CHAPTER ONE

spedagogical resources that are most useful within their chosen fields, and to apply those resources toward the production of a piece of research composed with the goal of formally entering the dialogue in which it situates itself.

While these course ideas raise many interesting questions about the state of our field, what strikes me most is the shift of emphasis from literary texts or common theoretical critical approaches to a shared experience of producing knowledge with students. These courses, it seems to me, allow for a range of texts and theoretical schools, but they will not work without shared pedagogical goals. What these courses seem to imply, then, is that what matters most is pedagogy.

This shouldn't be surprising, since for the last twenty years, the field has (at least theoretically) taken what David Downing terms a “pedagogical turn,” which shifts the focus from what we teach students to read and write to how we teach them (1994, xiii). Consequently, the role of the English professor is altered. More than one who transmits particular knowledge, he or she is a facilitator of student projects, a co-inquirer, a learner.

If we were to adopt these courses, we would need to give up the idea that our authority stems (solely) from our certainty, from the knowledge areas in which we have demonstrated achievement. After all, this pedagogy is not so much about transmission of predetermined knowledge as it is about the process of collaborative knowledge making, of asking questions, of learning. These courses require a commitment on the part of faculty to learn from their colleagues about other areas of the field and to learn with their students as they write their way into the field. But most of all, they require ongoing inquiry into how we are engaging knowledge with students, into how, as the Interpreting Texts description insists, “all [pedagogical] practice is equally informed by theory.”

Of course, as Downing notes, “such reconsiderations will no doubt reveal that our uncertainties, our hesitancies, our vulnerabilities are a much larger part of the learning situation than our traditional notions of authority and knowledge have ever led us to believe” (xiv). Indeed, these course sketches were met with some discomfort on the part of faculty: how do we introduce students to areas of the field in which we are not experts? How

can we help sophomore students locate appropriate projects? Do we teach creative writing as scholarly, and if so how? But perhaps we first need to address these questions: Do we know how to be the professors required by these descriptions, especially when so many of us in English studies were trained to be “masters” and not “learners”? Especially when so many of us were not trained as teachers, but as professors, scholars?

These issues and concerns are certainly not unique to my department; they have likely been felt to various degrees by most departments over the last twenty years as the infusion of cultural studies and critical theory into English studies has asked us to exchange foundational knowledge and transmission-based pedagogy for socially constructed knowledge and activity-centered learning. Certainly, this work has had an impact on the scholarship of English studies, resulting in a growing body of work examining the relationship between critical theory and classroom practices. What has not received nearly equivalent attention, however, is the issue of how we prepare professors of English to engage this new activity-centered field.

Addressing this issue is one aim of this book. But it can’t be answered without a concurrent examination of historical and contemporary conceptions of the research professor and the discipline, notions that necessarily shape our beliefs about the relationship between teaching and research, the role of the professor, and the way he or she should be prepared. In this chapter, I begin with the current situation—what Gerald Graff has called the “pedagogical boom” (1994)—and the institutional and disciplinary conditions that give rise to it. I then look to other historical moments when pedagogy has received heightened attention, so as to glean insight into the institutional structures and values that have disciplined, and continue to discipline, teaching. It is my hope that this sharpened understanding is a first step toward revision of the way we teach professors of English.

The Current Scene: A Turn toward Pedagogy

For those of us in composition, pedagogy has long occupied the center of our work. Rare is scholarship in composition that does
not, implicitly or explicitly, address issues of teaching and learning. Of course, for this reason, the field has also been devalued and denied disciplinary status. As the field of English studies has begun to “turn” toward pedagogy, however, pedagogy’s currency as a viable subject area has increased.

As I mention above, the collision of English, critical theory, and cultural studies has led to a new body of scholarship dedicated to issues, questions, and politics of pedagogy. For instance, in addition to numerous edited collections, we now have a journal devoted to (and entitled) Pedagogy (from the prestigious Duke University Press), backed by an editorial board of pedagogy “scholars,” and, as noted earlier, the MLA International Bibliography has expanded its scope to include “publications about the teaching of language, writing, and literature at the college level” (“Mellon Grant”).

This scholarship is largely informed by the language of radical (postmodern and critical) pedagogy, and has sought to establish pedagogy as what Henry Giroux calls “a mode of cultural criticism for questioning the very conditions under which knowledge and identities are produced” (1993, 6). Indeed, the pedagogical turn is fueled by the notion that pedagogy and politics are synonymous, and that pedagogy is crucial to social transformation. In fact, as Lynn Worsham (1998) sees it, pedagogy became a boom subject in the humanities when it became clear that theory, alone, was not doing the job. Pedagogy, with its ties to concrete sites and subjects, could fashion itself as a form of radical politics capable of changing (student) subjects, who could, in turn, change the world.

