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DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my students who have been the inspiration for learning how to invite them into the classroom and teach them what they need.

And, of course, this is dedicated to Mike Rose whose work has so inspired me and who graciously helped me with information.
Preface: Reading Mike Rose

*I*t is not terror that fosters learning, it is hope, everyday heroics, the power of the common play of the human mind.

*Lives on the Boundary* 242

This thesis on the work of Mike Rose, author, scholar, and professor at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), so closely matches my interests and goals as a writing teacher that it seems amazing to consider that when I started my master's degree program in English at Oregon State University (OSU) in the fall of 2002, I had not yet heard of Rose. However, my new career as a teacher also amazes me, since I had never dreamed of being a teacher. I started my career as a writer, writing poetry, freelance articles, book reviews, and author profiles for West Coast newspapers and magazines. A few years after I started writing, however, I found myself drawn to teaching. I began to teach creative and expository writing at Rogue Community College (RCC) in southern Oregon. even though I had never studied English literature and had never heard of the field of "rhetoric and composition," a field I would not know existed until I entered graduate school. And while Mike Rose's *Lives on the Boundary* (hereafter *Lives*) would have been an excellent book for me to read considering the demographics of my community college classrooms and the challenges my students faced, my colleagues never mentioned Rose. If I had known his work when I was first teaching, I would have found his inclusionary and compassionate approach encouraging and his insights into critical thinking and composing blocks helpful. I might even have arrived at OSU already planning to write my master's thesis on Rose.
As it was, I did not encounter Rose until my first term of graduate school when I took WR 511: The Teaching of Writing. Reading Rose's essay "Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal," I could see how relevant it was to the teaching I had just been doing. As I read his description of students in the UCLA writing program, I agreed strongly with his claim that many "lower level" writing courses (such as those I had taught at community college) did not adequately prepare students for the types of writing required at the university. I had seen this happen at RCC. The textbooks listed popular assignments such as "describe your favorite place" or "tell about an influential person." These assignments stimulated personal expression and creative writing, and even encouraged reluctant students to begin writing. But such descriptions and narrations are little help when students are subsequently asked in a mid-term essay exam to explain the causes of the French revolution, the value of line breaks in T.S. Eliot's poems, the significance of Cretan labyrinths in Roman art, or the logarithmic spiral in biology and art. Description, summary, and narration are valuable skills, but the university wants analysis, and most descriptions of favorite places and memorable people don't help students develop this skill. The cognitive skills students need to succeed in college — the questioning, interpretation, synthesizing, critique and re-evaluation skills — must be strengthened. Because community colleges are great places for students who haven't followed the traditional path to university, community college teachers must focus on these essential cognitive skills if students are to succeed as they move on. My experience told me that Rose was right about how preparatory writing courses help or don't help students develop
cognitive skills. I also appreciated the fact Rose added a solution to his critique: a course of instruction that he felt would be beneficial.

By the end of WR 511, I had decided that "rhetoric and composition" would best prepare me for my teaching career. I had begun to learn about the composing process, taxonomies of rhetoric, and basic writing, and I had became familiar with the theories of scholars such as James Berlin, Mina Shaughnessy, Paolo Freire, and Peter Elbow — but I hadn't yet settled on Rose as the focus of my thesis.

I next encountered Rose's work two terms later in WR 595: Introduction to Literacy Issues. Reading Rose's Lives, a blurred genre work rich with implications, showed me how much I could learn from this author. Vignettes of Rose's childhood and his background, his own inadequate schooling, his luck in being rescued by mentors, and his subsequent travels through academia showed me how caring and inclusive he was, qualities particularly appealing to the non-traditional students who make up the majority of community college populations. I liked the way Rose offered autobiographical anecdotes to demonstrate larger issues. Here I first encountered critiques of educational systems that do not always serve our students well, particularly the marginalized, like Rose, those whose lives (like his) were/are at risk for exclusion (or lack of inclusion) in the mainstream of education. I admired his method of presenting ideas through detailed narrative case studies with their thick description and compassionate ethnography. I began to tell all my friends that Lives was essential reading for anyone teaching at a community college.

Lives moved, fascinated, and educated me. I wanted to learn more. I discovered, however, that while Rose has written many articles, a textbook, and
another book about learning, as well as editing and co-editing several anthologies, I didn't find the sort of biographical and career overview that would provide a key to entering his varied oeuvre. Even his UCLA faculty web page offered only a brief outline of Rose's research interests and a selected list of his works. Nowhere did I find what I wanted — a description of Rose's pedagogical agenda, a manifesto of his academic project. Therefore, this thesis is my attempt to provide an overview of his work and to evaluate its contribution to the discipline.

In trying to formulate this overview, I have come to the conclusion that *Lives* offers important insights into Rose's oeuvre. I have used *Lives* as my own entree into the history and context of both rhetoric and composition and education in general. This focus on *Lives* has helped me begin to understand the many complex issues in the field of rhetoric and composition, both for my coursework and for my teaching. Further, the way that *Lives* allows me to see the world of teaching from the inside, the way it portrays teaching as an embrace and an invitation, and the way Rose shows how teaching can embody compassion for individual students, will help me as I continue my teaching career. I am eager to begin the process.

* * * * *

As I move through this project, I am grateful for the help of Mike Rose himself, who has provided materials and information. I want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of my thesis director, Dr. Lisa Ede, whose knowledge of current composition theory and vision has helped me get my bearings and whose skillful and
patient direction has helped me pull together all the many varied parts of this thesis. I want to thank Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton for being the first person to recognize that my calling was to rhetoric and composition and for providing me with a rich introduction to the field. Her participation on this committee is so important to me. Because my minor is literature and culture and because Rose's work with underprepared students in both academic and non-academic environments merges so perfectly with the social context of education, I am pleased to have Dr. Anita Helle on my committee as well. Her work on mentoring – an essential component of Rose's career and philosophy, as well as of my own – has been extremely helpful. Finally, I want to thank my Graduate Council Representative Dr. Janet Nishihara for agreeing to serve on my committee. Her background in ethnic studies and her work with OSU's Educational Opportunities Program seems providentially aligned with Rose's oeuvre. I thank the entire committee for their dedication, patience, support, and encouragement in this endeavor. I truly could not do this without your help.
**Introduction: Mike Rose and the Challenge of Education**

The challenge that has always faced American education, that it has sometimes denied and sometimes doggedly pursued, is how to create both the social and cognitive means to enable a diverse citizenry to develop their ability. It is an astounding challenge: the complex and wrenching struggle to actualize the potential not only of the privileged but, too, of those who have lived here for a long time generating a culture outside the mainstream.

*Lives on the Boundary* 225

Mike Rose — researcher, professor, and author — has been active in the field of composition for over 30 years. His varied contributions to our understanding of learning have been warmly received with important awards and fellowships. His articles are frequently cited, and his best-selling literacy memoir *Lives on the Boundary* has inspired teachers since its publication in 1989. Looking back at the development of the discipline of composition studies — a retrospective both desirable and possible now with the passing of time — I see that Rose has played an important role in this process. Both his significant early work on cognitive writing process research and his later attention to the social-cognitive aspects of learning have been valuable.

In addition to contributing a number of important ideas, Rose's oeuvre has also provided a useful example both in terms of his varied research focus and in his innovative use of academic analysis within public discourse. In particular, the blurred genre writing style Rose has used demonstrates how public intellectuals can make academic arguments about subjects that are important not only in classrooms, but also in the culture.
Yet this picture of Rose's accomplishments and contributions leads to an interesting observation. Considering the awards his work has received and the frequency with which certain works are cited in other texts, surprisingly little scholarly consideration has been written analyzing Rose's oeuvre overall. In light of composition's current focus on socially constructed knowledge and community literacy, Rose's scholarly project deserves more attention. In this thesis I hope to contribute to the scholarly conversation on Rose that already exists and encourage further consideration of his contributions and how they connect to the important aspect of inclusion.

One way to characterize Rose's contributions is to note the extent to which much of his research focuses on the theme of inclusion. Although Rose has not proclaimed an agenda of inclusion, I am suggesting that inclusion can be seen as a theme that unifies his oeuvre. I believe that demonstrating this way of reading of Rose's oeuvre will make his contributions more readily accessible. In doing this, I do not intend to force a perfect match between my reading and his oeuvre but rather to suggest that this way of looking at his work is a valid and useful interpretation. I see the theme of inclusion as the warp that holds the various texts together. In addition, I see Lives as a central piece of Rose's oeuvre, a piece that is particularly useful when looking at ways in which inclusion connects Rose's teaching, research, and writing.

