: November 12, 1996
Time: 1 pm

000 T: Things going OK?
K: Yeah.
T: Hot dog!
K: ?
T: ?
K: ?
T: Here we go. OK. So how many pages.
K: Five or six? (?)
T: Those are the page breaks.
K: OK
T: Let’s go to the preview pages. (?) Still got em
K: (?)

022 T: [reading] Guess I can’t do it either. Well at least it tells you where the page breaks are. Now, our next step, now that we have a complete draft, is to go back and take a look at what we want to do with this paper. So the first step in our revising is to go through and see how well this paper meets the demands of what we want it to do. Now when we first started what was it that we wanted this paper to do? Do you have the assignment sheet?
K: Yeah (?) Looking...
T: Nope, something else

036 K: OK (looking) (lots of background noise)

044 T: By golly, I can’t find it either. Well in here I’ve got the business of the rhetorical analysis down to nine-twenty-four. OK, what this says is that you’re going to have to do a rhetorical analysis on the Catt Hall controversy, OK?
K: OK.
T: And then the next assignment is (?) that you’re starting to gather sources. So that must be the thing that you’ve got, OK?
K: OK.
T: OK. So what this is supposed to do is it’s supposed to analyze the rhetoric, yeah, analyze the rhetorical situation for the debate about Catt Hall, that was to prepare us, OK?
K: Um hm
T: For the analysis of the arguments, OK?
K: OK.
T: So what this paper’s supposed to do, is it’s supposed to take a look at the arguments for and against naming Catt Hall, and analyze them in terms of logos / ethos / pathos,
K: um hm

063 T: And come to some conclusion about which arguments were better than others. That’s the goal. So, shall we begin? hee hee hee. You’ll remember this (?) You’ve been working on this one step at a time, all the way through. [Tutor reads from Excerpt 1]. OK. So, that’s our introductory paragraph. Let’s look at the structure of this. If I can get the whole thing on the screen at once. No, I can’t. [working on computer]. I’ll try again. No! I can’t. (?)
K: hm
T: OK. [working on computer]. OK, there we go. Whole paragraph. Now, let's take a
look at, (Shaunessy’s?) structure. OK. First we have an introduction of who Carrie
Chapman Catt was. Then we have some statements about the kind of remarks she
made. Then, then the "September 29th movement wants to change", and then we
have the name of the building, and then we have your transitional stuff (?). It
seems to me that maybe this stuff about the building ought to come ahead of the
September 29th movement wanting to change it. You see? Or, maybe combine in
some way. But actually, I think before. Because if the "September 29th movement
wants to change the name of a prestigious building that was named after her. The
building on Iowa State campus is named Catt Hall." So you think maybe this stuff
about the building they named for her should come ahead of the business about
somebody wanting to change it?
K: Yes
T: ha ha ha. I could tell that you couldn’t quite tell where I was going with that.
K: OK. So if I move [working on computer]
T: um hm
K: oops
T: There you go. OK. Alright. Here we’ve got the (reading the last 2 sentences of the
Excerpt 1). Well, since we’ve already said that we can say here that (reading
sentence).
K: OK
T: you see that?
K: um hm.
T: um hm. Then that’s our whole paragraph. So now you’ve moved from your
introductory paragraph here, and you’re starting, this is the background stuff
K: um hm
T: Ok? (Reading from Excerpt 2) "Carrie Chapman Catt......The September 29th
movement claims...claims that
K: [working on computer]
T: yep
K: why change that?
T: movement
K: so claims is a verb?
T: um hm
K: OK.
T: So I claim, but the movement claims. Do you hear the difference there? Cause I’m
singular? I claim,
K: ah huh
T: the movement claims. OK. I’m saving it to make sure. OK. The rest got put on the
next page. OK, now we’ve got a shift here. In this paragraph you’ve been giving us
the background on Carrie Chapman Catt. And now you start talking about the
September 29th movement. So what probably needs to happen in case we make a
shift like that?
K: I know
T: What do you know? ha ha ha. What needs to happen there?
K: A transition
T: yeah. Probably a new paragraph, too.
K: (yeah)
T: See where the September 29th movement starts?
K: OK.
T: (Starting reading at the bottom of page one.). OK. We've got to find some way to support these claims but first let's take a look at the overall organization, OK, so first you had your introduction

K: um hm

T: Then you had your background on Carrie Chapman Catt

K: um hm

T: Now we're talking about the arguments of the September 29th movement, who wants to change it, OK

K: um hm

T: "People who are (reading from top of page 2) for changing the name of Catt Hall claims"...claim. OK here we have that same thing with that claiming, as the verb. People and claims. See that? People's plural?