But how much has pedagogy changed English studies? Some would argue that despite the lip service, pedagogy is hardly a flourishing subject in our primary disciplinary sites: journals, conferences, book series. For instance, in their editors’ introduction to the inaugural issue of Pedagogy, Jennifer L. Holberg and Marcy Taylor acknowledge significant pockets of interest (special issues of PMLA, College English, Profession, the MLA Approaches to Teaching series), but contend that pedagogy remains a marginalized subject in English studies at large. They describe sharing the journal’s mission with others only to hear, “Oh, so it’s a ‘comp’ journal.” They argue, though, that not only is teaching not valued in the scholarship of literary study, it is also not valued in composition journals. As they write, “journals like College Composition and Communication are devoted to the scholarship of rhetoric and composition and not to teaching, any more than Victorian Studies is” (2000, 2).

Part of the problem is that scholarship on pedagogy is often more concerned with what Jennifer Gore calls the “social visions” than the “instructional acts” of teaching. That is, it typically remains at the level of abstract social visions, seemingly abiding by the assumption that someone else—namely the teachers—will unpack and deliver it to the students. In fact, Gore goes so far as to ask whether the new attention to pedagogy actually benefits students and teachers—whether it has actually reached classrooms. While it “dignifies” the work of educational theorizing, she is not so sure it has done much to dignify teaching itself (1993, 101).

Indeed, there seems to be a crucial distinction between pedagogy as it is written about in the scholarly realm and the actual practice of engaging English studies with students—the actual practice of teaching. This is evident when we examine the second (separate) way in which pedagogy has emerged as a “boom subject” in the field: as a response to the poor job market. As the 2000 MLA Newsletter article “Job Market Remains Competitive” makes clear, the combination of an overproduction of Ph.D.’s and a shortage of tenure-track positions means that two-thirds of job candidates find themselves employed by institutions very different from the research universities where they did graduate work. They will, in other words, be required to spend a large percentage of their time teaching: an activity for which most recipients of Ph.D.’s are ill prepared. As a result of this disjuncture, we see a renewed interest in “teacher training” and “professional preparation.”

This interest has manifested itself largely in the development of programs that exist outside of any specific discipline, such as university-wide centers for excellence in teaching, programs such as Preparing Future Faculty, the Consortium on the Preparation of Graduate Students as College Teachers, and national TA conferences (Chism 1998). In the March 2001 issue of Teaching English in the Two-Year College, essays by Jo Ann Buck and
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MacGregor Frank; Toni Cowan, Joyce Traver, and Thomas Riddle; and Sean Murphy offer new possibilities for preparing doctoral students as teachers, including graduate student internships in community colleges and faculty-in-training programs. While these programs make important contributions, they also demonstrate that teaching is not considered a disciplinary concern; it can somehow be amputated from scholarly issues and handed over to others for whom it is presumably more properly an object of inquiry. Even more, reform is driven by the job market or the need for undergraduate teaching, not by a reconception of pedagogy as an important mode of knowledge production.

Within the discipline of English studies, we might expect professorial preparation to look somewhat different. That is, if pedagogy is truly deemed a crucial mode of knowledge production deserving of critical inquiry, then we should see evidence of a radical departure from the very concept of teacher training, which suggests that teaching is a skill one can acquire or master. But there is much to suggest the contrary. For starters, the responsibility for preparing graduate students to teach typically falls on one person: the writing program administrator. Often, this training is completed during a brief orientation or a single “teaching seminar” or “practicum.” (There are exceptions, of course: many innovative courses and programs that support teacher development do exist, and I will draw from these examples here and in subsequent chapters to illustrate how the ideas I promote can be enacted.)

Because of institutional pressure to move new TAs into classrooms as quickly and efficiently as possible, the overwhelming majority of teacher-training programs still rely on “what-works” or skill-based methods to prepare new teachers, according to Catherine Latterell, who studied curricular requirements for TAs in thirty-six universities that grant Ph.D.s in rhetoric and composition studies (1996, 27). In this moment when English studies calls attention to the contexts of knowledge—to the importance of studying the social relations that inform how and what we come to know—it is ironic that “what works” teacher-training strategies, expected to function devoid of contexts, continue to function as the norm.

On the other hand, we are beginning to see an increasing number of theory-based courses, many of which serve at once to introduce students to the discipline of composition and rhetoric and to prepare TAs to teach first-year writing. There is nothing inherently problematic about offering TAs either “what works” practices or composition theory; both, in fact, are necessary. What is worth noting, however, is how teacher-preparation sites tend to feature one or the other, following disciplinary trends in making pedagogy either a body of knowledge or a skill.