Before moving further to discuss how I see the theme of inclusion in Rose's oeuvre, I want to address what I mean by inclusion. While this overdetermined term is used to describe the mainstreaming of students in a wide range of situations, I notice that Rose focuses particularly on those students marginalized by socio-economic
status, especially first generation college students who are often underprepared for academic work and who may need extra help to stay in college. Given the reality of public education in the United States, a focus on inclusion necessarily draws attention to the many ways in which students have been excluded. In fact, Rose's early research more often focuses on aspects of exclusion and the consequent implications of those exclusions for individual students and for society. It is by studying these examples of exclusion that Rose's advocacy for inclusion becomes clear. Although Rose rarely uses the term inclusion, I hope to show that the concept of including marginalized students in academia not only runs throughout his oeuvre but also gives his work coherence.

Thus, I am suggesting that reading Rose's oeuvre as a text unified by a theme of inclusion helps scholars better to assess its contributions and also encourages and facilitates a more widespread application of those contributions. I believe that teachers and institutions facing the increasingly diverse classrooms of the twenty-first century will find in Rose's work valuable insights that address current dilemmas.

Rose's emphasis on inclusion questions America's democratic goals for education by asking how everyone can be educated. As the epigraph from Rose's Lives that opens this introduction points out, democracy requires that our schools find ways to give all citizens the education they need. The question of the relationship between education and democracy is perhaps even more urgent now than it was when Lives was published in 1989.

Before I explore how inclusion and exclusion are addressed in Rose's work, I will begin by providing some background in chapter one in order to situate Rose in the
context of composition studies. Next, in chapters two and three, I will consider Rose's research into learning and inclusion, and the implications of that inclusion. In doing this, I will suggest how this theme of inclusion leads to a unified reading of Rose's work. Chapter two will address inclusion and exclusion through Rose's early research on individual students. Then, chapter three will look at Rose's shift in the mid 1980s to a wider focus on inclusion and exclusion in the institutional setting. To complete my argument that inclusion can be read as the unifying theme in Rose's oeuvre, chapter four will look closely at *Lives* to show how it reveals and embodies inclusion in its content, research method, and writing style. Chapter four will also argue that the style Rose uses for *Lives*, which he employed as well in *Possible Lives* five years later, can serve as a useful model for others who wish to influence public opinion by addressing a general audience.

Since the publication of *Possible Lives* in 1995, Rose's more recent research has turned toward an investigation of the cognition needed, developed, and used in the manual and skilled trades. As I will explain in my conclusion, Rose's new work is presented in such articles as "Teaching Tools," "Our Hands Will Know," and "The Working Life of a Waitress." These essays and others like them will be available in Rose's forthcoming book *The Mind at Work: Valuing the Intelligence of the American Worker*, which questions the privileging of academic intelligences and challenges deep-seated societal assumptions about class status, education, and inclusion. This newer work looks beyond the traditional college classroom. Here, Rose continues to use narratives and interviews to question how people learn (or don't learn) and to ask how to facilitate that learning. While I believe that Rose's newer work grows out of
his scholarly project in inclusion, this thesis will focus primarily on the works up to
1995 that directly address social context and inclusion, particularly in the writing
classroom and educational institutions.

I will conclude my argument by summing up Rose's contributions to theory
and practice in rhetoric and composition. I hope that in contributing to the scholarly
conversation about Rose's oeuvre, I might stimulate investigation because what Rose
has to say about schools and students and society needs to be heard.

What Rose says throughout *Lives* is that every child must be given a fair
chance. For example, in the "Crossing Boundaries" chapter of *Lives*, Rose rejects calls
to reinstate a canonical program to combat school failure saying that it would become
"a limiting band of excellence that, ironically, could have a dispiriting effect on the
very thing the current proposals intend: the fostering of mass literacy" (237). Instead
of forcing a uniform education based on one cultural heritage as a panacea, Rose
advocates a richer and wiser conception of education that would meet all students
where they are:

The literacy curriculum is being asked to do what our politics and our economics have failed to do: diminish differences in achievement, narrow our gaps, bring us together. Instead of analysis of the complex web of causes of poor performance, we are offered a faith in the unifying power of a body of knowledge, whose infusion will bring the rich and the poor, the long time disaffected and the uprooted newcomers into cultural unanimity. If this vision is democratic, it is simplistically so, reductive, not an invitation for people truly to engage each other at the point where cultures and classes intersect. (237).

That is, Rose wants a more compassionate approach that would foster real education and real equality for all students. "At heart," he says, "we'll need a guiding set of principles that do not encourage us to retreat from, but move us closer to, an
understanding of the rich mix of speech and ritual and story that is America" (*Lives* 238). This is the embrace of inclusion that runs throughout Rose's oeuvre and the reading I want to emphasize.
Chapter 1: Mike Rose in the Context of Composition

I had to stand on the borders of a number of disciplines and study the way knowledge is structured in the academy and, as well, detail what it means [for a student] to be unprepared to participate in that disciplinary structure. 

Lives on the Boundary 187

In this chapter I will briefly situate Mike Rose's career against the background of composition studies from the late 1970s to the mid 1990s in order to show how Rose participated in this developing field. This will also provide a background for my analysis of Rose's inclusionary themes in chapters two and three. Before I do this, however, I want to provide readers with a sense of Rose's education and early teaching career. This is important, I feel, because Rose's research is so materially grounded in his own experiences.

With a BA from Loyola University in Los Angeles in the mid 1960s, Rose started graduate study in English at UCLA, but, according to the narrative of his education in Lives on the Boundary, he became increasingly disenchanted with literary studies. He took a year off to study psychology at UCLA, a move indicative of his lifelong interest in investigating meaning as well as understanding how people learn to think. After this year of study, however, Rose resigned his graduate fellowship at UCLA without finishing his masters program in English and entered the Teachers Corps, a Great Society program. In this program, Rose taught at impoverished elementary schools and earned a masters degree in education at the University of Southern California (USC). Lives' many detailed narratives drawn from these teaching experiences not only testify to Rose's developing perspective about the social
goals of education but also to his growing perceptions about the connections between students' personal lives, their classroom experiences, and current theories about education. These are the connections Rose would later analyze and articulate in *Lives*. When he finished his program at USC and the Teachers Corps, Rose was primed for his next step.

At the same time that Mina Shaughnessy, author of *Errors and Expectations*, and her East Coast colleagues were analyzing the influx of basic writers in open admissions in the early 1970s and developing ways to meet their educational needs, Rose was encountering similar students in UCLA's off-campus Veterans Special Education Program that prepared returning Vietnam veterans to enter college. To create a curriculum suited to these veterans, Rose undertook work similar to Shaughnessy's curriculum development, as he theorized how to teach composition and critical thinking to underprepared adults.

What Rose learned from his analysis of these students was reinforced by his other concurrent teaching experiences. Rose tutored in a community college writing center, taught English and humanities on an Air Force base (*Lives* 159), taught a "college preparation program for people in low-level law-enforcement jobs" (*Lives* 160) and even taught a poetry class by telephone conference call, an early version of distance education (*Lives* 161). As he notes in *Lives*, Rose valued this wide variety of non-traditional training for providing him with the kind of rich interdisciplinary course of study I couldn't find at UCLA, one that was grounded in my work, that fused mind and world. In higher education, there is a politically loaded distinction between "pure" and "applied" study. Pure study is elevated because it putatively involves the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake — mathematics and literature are good examples; applied study (engineering, medicine,
education), because it is situated in human affairs, is somehow tainted, is less – well – pure. What a bewildering distinction I would have thought. What a silly, bloodless dichotomy. (155)

Thus, Rose's observations from his varied teaching experiences led him to new perspectives as he studied his own students and used his results to improve his teaching. By doing this, he was combining pure and applied study. Because his research and teaching "fused mind and world," he resisted arbitrary divisions that would categorize his research as either pure or applied and that would privilege the pure over the applied. His many investigations into how people learn and the applications of his research in the classroom suggest how limiting such boundaries between pure and applied can be.