K: oh

T: Well people is more than one, but singular, I guess

K: hm

T: People claim, people claims. Everyone claims. We've got a list of these. Let me see if I can find it. [looking for sheet]. Well I can't find it, we'll just have to mark that down as a word we've got to look at. I don't know where we keep that stuff. OK. [reading again at the top of page 2, excerpt 3] "An illustration of, people who claim that Carrie Chapman Catt has said xenophobic and racist remarks." OK, how does this relate to your (?)—logical statement for the September 29th movement.

K: OK, part of that one, that, remember where, um, that day I got confused about the (beginning and ending?)

T: oh, this is the stuff

K: this is the stuff here about talking about it

T: this is the stuff where you had the stuff for Carrie Chapman Catt on the wrong side.

K: yeah

T: OK. Well, do you think we need that? Well, what do you want to do with it then?

K: (?)

T: Just change this paragraph here [student working on computer]. OK. "As indicated earlier, Catt mostly likes white people because she thinks other ethnic groups are inferior in her eyes. This type of argument is a ethos or fair play. Using the expression of only liking "white people" is working because people around campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her." Um. OK. So you think she's making an ethical argument because she says that other ethnic groups are inferior? Let's talk about what we think she's saying.

K: Yea

T: OK when she says that non-whites are inferior, that's an ethical argument?

K: Yes

T: OK. So how does that relate to, first off, how is that an ethical argument? Can you describe for me how that's working?

K: That could be that if she thinks that non-whites are inferior, then she could, um, the way I feel it could be wrong

T: That statement could be wrong or right?

K: Yeah, that it could be a fair play argument that is right or wrong, but,

T: Oh I see what you mean, I think. Keep going.

K: Um, because if she thinks that non-whites are inferior, that they can't be leaders, then if I was out in the audience I would think "wait a minute, that's not right." But in her eyes she thinks that she's right and I would be wrong.

T: OK

K: Does that make any sense?
T: OK. So we had talked about ethical arguments as being a right or wrong argument and that (?) this is the right thing, and so as an audience member you're saying 'wait a minute that's not right' but she's saying that it is.

K: um hm

T: So that makes it an ethical argument? Hm. Well, I think what's hanging me up, is that, I can see where you're getting that because of the way we described ethos, you know we described it as this fair play, do the right thing sort of thing.

K: um hm

T: And in that sense, I think you're probably right in that Catt would say it's an ethical argument because it's only fair for white women to have the right to vote when all of those people who don't deserve it have it. OK.

K: um hm

T: So that is from her point of view a fair play argument. From our point of view it's almost an opposite sort of fair play argument because we're saying that what she's says is NOT right.

K: um hm

T: So there's two points there. We're back to that, we got two different points that are trying to be made in the same sentence, ha ha, which is why I'm confused. OK. OK. So let's expand. You say "As indicated earlier.Catt mostly likes white people because she thinks other ethnic groups are inferior in her eyes. This type of argument is a ethos or fair play." Ok. So we need something to clarify here why that argument is an ethical argument. OK? She's saying that white women should have the right to vote because.....[student typing] should have the right to vote. This is back when, they didn't have the vote. Now what's the fair argument here? I think the key word in your last one is that the other groups are inferior. Inferior is the key word. So what kind of argument can you construct from that? ....

K: [student typing]. [238-245].

T: OK. you mean, OK let's see. Catt's saying that white women have the right to vote because the white women are the leaders and the non-white women are the ones who are looking down upon"...you know that clarifies exactly what you're talking about. OK first that, her point of view is that it's only fair for white women to vote when they are the leaders. OK. But there's a problem with sentence construction here, it says the non-white women are the ones who are looking down upon—who are the non-white women looking down on?