Further, this preparatory work is not often designed to initiate the career-long development of graduate students, but to answer immediate program requirements. Consequently, teaching is often only addressed when it serves the needs of the university. In doctoral programs (or, more accurately, outside of them), then, graduate students learn that teaching may be important to subsidize their “real” work, but that it is not central to their development as professors. Of course, this lesson begins upon admittance to graduate school: graduate students teaching first-year writing courses are almost exclusively admitted for doctoral study based not on their potential as teachers, but on their potential as scholars. What matters most is that which is emphasized in their credit-bearing courses: scholarly development.

Because of the job crunch, however, there has been increasing pressure to professionalize graduate students, and to help them represent their teaching in ways that increase their marketability (Leverenz and Goodburn 1998, 13). While the development of teaching portfolios offers important opportunities for reflection and revision, teaching portfolios created for the purpose of self-promotion differ greatly from those composed for teaching development; likewise, as Carrie Shively Leverenz and Amy Goodburn point out, they are not typically assessed in “terms of growth or development but in the degree to which teachers represent themselves as successful” (13). Once again, teaching is granted attention not because of its inherent value as a subject matter, but because it is a vehicle for job placement.

As much as the recent pedagogical boom has helped recast pedagogy as a site of scholarly study and illuminated the need for better teacher preparation, there is much to suggest that it is
already disciplined. Put simply, this movement does one of two things: it turns pedagogy into a “new” body of knowledge or it reifies the notion that pedagogy is merely a skill, subsidiary to the real, disciplinary work that takes place in the curriculum. Valuing pedagogy, making pedagogy central to proferring, requires more than scholarly efforts and more than improved training practices. It requires a rethinking of entrenched notions of the discipline that determine the relationship of teaching to scholarship and that reinforce a limited conception of who the professor is and should be.

Disciplining the Research Professor

To explore our contemporary conceptions of the discipline, and the research professor who occupies it, we need to look all the way back to the German research university. When the United States adopted this model at the turn of the last century, university education shifted away from its service-oriented mission and uniform curriculum, whose aim was to produce “public-spirited, service-oriented” graduates (Kuklick 1990). Instead, it embraced the German ideal of Wissenschaft, which promoted, above all, the “ardent, methodical, independent search after truth in any and all of its forms, but wholly irrespective of utilitarian application” (Hart 1874, 250). Under this new research ideal, students were free to elect new courses of study, at the same time American professors were freed from accountability to their students (Crowley 1998; Berlin 1987). Their new responsibility was to knowledge. As James Morgan Hart, an American who traveled in 1861 to Germany to study, put it, “[T]he professor is not a teacher, in the English sense of the term; he is a specialist. He is not responsible for the success of his hearers. He is responsible only for the quality of his instruction. His duty begins and ends with himself” (1874, 264).

The new research university also gave way to a new conception of disciplinarity, conceived as a static body of specialized (not utilitarian) knowledge, made and extended by “experts” and transported by “teachers.” This transition, Richard Ohmann reminds us, was steered by the “unseen hand that guides a laissez faire economy” (1976, 288). That is, the new research-driven discipline was easily appropriated to serve the goals of scientific management (Downing, Hurlbert, and Mathieu 2002). As Downing (2002) argues, one of the most significant consequences of these corporate appropriations was teaching’s subordination to research. Put simply, disciplinary knowledge could be more easily quantified and commodified than could teaching.

The development of doctoral education in English, beginning in the early twentieth century, also helped to cement English as a research discipline and to establish what Stephen North calls “College English Teaching, Inc.” Under this structure, doctoral students contributed to the university economy through both their tuition dollars and their labor, payments that ultimately served to maximize graduate faculty’s profits as researchers. By acting as teaching fellows or assistants, doctoral students would generate credit hours at a fraction of the price of full-time faculty (2000, 25). Moreover, these teaching duties were considered ancillary to credit-bearing, disciplinary work; at most, teaching might have been considered an extracurricular “apprenticeship.” Under this model, the students were subjected not only to the “master’s” instruction, but also to his rule. After all, as North writes, “when the faculty from whom you are seeking your education are also in charge of your means of funding that education, they can exercise more control—and more direct control—over the trajectory it follows than faculty without that fiscal power” (27).

The payoff was great for graduate faculty, who, now excused from teaching labor-intensive lower-level classes, could dedicate more time to the disciplinary work of researching. When they did teach, it was typically in their research areas (and enrollments could be guaranteed through graduate course requirements). Thus, the link between proferring and knowledge mastery was confirmed, as was the notion that the labor of teaching could be handed over to someone “lower” on the academic totem pole. Indeed, the work of teaching became something quite different from the work of proferring. Teaching was crucial in making the disciplinary machine run, but it functioned in service of—not as central to—that machine.

But I need not use the past tense here. This model, institutionalized in American universities more than a century ago, re-