When UCLA invited Rose to run its Tutorial Center, Rose returned to the university setting, where he continued his investigations into how students learn (or do not learn) to write. The Tutorial Center was part of UCLA's Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) designed "to recruit and assist students from low-income and minority backgrounds" (Lives 164). EOPs such as the one at UCLA were being established at universities nationwide and were descendants of the SEEK program that Shaughnessy had worked with at City College in New York just prior to open admissions. Thus, Rose was working in a line of inquiry that other composition scholars were similarly investigating. Working at the Tutorial Center furthered Rose's transformation into a teacher-researcher, someone who derives ideas and theories about learning from his classroom observations. His efforts to "discover the reasons behind poor performance" led to his 1981 dissertation (in Educational Psychology) and to his early cognitively-grounded research on writer's block (Lives 170).
Before going on, I want to provide a brief overview of Rose's oeuvre to orient readers to the variety of research that Rose has engaged in. His work from 1980-1990 can be classified into two somewhat overlapping categories. In one of these lines of research, Rose investigated the ways that students are blocked in their writing and reading. This set of texts includes his 1980 article "Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block," his 1981 dissertation "The Cognitive Dimension of Writer's Block: An Examination of University Students" and subsequent 1984 monograph *Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension*, and the 1985 anthology he edited and contributed to – *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems*. Rose's collaborative research with Glynda Hull from 1988 to 1991 led to three prominent articles that extend this inquiry. In "Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing," "This Wooden Shack Place: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading," and "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse," Rose and Hull research individual students' writing blocks using cognitively-based research methods to investigate reading and writing practices and classroom discourse.

During this same decade from 1980 to 1990, Rose started a second, related, line of inquiry into the institutional exclusion of students based on their unskilled writing. Rose's work in this area begins with his 1979 article "When Faculty Talk about Writing," and includes such articles as his 1983 "Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal," his 1985 "The Language of Exclusion," and his 1988 "Narrowing the Mind and the Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism."
These two lines of research – the focus on cognitive writing difficulties of individual students and the focus on faculty members' and institutional attitudes toward remediation for under-performing writers – merged with the publication of *Lives on the Boundary* in 1989, where the themes of inclusion and exclusion on both the individual and institutional level became more clearly united.

During the following decade, from about 1990 to 2000, Rose turned toward a broader focus on education in society. He researched and wrote the 1995 book *Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America* about classrooms nationwide. He also continued writing guest essays advocating inclusion. Among these editorials are his 1991 article "Education Standards Must be Reclaimed for Democratic Ends" for *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and his 1997 piece "Saving Public Education," which was part of a collection of essays for *The Nation* that also featured commentary by other public intellectuals and scholars such as Jonathan Kozol and Lisa D. Delpit. In both "Education Standards Must be Reclaimed" and "Saving Public Education," Rose links public education to democracy. In doing this, Rose urges a greater societal commitment to inclusion and a greater awareness of the part that teachers play in this process. His call for "a commitment to public education ...that honors the work good teachers do daily and draws from it broader lessons about ability, learning and opportunity" emphasizes the role teachers play in encouraging and enabling students' inclusion not only in school but in society ("Saving" 21).

This brief overview of Rose's research in the 1980s and 1990s situates Rose's development as a teacher, researcher, and public intellectual. Given this background, I now want to look more closely at individual texts and connect them with the
concurrent work of other scholars in the rapidly developing field of composition studies. For example, Rose's cognitively-grounded research on writing blocks in the early 1980s relates to similar work by Linda Flower and John Hayes, whose 1981 essay "Cognitive Process Theory of Writing" drew on Janet Emig's ground-breaking 1971 *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. This focus by Rose, Flower and Hayes, and Emig, and others, on the cognitive aspect of student writing changed the way some scholars viewed the teaching of composition. Rose's dissertation and his cognitively grounded research played an important role in his scholarly project.

Rose's view of writing as a "highly complex problem-solving task [that]...can be examined with the tenets and models provided by cognitive psychology" and his assertions about the dynamic process of writing aligned him with his contemporary compositionists who advocated teaching writing as a process ("Teaching University Discourse" 89). In his 1981 "Teaching University Discourse," as well as in "Sophisticated, Ineffective Books – The Dismantling of Process in Composition Texts" of the same year, Rose asserts that while the growing literature about process acclaims "the highly complex, non-neatly sequential nature of the composing process," nevertheless many recent sophisticated textbooks start with lists, stages, and rules ("Sophisticated" 67). As Rose had argued the year before in "Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block," such rules and outlines often inhibit students more than help them.

In 1983, Rose again addressed the question of textbooks as a way to teach the process of writing. In "Speculations on Process Knowledge and the Textbook's Static Page," Rose warns that textbooks will not necessarily "become more effective as our
knowledge about composing increases" because of the complex nature of writing (208). What would work better than a textbook, claims Rose, is "a learning relationship between teacher and student that accounts for individual differences, the process of composing, and the demands of audience" ("Sophisticated" 70-71).

Rose did, later, coauthor a textbook based not only on beliefs about writing as a process but also on his theory of cognitive sequencing for critical thinking. This theory of cognitive sequencing relies on the gradual development of critical thinking skills building upon each other. Such a pedagogy helps all students — and especially the underprepared — acquire the analytical skills they need for inclusion in mainstream academia because the writing assignments are drawn from typical assignments in the disciplines.

Rose explains and elaborates on the materially grounded origins of his theory of cognitive sequence in several works. In the section of Lives devoted to the curriculum he invented for the Veterans Special Educational Program at UCLA, Rose describes how this classroom experience emphasized the effectiveness of leading his students through assignments in summarizing, classifying, comparing, and analyzing to develop their critical thinking (138). Though this work with the veterans took place in the 1970s, Rose's first publication emphasizing sequencing in the writing classroom appeared in 1981. That essay, "Teaching University Discourse," argues not only for teaching writing as a process but also for a pedagogy that develops certain cognitive skills in sequence. Rose bases his recommendations for teaching these skills on a university-wide study of typical assignments in various UCLA departments connected, perhaps, to his work on UCLA's interdisciplinary Writing Research Project. Thus,
"Teaching University Discourse" is an application of writing across the curriculum and includes a sample curriculum in an appendix. A similar progression of assignments – seriation, classification, and analysis – developed for the UCLA Freshman Preparatory Program out of Rose's work with the veterans is outlined in his 1983 "Remedial Writing Courses" (207-208).

Rose would ultimately embody his theory about teaching the writing process through cognitive sequencing in the textbook he coauthored with Malcolm Kiniry, one of his colleagues from the Veterans Program. The first edition of Critical Strategies for Academic Writing appeared in 1990, right after the publication of Lives, with reprints in 1993 and 1998 under the expanded title Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing (hereafter Critical Strategies).

While the field of rhetoric and composition claims critical thinking as one of the goals of the composition classroom, not all textbooks make such an obvious effort as Rose and Kiniry's text does to help students progress through cognitive sequencing to develop their analytical skills. The assignments in Critical Strategies not only sequence increasing levels of analysis, but also engage students with challenging and representative disciplinary material from departments across the curriculum.

As an example of how Rose and Kiniry craft their composition classes to embody their theories, I will briefly describe the third edition's first chapter. This chapter, which focuses on defining, opens with an excerpt from Howard Gardner's Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences, moves to a professional application with an excerpt from Daniel Goleman's Emotional Intelligence: When Smart is Dumb, and follows that with an excerpt from John R. Hayes and Linda S.
Flower's *Identifying the Organization of Writing Processes* (xv). The series of assignments that follows the readings focuses on language, word history, personal essay, biology, psychology, genetics, history, and ecology. By devising a curriculum based on their beliefs about how cognition develops, Rose and Kiniry contribute a practice that teachers can readily apply. This practice is particularly useful in community college classrooms where many students have not completed high school, and, therefore, might have missed critical thinking lessons. Rose and Kiniry's textbook suggests ways to teach thinking that can be especially helpful for these students.