K: um

T: They're not. ha ha ha

K: Should be up upon

T: They're the ones who white women are looking down on. See what I mean?

K: Oh

T: Do you see why that wasn't working?

K: [typing 258-261] Should there be a comma there?

T: Well, right now we're looking at meaning, OK, we'll worry about the sentence level after we make sure we've got the sentence sort of saying what we want it to mean, close enough to what we want.

K: um hm

T: What we've got here..."That white women should have the right to vote because white women are the leaders. White women are looking down upon non-white women". OK. All of that stuff that she was saying about, immigrant men, Negro men, and all these guys who didn't deserve to vote but could,

K: um hm

T: and then she said, she literally said, "It's not fair, that these people can vote and white women can't." And she never did say white women, she said Woman, with a
capital W. But what she meant was, white women. OK. So that's her fair play argument.

K: um hm
T: And that's what you're articulating there. Now the second part of this paragraph is where you talk about how people on campus feel about that. OK. Now what was the actual words that she said. She didn't say only liking white people. What were the words she said?

K: Um, did she say non-white?
T: Remember we looked it up last week?
K: White supremacy?
T: Right. OK. So I would, in this next sentence, I would substitute this direct quote with what she said using the expression of white supremacy instead of your paraphrase.

K: [typing] ah..
T: Is working because people on campus are angry that they think they are inferior of her or that she thinks they’re inferior. You said they think they are inferior. And I don’t think they think they’re inferior at all, do they?

K: No
T: ha ha ha ha. that
K: Could I say that they think that she she’s, they think that she is inferior?
T: Is that what they think?
K: No
T: What do they think?
K: (silence)
T: It’s not a test, relax ha ha. Ok, if someone says women are inferior, and we get angry, is it because we really think we’re inferior?

K: No?
T: It’s because they’re wrong. They think we’re inferior. Right? Ok. So, I see your wheels turning here.
K: laugh
T: You know what you mean, it’s just a question of stating it that way, right? Now how would you phrase it if you wanted to make it clear that they’re angry about what she thinks because it’s wrong?

K: um, (reading from paper) um, that she says that they’re inferior?
T: um hm. She did say that they were inferior, that’s it. That’s why they’re angry.
K: OK.
T: That’s one of many possible combinations, but that’s one of them.
K: [typing 319-326]
T: OK. Save it. in the incredible paper eating machine. “September 29th movement wants “movement want. There you go. (changing want to wants). to change the name of CATT Hall because they believe that she has insulted people during the ...I don’t think you need that "has" there because we’re not, it’s just a simple past. right? See what I mean. Let’s look at it again. “They believe that she insulted people.....passed.”