By the mid 1980s, while Rose was developing his theory of teaching writing through cognitive sequencing, the cognitive approach to teaching the writing process was starting to draw the attention (and critique) of fellow scholars. James Berlin's "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories" (1982), Patricia Bizzell's "Cognition, Convention and Certainty: What We Need to Know about Writing" (1982), and Marilyn Cooper and Michael Holzman's "Talking About Protocols" (1983) each praised the useful insights of cognitive writing process research while pointing out its limitations. By 1985, Berlin's disciplinary history *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges 1900-1985* grouped Rose, along with more widely known scholars such as Andrea Lunsford and Mina Shaughnessy, among those interested in "theories of cognitive development [...] in describing composing" (186). As Berlin's comments suggest, by the mid-1980s Rose had entered the conversation. He was recognized as one of the authors currently defining the discipline of composition studies.
Thus, 1985 became a pivotal year for Rose, with Berlin's recognition and the publication of *When a Writer Can't Write*. Rose's own contribution to that volume—the concluding essay "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing Process Research"—shows Rose's movement towards what Berlin identified in *Rhetoric and Reality* as a social component in the teaching of writing. Notes Berlin,

> [t]hose applying cognitive strategies to writing behavior have also broadened the theoretical base of their study, some including a new interest in the social influence of learning and others expanding the range of psychological premises on which they rely. (186)

While Rose's name is not mentioned in this paragraph (nor in Berlin's subsequent briefer and more codified taxonomy in "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class"), Rose was one of those whose attention was moving from a narrow focus on the individual student's cognitive process to a broader look at the ways that students' social situations affected their school work. In his 1985 essay "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing Process Research," Rose points out the necessity of this wider focus, suggesting that because "no complex composing behavior is purely cognitive," a more useful research framework should be used (232). "One such powerful framework," he says, "would be the cognitive/affective/social-contextual trinity...[which] contains the traditional two domains of human mental reality and the social context that influences and is influenced by that reality" (232). That is, Rose claims that any research into students' cognition in the composition classroom should consider how their lives outside the classroom affect their ability to write.
At this point in his career, Rose was looking beyond the classroom to explore the relationship between social situation, emotions, cognition, and student success. Not only do students' home cultures and backgrounds affect their classroom cognition, so also do negative classroom experiences. Rose's recognition in Lives of the role that emotions and social situation play in students' cognition is noted in The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing. The entry for Lives characterizes the book's focus as attending to "the affective dissonances evoked by [students'] experiences of crossing boundaries into school from relatively marginalized social positions" (Bizzell, Herzberg, & Reynolds 154). In order to understand how to ensure the inclusion of marginalized students in the college composition classroom, Rose looked more deeply at social factors.

Rose's emphasis on the social situation of students led him to search for ways to "see beyond failure" to the varied reasons behind students' lack of success (Lives 170). For example, he reports in Lives on his tutoring work with a student named Suzette whose writing contained fragments. An interview with Suzette revealed that her grammar errors resulted from her attempts to write prose more sophisticated than she was currently capable of (171ff). That is, her errors were not due to a lack of intelligence or knowledge of grammar but to an effort to approximate academic writing, a style she hadn't mastered. By revealing how factors other than intelligence or cognitive abilities might contribute to a student's mistakes, Rose challenged faculty attitudes that pointed to unsuccessful writing as evidence of cognitive deficit and, therefore, as grounds for exclusion from academic studies.
Rose's study of Suzette presents the student side of remediation. The theoretical side of remediation he addresses in articles that call for a redefinition of the very concept of remediation. Rose's efforts to redefine remediation appeared in 1979 "When Faculty Talk About Writing," in 1985 "The Language of Exclusion," and in 1988 "Narrowing the Mind and the Page." As I will demonstrate in chapter three, these articles blend a critique of institutional perspectives with insights into student experience. By doing this, Rose demonstrates the cognition behind performance as well as the cognitive and social consequences of institutional decisions. "Narrowing the Mind and the Page," for example, addresses several prominent theories about cognitive processing that Rose says have been extrapolated problematically to explain poor writing as caused by various kinds of cognitive deficiencies. These theories include field dependence, Jean Piaget's theories on how logical thought develops, and orality-literacy theories that "suggest that the thinking of some minority groups might be affected by the degree to which their culture has moved from oral to literate modes of behavior" (23). When such theories are applied to suggest "that unsuccessful writers think in fundamentally different ways from successful writers," Rose says that this leads to troublesome implications because "[s]ocial and political hierarchies end up encoded in sweeping cognitive dichotomies" (23-4). In arguing against such limiting taxonomies, Rose wants a more humane and helpful assessment of writing problems.

Another essay addresses problematic attitudes toward the cognitive abilities of remedial students through a case study. In "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse," coauthored by Rose with
Glynda Hull, Kay Loser Fraser, and Marisa Castellano (1991), the authors situate a detailed analysis of student-teacher interaction in the context of historical assumptions about remediation and cognitive ability. As I will suggest in the next chapter, this article documents how teacher (mis)judgments about a student's contributions can lead to the student's sense of exclusion. In this case, as in the case of Suzette, the tutorial student in Lives who was writing fragments, Rose points out how cognitive reductionism leads to mistaken assumptions.

By demonstrating the "logic of error" behind Suzette's fragments and his methods of deducing her underlying reasons, Rose connects his research with Shaughnessy's contributions, going so far in Lives as to mention her work and the "institutional expectations that students face and the way they interpret and internalize them" (171-2). By making explicit the way students try to meet educational expectations, Rose reminds readers how students' cognition and their ability to learn is affected by their social situations.

Rose's increased focus on the social aspects of students' cognition coincides with a time when he expanded his research beyond the UCLA campus. In 1986, he spent a year as a visiting professor teaching an introductory course in literacy studies to graduate students at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh (home of Linda Flower and the future site of her service learning community literacy projects). During that year, Rose met with Eugene Kintgen, who taught a similar course at Indiana University, and they combined their reading lists. Working with Barry Kroll, also of Indiana University, the three scholars co-edited an anthology addressing literacy in various social aspects. The resulting volume, Perspectives on Literacy
(1988), is a collection of essays by such scholars as Walter Ong, Eric Havelock, Harvey Graff and Sylvia Scribner among others. The editors state their aim is "to provide the requisite background for informed and intelligent discussion of the many issues surrounding the question of literacy today" (xi). The anthology also reprints David Bartholomae's essay "Inventing the University" which Rose has first published in *When a Writer Can't Write*. In 2001, this literacy anthology was updated and republished as *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*, attesting to its continued usefulness to the field.

It is easy to see connections between *Lives* and Rose's work on this first literacy anthology, projects he worked on simultaneously. In several places, *Lives* includes background material about literacy and education in America to help readers understand his arguments. For example, the first chapter of *Lives* discusses literacy concerns in the 19th century, including faculty distress about the poor writing of Harvard graduates and the resulting 1896 article on "The Growing Illiteracy of American Boys." By including this material in *Lives*, Rose shows his readers that public concerns about a literacy crisis are not new (5). Another connection between the anthology and *Lives* can be seen by comparing themes that appear in both volumes. For example, John U. Ogbu's essay "Literacy in Subordinate Cultures" in *Perspectives on Literacy*, which addresses "the educational experiences of blacks and other subordinate minorities in the United States (e.g. Chicanos, Indians)" (231) shares concerns with the way that Rose in *Lives* contrasts the educational experiences of "males from the upper crust" with the experiences of "[w]omen, immigrants, children of the working class, blacks, and Latinos" (6). Likewise, Rose addresses throughout
Lives questions of the many varied social consequences of literacy as addressed in the anthology through essays by Harvey Graff, Paulo Freire, and Carl F. Kaestle's. More specifically, Lives focuses on "cognitive consequences of literacy" a section in Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole's anthology essay "Unpackaging Literacy." And the anthology reprints David Bartholomae's "Inventing the University" which Rose first printed in When Writers Can't Write. Thus, both books address similar themes of literacy, education, cognition, and social situations of students. While these thematic connections between Lives and Perspectives on Literacy are not surprising, I suspect that Rose's work on the anthology and his focus on academic inquiries into the "literacy crisis" likely influenced the way he presented the issue of literacy – its history and consequences – for a general audience reading Lives.

This time Rose spent in Pittsburgh had further implications beyond its effect on Lives. For one thing, Pittsburgh is the site of Rose's first collaborative research with Glynda Hull. Here they studied the cognitive challenges of a community college student struggling to grasp academic writing. The first documentation of Rose and Hull's research was a presentation at the Modern Language Association (MLA)'s Right to Literacy Conference. That presentation – "Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing" – was revised and published in Written Communication in April 1989 as "Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing." At the time of this publication, Rose and Hull were working on another article, this one with Kay Losey Fraser and Marisa Garrett (later Castellano). These authors presented their work entitled "The Social Construction of Remediation" at the Tenth Annual Ethnography
in Education Forum at the University of Pennsylvania in February, 1989. Thus, about the same time that *Lives* was published, Rose was collaborating on important new research deeply centered in the field of literacy studies and rhetoric and composition.

Rose would continue to collaborate with Hull on the 1990 essay "This Wooden Shack Place: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading," which won the 1991 Braddock Award from the Conference on College Composition and Communication. The following year Hull and Rose (along with Fraser and Castellano) won another Braddock award for their coauthored essay "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse," drawn from their collaborative presentation at the Ethnography in Education Forum. In these collaborations, Rose and his coauthors investigate individual students and consider how social situation affects their classroom ability.

In *Lives*, Rose often uses this same approach of focusing on individual examples to investigate broader issues of teaching and learning. One example from *Lives* is an extended narrative of his interview with Millie, an urban adult trying to pass her GED. In a move typical of Rose, he shifts from being an observer to becoming a participant. As Millie struggles with the practice GED test questions, Rose steps in to show her how "the test maker's trap" has fooled her into picking the wrong word to match a prefix (217). One test example gave the word *unhappy* and asked the test-taker to match the underlined part of the word with *very*, *glad*, *sad*, or *not*. By demonstrating "the complete foreignness of the task[s]" in these national standardized tests and by pointing out that "[n]owhere in their daily reading are these students required to focus on parts of words in this way," Rose undermines the
credibility of these tests as accurate representations of students' lack of intelligence and demonstrates why the tests can be discriminatory and exclusionary when used as entrance requirements for jobs and school (217).

Making this turn from cognitively-based research into students' writing process to a broader consideration of students' social situations linked Rose with concurrent work by other prominent composition scholars. In 1989, Flower was moving in the same social cognitive direction, as shown by her essay "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning" coauthored with Christina Haas, which won the Braddock Award in 1989. When the article was reprinted in a collection of Braddock winners, Flower and Haas characterize the essay as "an early step in Linda's work toward an expanded social/cognitive account of writing . . . following writers into the process of constructing negotiated meaning" (258). Given the increasingly social focus of many composition scholars in the late 1980s, the two consecutive Braddock awards won by Rose and his collaborators recognize not only the value of their work but also validate the directions of their inquiry. This direction was not only considering the students' cognition but also the questions of negotiated meaning in the interaction of student and teacher, areas of growing concern to composition scholars who hoped to bring social construction theories to the study and teaching of writing.

Because the terms social cognitive and social construction might sound similar, I want to pause here to discuss them. Social cognition refers to a general approach to the thinking about writing and the teaching of writing that was influenced first by cognitive research on writing and later modified in response to criticisms that a sole focus on cognition ignores important social aspects of writing. Carol Berkenkotter's
1991 essay "Paradigm Debates, Turf Wars, and the Conduct of Sociocognitive Inquiry in Composition" offers this explanation:

By sociocognitive research, I mean research that looks at the complex relationship among language use (in cultures and communities), the development of knowledge structures (schemata) on which language use depends, and the situated, indexical character of schemata. (159)

This connection between language use in students' cultures and the way students develop schemata for using language relates to the way Rose and Hull use the adjective social-cognitive in their article "Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing." In this text, the term relates to "how human beings continually appropriate each other's language to establish group membership, to grow, and to define themselves in new ways" (139).

In their research, a student copies directly from the text in an effort to appropriate the discourse she aspires to. While more sophisticated students would recognize this as plagiarism, some students may be cognitively and socially underprepared to recognize this behavior as problematic. This sort of research intertwining cognition and writing ability was prevalent in the 1980s but became less common as the field of composition studies began to focus on social aspects of knowledge. With its focus on social cognitive aspects of writing, this essay by Rose and Hull seems to bridge the two interests.

The term social construction, on the other hand, refers broadly to a loosely defined and increasingly held theory of the way that discourse communities agree on what constitutes knowledge. As defined by Cynthia Haynes in *Keywords in Composition Studies*, "the interpretive turn in composition to social construction represents a new paradigm for understanding how meaning is made, how knowledge is
constructed, and how the self is constructed" (221). For Rose and Hull, their Braddock Award-winning essay "Remediation as Social Construct" addresses two aspects of social construction. One aspect of social construction deals with the way that interactions between teacher and student do or do not lead to the construction of new knowledge. In their detailed analyses of classroom conversations, Rose and his coauthors point out several occasions in which the student Maria's spontaneous interjections in the classroom discussion are discounted by the teacher, effectively excluding the girl. Due to the teacher's expectations about the way that remedial students should wait for an invitation to speak, "Maria's moment for contributing a piece of knowledge is lost, and so is the opportunity for the class to consider an important issue [that Maria was raising]" (294). The authors assert that talk is the way "that learning gets done, that knowledge gets made" in the discourse community of the classroom (303). So when the teacher silences Maria, socially constructed knowledge is lost. This is one way that the term is used in this essay.

Another way that "Remediation as Social Construct" uses the concept of social construction is in its presentation of the assumptions educators make about the connections between language use and cognitive ability. When teachers interpret the ways some students speak as indicative of lower intelligence and thus as indications for the need for remediation, such assumptions amount to a socially constructed belief by educators about remediation. In this case, the discourse community coming to an understanding of a concept is composed of faculty and administrators discussing remediation. Thus, the term social construct in the title refers to how ideas are understood in various discourse communities, in this case, the way educators conceive
of remediation. The way that Rose and his collaborators use this term is similar to the ways that other scholars were then investigating and theorizing about how composition classrooms could or should be structured around a socially-constructed epistemology.

Rose's changes in research interests and methodology from a narrower cognitively based focus on individuals to a broader focus on social situations are typical of the way that disciplines rarely follow a uniform linearity. The retrospective "Afterword" that follows the reprint of "Remediation as Social Construct" in On Writing Research: The Braddock Essays 1975-1998 notes how interests in a field can change:

Research that considered problem solving strategies and the 'logic' of seemingly illogical writing behaviors was highly valued" [until the field of composition studies shifted its focus toward] "the social and interactive aspects of writing, due in part to context-dependent activity. (310-311)

Likewise, Hull and Rose again note this changed interest for scholars in their field in their retrospective "Afterword" to the reprint of their other Braddock Award-winning essay, "This Wooden Shack Place," pointing out the "significant shift in composition studies toward social and political analysis, providing much-needed awareness of the broad contexts that inform writing and writing instruction" (282). In saying this, Rose and Hull identify the changes in the field of composition studies and the ways that they were participating by contributing new material.

These scholarly articles that Rose authored and coauthored for academic journals during the 1980s and early 1990s were not the only place that Rose was pursuing his interests. Addressing similar educational and social concerns are Rose's
Lives on the Boundary and Possible Lives, both of which focus on classroom observations, students' cognition and exclusion, historical context, institutional attitudes, and public policy. Written for a general audience, both Lives and Possible Lives received enthusiastic reviews in academic journals (Harris and Trimmer in College English; Royster and Spellmeyer in College Composition and Communication; Spaeth in College Teaching).

As I noted earlier, Lives on the Boundary looks at the exclusionary experiences of underprepared students entering college, set against the background of Rose's own experiences as a student and teacher. By contrast, Possible Lives, which I see as a kind of sequel to Lives, describes exemplary teaching in public primary and secondary classrooms that prepares students for success and inclusion when they move on to college. In Possible Lives, Rose's research as classroom observer as well as his experiences as a participant are presented in a pattern of narrative structure followed by commentary and analysis that is not dissimilar from the pattern he uses in Lives. Further, both books have a similar purpose and tone as they argue for educational fairness. I will discuss both books more fully in chapter four.

Rose's arguments in both Lives and Possible Lives about the importance of an inclusive approach to education have been supplemented by the opinion pieces mentioned earlier in The Chronicle of Higher Education and The Nation, as well as guest editorials in the Los Angeles Times. Rose's skill at blending academic analysis and public discourse in these texts has been recognized by Bruce Herzberg as particularly significant because "public policy follows popular, not academic opinion" (467). In demonstrating how and why to blend academic analysis into public
discourse, Rose's *Lives* predates by 17 years the call made by Lester Faigley at the Conference for College Composition and Communication (CCCC) for "writing teachers and academics to enter public discourse... to engage the serious questions of public policy" (Herzberg 466). It is ironic that Rose's public discourse, which is less often cited in academic articles, should in fact be such an important contribution and model. I will return to this argument about the effectiveness of Rose's public discourse style in chapter four with my close reading of *Lives*.

Despite the acclaim he has received over the years for all of the above-mentioned texts, Rose's oeuvre has not received much critical attention in articles, books, or dissertations. Such attention is, of course, one of the ways that scholarship builds reputations. A consideration of other scholars' reputations can clarify this point. Many important 20th century scholars in composition and education have instantly identifiable oeuvres, a fact that encourages and facilitates their utilization by the field. Mention the name of Paolo Freire, and most academics, scholars, and teachers will identify his project in literacy and social justice in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, though his contributions to the field certainly cover far more territory. Mention the name of Mina Shaughnessy, and most will identify her in terms of her landmark research on basic writers in *Errors and Expectations*, which redefined our understanding of the challenges and opportunities for teaching non-traditional adult students. Mention the name of James Berlin, and many will identify him in terms of his significant taxonomy of composition theories in the 20th century set out in his articles and book. Berlin's framework helps us study competing approaches to the teaching of composition and continues to be useful in terms of defining composition
studies as an academically respected field of research, even as the taxonomy itself comes under question. Berlin has also contributed a great deal more to the field, but for many, the taxonomy and his history of writing instruction stand out as a symbol of his scholarly project. These are figures in the field of composition whose work is readily identifiable, whose projects are readily articulated, and whose legacies are already being evaluated and documented. Such texts as Moacir Gadotti's *Reading Paulo Freire: His Life and Work*, Min-zhan Lu's "Redefining the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy" and Jane Maher's *Mina P. Shaughnessy: Her Life and Work*, and Michelle Sidler and Richard Morris's article "Writing in a Post-Berlinian Landscape: Cultural Composition in the Classroom" show how the contributions of Freire, Shaughnessy and Berlin are being assessed.