K: OK
T: And it was an amendment to the United States what? What was it an amendment to? the old document?
K: Oh
T: The United States constitution? There you go. That’s good. OK. [reading from page two] This argument is emotional or pathos argument. “This situation is expressing the emotions they have of Carrie Chapman Catt” Do they have emotions of it? or about it or
K: Probably about it
T: Yep, probably about it.
K: or for.
T: Do you like "for" better?
K: Yep
T: [working through it] there, there you go. "This is working by making people angry into expressing people how they feel....". Ok, when you capitalize the University like that I think you're talking about Marty and all the people there. Who wants to know how the name got there? Well, President Jiskhe and all those guys know how it got there. It's the students, right?
K: Should I say just university?
T: I would put just students
K: Students?
T: Yeah, cause um
K: Could you put um like students of Iowa State University?
T: Yes you could
K: [typing 377]
T: Space there. Students want. Now who or want? "They are unhappy now that they have changed it to Catt Hall" ha ha ha I would say so. "This is a pathos argument." No, it can't be fair play if it's pathos. If it's pathos it's emotional. Ethos is fair play.
K: OK
T: So which one did you mean? Is this an ethos or a pathos?
K: .
T: See that would be an emotional argument.
K: Oh. [typing]
T: "This argument could be right or wrong to many people's opinion." OK. So it's a feeling argument as opposed to a logic argument. The Board of Regents can return a compromise with the September 29th movement....a long is two words...(last paragraph on page two)
K: Could I take this September 29th movement out?
T: I don't see how you could do it
K: Oh, OK
T: Because otherwise your referent, your pronoun referent is going to get muddy. If you just put "they" in there it would be hard to tell if it were the September 29th movement or the Board of Regents that was the "they." Do you see what I mean?
K: Oh, OK. um hm
T: "As an illustration...." on or in? on
K: [typing]
T: On. OK, this is the quote, right? So we have to have quote marks around that, right?
K: [typing]
T: The new phys ed building" Advisory committee. On the campus right?
K: Yeah, [typing]
T: Right, that would be, is that the end of the quote? And it was that advisory committee that said that, right?
K: Right
T: That quote's got to, you need to attribute that quote. Oh, said the GSB. It was the GSB (Government Student Body)
K: Oh,
T: Said the GSB
K: OK, so it would be
T: So I would say "said the GSB"
K: [typing]
T: And what year was that?
K: um, 1974
T: OK, then I would say 1974. And now GSB is saying changing the name
K: They're confused!
T: Well, they're not the same people! Were you born in 1974? Maybe your parents
were here. ha ha
K: Almost. 1976
T: Is when you were born?
K: laugh
T: So maybe your parents were here. Oh God, now I feel old. I shouldn't have asked.
OK, [reading 'Advisory committee']. Ok. where's the verb in that sentence?
K: Naming
T: Naming is part of a, see we've got the advisory committee on naming buildings, but
we don't have them doing anything. The Building being named after Carrie
Chapman Catt is part of this phrase, but we don't have a verb, we don't have the
advisory committee doing anything. What are they doing?
K: . . . Advising?
T: Well, yeah, they're advising, but we've got to find another verb for it.
K: . . .
T: Is this a word that when you say someone else should do something and it's a good
idea, like that? recommending?
K: Oh, yeah
T: Is that the one you wanted? ha ha ha
K: Yeah
T: And in this case it's past
K: Oh
T: OK. The advisory committee on naming of buildings recommended that the new
women's phy ed building be named after Carrie Chapman Catt." Now, here's the
organizational question. That paragraph pretty much makes sense, but it seems to
be about stuff back in the beginning about when you were giving the history about
Carrie Chapman Catt on campus. So you've gone, you started out with your
introductory paragraph and then your history of Carrie Chapman Catt on campus,
and then you started talking about arguments
K: um hm
T: But now you're back to talking about history, what do you think?
K: um hm
T: Where would you put it?
K: Um, probably by the (history?)
T: Yeah, I'd move that whole paragraph back up to where the history is. Yep, right
there.
K: [moving text]
T: There you go
K: I think I might have put
T: Right there.
K: I think that what might have happened was is I put that there but I wasn't sure, I
might have put it in between
T: Just in between stuff?
K: Um hm because of that little line there, that's where, because there's one up above
too, that (?)
OK. Now we're back to talking about the Board of Regents. "Furthermore" [page 3]. 300,000—you need to put a dollar sign there.

K: OK

T: Cause otherwise it's 300,000 little red cats or something

K: OK

T: You know me, I'll think anything! [reading] Ok, you need to put her in there too.

K: OK, after "her"

T: Yeah, after her at Iowa State University. OK, now that paragraph is about the history again, isn't it?

K: Um hm

T: So now what?

K: Um. [pulls out outline]

T: Oh, when in doubt, look at your outline, huh? good idea! ha ha

K: a h

T: See where you have that on your outline you've got it clear back up here

K: OK

T: So I think that you're probably supposed to move that one back to where it goes on the outline, too. ha ha ha.

K: OK

T: By the way that's a great clear paragraph.

K: Can you understand it?

T: I understand it. So then we want to go, yeah, it should be....wa la! Alright, now what's next?

K: Um, actual fundraising

T: That's what we just moved

K: OK, controversy.

T: OK. Situation for and against (page 3). You don't need that word

K: [deletes word]

T: "We will now look at the main arguments being used by Catt's supporters and September 29th Movement.". Kathy, that's a perfect transitional paragraph!!!!

K: giggling

T: Absolutely, without a doubt. We just have to put it in the right place to make the transition (laughing)

K: laughing

T: All of the stuff that comes before it is the history, and all the stuff that comes after it is the argument, OK.

K: OK

T: Look at that! (reads sentence). That's brilliant! Absolutely brilliant!