While the careers of Shaughnessy, Freire, and Berlin are receiving attention, where is the corresponding work on Rose? One of the few texts addressing Rose is Julie Hagemann's dissertation, ""Worthy Co-Workers in an Inclusionary Pedagogy': David Bartholomae, Patricia Bizzell, and Mike Rose" (1995). Here, Hagemann notes that Rose is not much written about and "seldom cited in histories of the field" (12-13). It seems ironic that Rose, whose work champions inclusion in academia for those on boundaries, might himself find his own boundary-crossing oeuvre less visible in academic literature despite the recognition that his work has received.

In raising this issue, I want to point out that Rose rarely participates in the sort of scholarly dialogues that help define the discipline. For example, Bizzell evaluates the work of Flower and Hayes in "Cognition, Convention, Certainty." With Bruce Herzberg, Bizzell critiques the literary criticism approach of E.D. Hirsch in "'Inherent'
Ideology, 'Universal' History, 'Empirical' Evidence, and 'Context-Free' Writing: Some Problems in E. D. Hirsch's The Philosophy of Composition." Bizzell also addresses the work of Paulo Freire in her essay "Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness: An Application of Paulo Freire." Thus for Bizzell, publishing analyses of fellow composition scholars has been one way that she has contributed to the scholarly conversation.

By contrast with Bizzell, Rose has contributed a number of academic articles to the scholarly conversation in composition studies, yet he has chosen not to critique the work of fellow scholars. Even in critiquing current composition textbooks, for example, Rose concentrates on the ideas rather than on specific titles and authors, as Bizzell did in her essay "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty." Unlike Bizzell's textbook critiques, Rose's articles — "Sophisticated, Ineffective Books: the Dismantling of Process in Composition Texts" and "Speculations on Process Knowledge and the Textbook's Static Page" — focus on his argument that the writing process is too dynamic to be taught from a textbook outline rather than on criticizing scholars or naming names.

One exception to Rose's pattern of not directly encountering fellow scholars might be his response to Richard Rorty's keynote speech "Education, Socialization, and Individuation" at the American Association of Colleges' (AAC) 1989 Annual Meeting. As one of nine academics responding to Rorty in the AAC's journal Liberal Education, Rose attacks Rorty's ideas about disregarding the teaching of critical thinking skills until college because such a plan would deprive the many students who do not attend college of the benefits of this level of thinking.
In responding to Rorty's speech, Rose takes on the role of public intellectual in the realm of education, joining the ranks of other public intellectuals such as Richard Rodriguez, bell hooks, and Jonathan Kozol. It seems no coincidence that this response to Rorty came in 1989, the same year that Rose published *Lives*, because both texts add to the public discourse about education. Further, in putting his theories into public debate, Rose was in a position to be interviewed by Bill Moyers for his series "A World of Ideas: Public Opinions from Private Citizens" for Public Television (Tucher). Rose's path, then, has differed somewhat from that of other academics such as Bizzell or Bartholomae.

These differences in approach to scholarly and public debate have created for Rose a different kind of scholarly reputation. These differences might also explain why Rose's oeuvre does not seem to lend itself to a unified scholarly critique. Thus, while Bizzell, Bartholomae and Rose have each made important contributions to the field of composition studies, Bizzell and Bartholomae may have attracted attention in ways that have built more noticeable scholarly reputations.

In a telephone interview with me, Rose suggested another factor that has affected his name-recognition among scholars – the nature of his theorizing. Theorizing and creating theory, says Rose, have become "the coin of the realm in academic circles" in recent years (Rose). Yet his theorizing is presented in a less traditional or academic manner, which makes it less visible. He explains that his approach is not traditionally academic:

I tend to not work that way, and so you take a book like *Lives on the Boundary* or *Possible Lives*, say, and it's so interesting how many people love that book but [the books] never appear in people's bibliography. Say somebody's writing about social class and
composition and [they] quote Henry Giroux who writes about political theory, yet they won't quote from Lives and why is that? One reason is that [Lives] is not a specially theorizing book; [it] does not enter the academic conversation with the specific theorizing moves that academic conversations tend to be based on – and yet the reviews – maybe David Bartholomae [was one who pointed out] the way the theorizing is embedded in the narrative. [Lives] doesn't foreground the theory and doesn't put neon lights around it. [And this lack of foregrounding] wouldn't affect the practitioner folks, but it would affect whether Lives gets cited in some articles in CCC [for example] about social class and composition. (Rose)

Here Rose confirms what Lives reveals. His theorizing – the way knowledge is built in the academy through analysis and synthesis – is not expressly brought forward in Lives, but rather is implicit. Rose lets the stories, students, and studies build his case for him. This method of embedding implicit academic argument in public discourse is exactly what Herzberg has praised, noting that this model of theorizing via public discourse has not been widely adopted by scholars. Given the social turn that rhetoric and composition studies have taken since the late 1980s and the extent to which many scholars in the field have expanded their goals beyond just helping students write better to helping students become agents of change, it is ironic that few have followed Rose's lead.

Another complication in terms of theorizing is that the field has shifted away from valuing the cognitively based research that Rose and his coauthors carried out in the 1980s. In recent years, composition studies has focused more on social context and political analysis. Now the most highly valued kind of research employs a different kind of theorizing, one that is more distant from specific students' texts and experience and more closely involved with the interpretation of other theorists' work. In the retrospective Afterword to "This Wooden Shack Place," Rose and Hull address
the idea of "theory wars" and call for ways to move "beyond the current 'theory' vs. 'empiricism' divide and into generative paradox" (283). Characterizing these differences in theorizing styles suggests ways that Rose and Hull see a need for the field to take a broader perspective on ways of theorizing. In attempting to bridge these differences in theoretical approach, Rose and Hull ask, "What might a critical empiricism look like? Is data-driven post-post-structuralist theory possible?" (283). This analysis of the changing trends in theorizing styles combined with the public discourse style of Lives helps clarify the background for Rose's comment to me about why Lives might not be cited as often in scholarly literature even though most scholars in rhetoric and composition have read Lives.

By briefly overviewing Rose's oeuvre in this introduction, then, I have attempted to situate Rose in composition studies so that as I move on to discuss his individual works their context will be clear. The next chapters will begin to demonstrate how I compose a reading of his oeuvre based on a unifying theme on inclusion. In order to do that, I will consider specific instances of inclusion in his work. The next chapter will address Rose's earlier research, which focuses on individual students, while chapter three will investigate his shift to a larger focus on issues of inclusion in the institution.
Chapter Two: Inclusion for the Individual

They had to be let into the academic club. 
Lives on the Boundary 141

Teachers who welcome students on the first day of school send a powerful message about inclusion. Yet getting students physically inside the classroom is just the start of including them in society's powerful literacy club. Students need more than an open door to engage them in the learning process. As Lynn Quitman Troyka, who teaches in an open admissions institution, puts it, "Students have been given access to admission; now they need access to learning" ("Defining" 12). Too often in too many ways some students are left out or left behind. When students are excluded accidentally or intentionally, even "for their own good," the implications are significant both for the individual and for the community.

Because the implications of inclusion and exclusion are so significant, this chapter considers ways that Mike Rose has addressed inclusion. Although Rose has not published a specific agenda for inclusion, his varied research on how people learn and the situatedness of that learning can be seen as arising from a deep commitment to inclusion. This commitment connects with a belief that inclusion in society comes in large part from inclusion in education. Yet it is clear to me that a focus on inclusion necessitates a focus on exclusion, since the terms define each other. And in fact, much of Rose's early research addresses particular cases — and causes — of exclusion. Therefore, the next two chapters will consider Rose's both scholarly works and his
public discourse in relation to exclusion and inclusion. In so doing, I will show how
inclusion underlies Rose's work and how it unifies his oeuvre.

The theme of inclusion versus exclusion pervades Rose's articles, books,
editorials, and interviews as he investigates ways that students are brought in or shut
out. Rose doesn't limit his research to traditional college freshmen but investigates
students from grade school to graduate school. In researching for *Possible Lives: The
Promise of Public Education in America*, Rose traveled all over America visiting
primary and secondary classrooms in search of inspirational and inclusionary teaching
practices. He doesn't limit his research to the teaching of English composition or the
acquisition of academic literacy, either, but includes an algebra project in Mississippi,
a local history project in Kentucky, and much more. He doesn't even limit his
research to traditional curricula, but studies an autistic boy being mainstreamed in a
special preschool for *Possible Lives* as well as dropout teens learning plumbing for
"Teaching Tools." Rose not only studies specific student-classroom situations but also
addresses general concepts in education.

Rose's research and writing range from a micro level analysis investigating
individual student-teacher interactions to macro level research on education and
society. Using examples from *Lives on the Boundary*, *Possible Lives*, and from Rose's
more scholarly work, this chapter will focus on issues of individual inclusion in Rose's
oeuvre. The following chapter will then turn to Rose's macro focus and consider
examples in his books and articles that address inclusion on a broader, institutional
scale. To some degree this micro-macro distinction is reflected in the chronology of
Rose's oeuvre. Although there is some overlap, in general Rose's individual micro
analysis research connects to his early cognitive work while the macro focus on inclusion at the institutional level correlates with his broader social perspective in the mid 1980s.

In both cases, however, Rose presents his ideas through specific examples of inclusion and exclusion along with analysis to make his argument. In addition to drawing on Rose's own experience as a student, Lives also provides many narratives of students Rose worked with or observed. For example, in Lives Rose tells about Harold, the fifth grader whose teachers increasingly (and incorrectly) label him as developmentally disabled. In Possible Lives, Rose describes what happens to Michelle, the Native American girl whose cultural heritage was discounted by her teacher. Rose's collaborative academic research with Glynda Hull presents the case of Robert, the Jamaican boy whose interpretation of a poem in a remedial reading class was problematic because it did not match traditional English department assumptions. Rose and Hull with Kay Losey Fraser and Marissa Castellano research Maria, a bright student whose lively participation in a developmental writing classroom led to a diagnosis of cognitive deficiency by her teacher who misinterpreted Maria's patterns of interaction. Maria internalized her teacher's negative judgments about her ability and downscaled her educational plans. In each of these studies, Rose documents exclusion.

Exclusion from education can be explicit or subtle. Throughout America's history students have been explicitly excluded from classrooms on the basis of race, class, ethnicity, gender, or judgments about their mental ability. Not so long ago, Mike Rose himself, a white male child of Italian working-class parents, would have
been excluded. In fact, due to clerical errors, Rose was mistakenly placed in his parochial high school's vocational track before a teacher noticed Rose's ability, checked the misfiled test scores, and switched him to college prep. As Rose tells Bill Moyers in an interview for Public Television, his experience of exclusion from academia was far from unique. "What's interesting [...] about that experience is not that an unusual thing happened, but that it shows how arbitrary placement in 'fast track' and 'slow track' can be" says Rose (Tucher 219).

Neither he nor his parents even considered questioning the school's decision to exclude Rose from the college prep track, the track that leads to academic success (Tucher 220). Because Rose was a first generation high school student, his parents had no experience to draw on. Recalls Rose,

my father got through second grade in Italy. What would he know about tracking, different curricula, all that! My mother was an exhausted waitress. Where would they get the confidence to go and even question a school about these things? (Tucher 220).

His parents' reaction leads Rose to generalize about how other families might have likewise accepted their children's exclusions: "[F]or parents who are not socialized into that whole way of thinking about education, it's very easy not to realize that something is amiss" (Tucher 220). Thus, Rose points out that social criticism of parents for not sufficiently directing their children's schooling may be unfair.

Just as Rose and his parents accepted the school's judgment about Rose's lack of ability, so, too, did Rose's fellow students in the vocational education program. As Rose describes in Lives, instead of working to their best potential, the Voc. Ed.
students believed the school's low expectations of their ability and "floated to the mark that was set" (26). This proves to Rose how labels of deficit can be self-fulfilling.

Luckily, however, Rose was rescued. In an unusual move, he was switched from Voc. Ed to the school's upper level academic track. He was further included in society's "literacy club" by being invited into informal mentoring by his high school English teacher, Jack MacFarland. With this extra help, Rose went to college and ultimately became a UCLA professor, researcher, and author. But few students are as lucky as Rose was. In Lives, Rose demonstrates numerous ways that students are excluded.

One particularly poignant case of exclusion in Lives is the story of Harold Morton, a fifth grade student Rose taught during his Teachers Corps years. When Rose first met Harold, the boy was still in a regular mainstream classroom, though his learning was constricted by a system that was inadequate to meet his complex psychological and educational needs. Harold's difficulties with reading and writing had been variously misdiagnosed as medical, psychological, or neurological. Successive teachers had recorded increasingly gloomy assessments in Harold's file referring him elsewhere, saying, in effect, "No, no, not us" (125). As a consequence, Harold was "being considered for other placement" – that is, a class for mentally retarded children – a move Rose would consider exclusionary. Says Rose, "What interested me was the way the teacher's assessment reduced Harold to a child without any ability to read or write" (123). Harold was reduced to an abstract definition in an effort to compartmentalize him. As Rose thought about the case, he realized that "[t]he diagnosis revealed more about a teacher's need to reduce the complexity of
troubling behavior than it did about the nature of Harold's difficulty with written language" (126). Harold was systematically being excluded by a system that was not equipped to reach out. By the time Rose worked with Harold at an impoverished public school in South Los Angeles, the boy was nearly silent. With patient attention, Rose drew out Harold, improving the boy's reading and writing skills, though he couldn't undo most of the damage, nor could he stay with Harold to ensure his future. Rose's indictment of the potential of the well-meaning system for error is poignant but inescapable:

[Harold's] past was being replaced by a sterile chronicle of assessments that couldn't get to the living center of the problem: the lost father, the mother receding slowly into a dim parlor, the growing weight of the assumption of his feeblemindedness. Harold was made stupid by his longing, and his folder full of tests could never reveal that. (127)

Studying students such as Harold convinced Rose that education must be more than an open door; it must be an invitation, an embrace so that students at the edges of academia, those who are underprivileged and underprepared – often marginalized also due to ethnicity, class, and gender – get extra help to ensure their inclusion in academic success. This extra help can take the form of mentoring or remediation or both, two issues this thesis will explore later.

As Rose demonstrates, exclusion has many faces. Students are excluded for a variety of reasons. Some are excluded by being labeled deficient – slow learners – when they don't match mainstream expectations. Others are excluded when their language doesn't match the academic discourse expected. Students are excluded because of their heritage or social status. Often this exclusion is unconscious or unintended, such as the way Maria's teacher judged her behavior. Other times,
exclusion might be well intended, such as a decision to move Harold to a "more suitable classroom." For Harold, however, inclusion meant staying in his regular classroom and not being sent away to special education classes. A quite different case of exclusion involved Michelle, for whom inclusion meant being accepted as Native American by her teacher.

Rose first met Michelle Taigue, a Native American high school teacher in Tucson, during his classroom research for *Possible Lives*. In that book, he includes Michelle's story of how her elementary school experiences nearly pushed her out of academia:

> It seems that when she told one of her teachers that she came from the talking tree – an old Yaqui creation story – the teacher thought something might be wrong with her and recommended placement in a special education class. That recommendation, fortunately, never came to pass. (378)

Teachers who fail to recognize the role that a student's background may play in their education can make costly mistakes about a student's cognitive ability. Michelle's identification with her heritage, a heritage unfamiliar to her Anglo teacher, nearly caused the teacher to exclude Michelle from a mainstream classroom, a move that could have had serious consequences. Michelle told Rose that after being rejected over the Yaqui talking tree story, she discovered Greek mythology and made another attempt to connect her background with mainstream culture:

> Excited, she took the book to her teacher. Her teacher complimented her on her reading and explained that these myths came from one of the great periods of our civilization. Yes, Michelle said, they're just like me, just like the [Yaqui] stories I told you. "No," the teacher replied – as Michelle remember it, the teacher had an odd expression on her face – "no, that's very different." (*Possible Lives* 378)
The teacher's rejection of Michelle's cultural heritage was congruent with a former official American government policy of forcing Native Americans to assimilate into the dominant White society. In privileging the traditional canon, the teacher's behavior had the effect of nearly denying Michelle membership in the elite literacy club. Now that she is a high school teacher, Michelle Taigue works to minimize exclusion as she prepares her Navajo and Hopi students for college.