K: [typing]

T: You've just told us, that's called forecasting by the way, you know like weather forecasters?

K: um hm

T: You've just told us exactly what you're going to do next. So supposedly you're going to look at the main arguments. "There are people" (page 3) (Cox) Good. "Many people...accomplishments. Many people who are Carrie Chapman Catt supporters" (page 4). COX) Well she doesn't believe in the Campus Reader, so what are we going to do with this? .. Since we've already quoted the Campus Reader,

K: um hm

T: Maybe we can put that inside the quotation

K: OK

T: So what we do is take out this part, move this part, move this part,
K: where
T: right here
K: yeah
T: See what I'm going to do? [typing] paste. Ha! you put the space in there automatically, see how you are?
K: Does that look funny?
T: Do you not like that? It will automatically do that (?)
K: OK
T: "Jane Cox believes that....(page 4)" Now is that a direct quote from Jane Cox?
K: um hm
T: That's a direct quote from Jane Cox
K: um hm
T: Or is it from the woman who's interviewing Cox?
K: ....... [looking]
T: You've collected a lot of interesting stuff. OK, here it is. OK, so this is Alice Lukans (?) quoting Jane Cox. So it should say Alice Lukans instead of Jane Cox. Cause it's a quote from her.
K: OK [typing]
T: OK. Good. "Some of the people.. (page 4)" Well, she actually said that, right?
K: Yes
T: So it's not that they believe that, it's that she said it. ha ha ha
K: OK
T: So you can take out the part about what other people believe and just say "Carrie Chapman Catt said"
K: So just take out the September 29th Movement?
T: Yeah, you can just start out with the Carrie Chapman Catt part because she said it. ha ha
K: OK
T: ha ha ha. OK. "Carrie Chapman Catt said. Women's suffrage, would so vastly increase the vote...overthrow" You've got your citation, that's good, that's perfect, I see you're remembering to put the period outside the parenthesis, that's good. "The people of the white population is or are"
K: People are.
T: "People of the white population are hurt by it....Carrie Chapman Catt (bottom of page 4 and top of page 5). "Many people believe it is right to speak out against racism, but to have Carrie Chapman Catt go back on her word and saying racist remarks is wrong." OK, um. Explain to me exactly what you're trying to say there.
K: People believe that, um, that, like if, um, to not speak out against racism is hurting people, um, I was trying to say that, she would say one thing, like "I'm not going to say to you (?)," but later on she does. Going back on her word, when she promised.
T: OK, where in your research did you find her promising that?
K: I didn't
T: Ah, that's the problem. ha ha ha. So what do we do with that? We have no way of backing up that claim.
K: Delete it
T: Delete it, yeah. Actually that next sentence will be OK. Just that sentence is a problem. The one about, yeah. I thought, boy you have access to some great research because I haven't seen this stuff. OK, here's the argument part. "Should we look beyond when she spoke out against racism". OK, do you mean should we look beyond when she made racist remarks?
K: Yes
T: OK, then that's what you meant there. Should we look beyond when she made racist remarks

K: [typing]

T: Instead of when "she spoke out against racism" "should we look beyond..." OK. "The people who are behind (last paragraph). Ok, this is a repeat of the other stuff. Ok, this part, (?) And then here's .... So the stuff that is all in black is the stuff we've already moved.

K: OK

T: OK. "Catt supporters think she was a good choice to name a building after."

K: typing

T: OK, yeah,

end
APPENDIX E
HUMAN SUBJECTS FORM
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. ☑ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. ☑ Consent form (if applicable)

14. ☑ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. ☑ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:
   First Contact
   October 18, 1996; March 15, 1997
   Last Contact
   December 17, 1996; May 10, 1997

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

   Month / Day / Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer

   Date

   Department or Administrative Unit

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

   ☑ Project Approved   ☑ Project Not Approved   ☑ No Action Required

   This would have been approved had it been submitted prior to completion.

   Patricia M. Keith
   Name of Committee Chairperson
   Date

   Signature of Committee Chairperson

GC: 8/95
REFERENCES CITED


Olson, Gary A. "Toward a Post-Process Composition: Abandoning the Rhetoric of Assertion." In Post Process Theory: Beyond the Writing