Being in the right classroom and having sympathetic teachers might still not be enough to ensure a student's inclusion. For Rose, the move into the college prep track during his junior year of high school was provisional upon his ability to keep up and do the work. Abruptly included with the elite students, Rose might still have been shut out of academia because, as he notes in Lives, "[s]uch a shift is virtually impossible. Kids at that level rarely cross tracks" (30). While Rose did manage to pass his courses and stay in the college prep program, most students who are suddenly given a chance to move up cannot adjust quickly enough. Those who have missed out on years of core knowledge and training in the kind of critical thinking skills needed for college prep classrooms find that making up what they haven't learned is an almost overwhelming task.

Complicating this situation is the fact that for many students the experience of constant failure, along with the resulting deficit labeling, affects their beliefs in their own ability and, therefore, their ability to succeed. Lower-tracked students, having failed so often, cannot always rise to meet the new challenges. As Rose observes in Lives, "given the troubling histories many of these students have, it's miraculous that any of them can lift the shroud of hopelessness sufficiently to make deliverance from
these classes possible" (31). In saying this, Rose points to the role that emotion plays in cognition and performance. During his years in Voc Ed. classes, Rose and his classmates aspired to just be "average" in order to defend themselves from society's belief in their inadequacy, its obvious exclusion from the upper level tracks that lead to success in society. Students in the Voc. Ed. Track know that they are "placed in a curriculum that isn't designed to liberate [them] but to occupy [them], or, if [they're] lucky, train [them], though the training is for work the society does not esteem" (*Lives* 28). In other words, the Voc. Ed. kids knew that they were not taught skills and knowledge that would allow them to participate in the benefits of society. They were excluded from education as well as from upward mobility.

Lower-tracked students are not the only ones excluded, as Rose discovered. Sometimes, even formerly successful high school students who enter college find their continued inclusion suddenly at risk. In *Lives*, Rose documents some first year UCLA students facing the same cognitive challenges and the same fears he had when moving into college prep. One of the students lamented that college is "'asking me to do things I don't know how to do . . . and [I] wonder if I'm gonna make it" (4). The student concluded, in a self-excluding way, "We don't belong at UCLA, do we?" (4). This reaction is similar to Rose's own high school experience.

This sense of self-exclusion can also arise from class differences. As a student from a working class background, Rose noticed that most of his classmates at Loyola came from the middle and upper-middle classes. He says, "they came from and lived in a world very different from my own . . . and this translated, for me, into some personal inadequacy" (*Lives* 43). To assuage this sense of exclusion, Rose and his
friend mocked the college literary magazine as being too elite, "simultaneously feeling contempt for and exclusion from a social life that seemed to work with the mystery and enclosure of the clockwork in a music box" (Lives 44). Later, however, Rose would edit that magazine and publish poems, thereby engendering his own inclusion in that literary world.

Rose's personal experience with class exclusion is supplemented by another case he reports in Lives. In this instance, the student is Lucia, a bilingual non-traditional student, with whom Rose worked at the Tutorial Center. Rose notes that Lucia "represented a population that historically hadn't gained much entrance to places like this: the returning student, the single, working mother" (181). Working with Lucia on her psychology reading as she bounced her baby on her lap, Rose notes that she was struggling with the same "upper-division courses that [he] took" years before (182). As Lucia labored over a difficult passage in Thomas Szasz's The Myth of Mental Illness, Rose realized that some of her difficulties in understanding the reading lay in her lack of experience with typical academic moves. For example, Rose reports that

[i]t is a standard move in liberal studies to find religious analogies to nonreligious behaviors, structure, and institutions [...] but she didn't have the background to appreciate what happened to Freud and psychoanalysis the moment Szasz makes his comparison [of Freud to God], wasn't familiar with the wealth of conclusions that would follow from the analogy. (184)

That is, Lucia's lack of experience with analysis made it harder for her to comprehend the passage without help. Rose's conclusion from this encounter shows the extra effort needed to include students such as Lucia in academia.
Students like Lucia are often thought to be poor readers or to have impoverished vocabularies (though Lucia speaks two languages); I've even heard students like her referred to as culturally illiterate (though she has absorbed two cultural heritages). It's true there were words Lucia didn't know (*alchemy, orthodoxy*) and sentences that took us two or three passes to untangle. But it seemed more fruitful to see Lucia's difficulties in understanding Szasz as having to do with her belief system and with her lack of familiarity with certain ongoing discussions in humanities and social science [...] and background knowledge. (184)

Rose's ability to describe Lucia's difficulties without a judgment of cognitive deficit and his ability to introduce her to the necessary academic moves illustrate both theory and practice for inclusion. When their session finished, Rose reflected on the context for Lucia's cognitive challenges:

I began to think about how many pieces had to fall into place each day in order for her to be a student: The baby couldn't wake up sick . . . the cousin . . . had to be available to watch him, the three buses she took from East L.A. had to be on time — no accidents or breakdowns or strikes — for travel alone took up almost three hours of her school day. Only if all these pieces dropped into smooth alignment could her full attention shift to the complex and allusive prose of Thomas Szasz. (*Lives* 185)

As Rose shows the details of Lucia's life — the situatedness of her learning — he shows what threatens her inclusion in the life of the mind.

To be included in the academy, students must demonstrate understanding; they must be able to write essays and related academic texts. But writing can pose additional problems for students and lead to exclusion. Rose discovered that some students who had been successful writers in high school began to fail when they entered college. Failing freshman composition could lead to a student failing out (or dropping out) of college, a clear picture of exclusion.
Students struggling in their first year composition classes frequently came to UCLA's Tutorial Center, stimulating Rose's interest in their difficulties. When Rose first started investigating the cognitive components of writer's block among these students, he wondered if factors besides the assumed psychological ones were preventing otherwise capable first year students from successfully completing their assignments. Through his qualitative research — via videotaping, interviews, and simulated recall — Rose discovered that the students who were blocked in their writing were almost always inadvertently holding themselves back due to adherence to various rigidly held rules and inflexible plans for composing.

Rose began to write up and publish this research on writing blocks. In his 1980 article "Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block," in his 1981 dissertation, in his 1984 monograph *Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension*, and in his 1985 essay "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research*, Rose shows how some students operate (or rather, fail to operate) under misunderstood dictums or rules applied too rigidly and too often. Rose's research focused on "logical" adherence to rules, which results in a rigid process for writing that confounds efforts to produce acceptable work and further results in excluding student writers from the academy. As he explains in "Rigid Rules,"

[t]his blocking usually resulted in rushed, often late papers and resultant grades that did not truly reflect these students' writing ability. And then, of course, there were other less measurable but probably more serious results: a growing distrust of their abilities and an aversion toward the composing process itself. (389)
Rose shows how a student's belief that "if sentences aren't grammatically 'correct,' they aren't useful . . . keeps [the student] from toying with ideas on paper, from the kind of linguistic play that often frees up the flow of prose," and which then impedes the progress of the writing, leading to incomplete assignments, writing anxiety and apprehension, and general loss of confidence (395). In other words, Rose shows how psychological or emotional barriers can result from the blocks, not just cause them.

These discoveries about the causes of writing blocks help teachers guide their students past and through blocks, rather than characterizing the blocking students with a judgment of mental or moral deficit. That is, students who do not finish assignments may be neither stupid nor lazy. Rose's discoveries about writing blocks correlate with other research being done about the same time by Mina Shaughnessy and David Bartholomae who were investigating similar questions of "logic of error" as seen in the work of the basic writing students they were encountering in open admissions classrooms.

Sometimes the "logic of error" relates to misunderstandings between teacher and student. While students can be excluded from mainstream academic classes based on writing skills that don't meet college standards, students can also be excluded because of non-academic articulation skills. In several cases Rose shows how classroom conversation that doesn't match teacher expectations can cause exclusion when the teacher labels the student deficient.

In his research for Possible Lives, Rose looked at cultural differences in conversation patterns that can lead to such misunderstanding. Sometimes, says Rose, "the reserve of some Indian people is misread in school as a sign of intellectual
inadequacy" (369). Fortunately, he found classrooms that did take into consideration the potential "mismatch between the communication styles of various groups of Native Americans and the styles that tend to lead to success in mainstream, predominantly White, classrooms" (Possible Lives 369) and that allowed the students space to move into the conversation at their own speed. When student behavior does not match instructor expectations, labels of cognitive deficiency have often been applied. Judgments of cognitive deficit can also occur with students who are livelier than expected.

Rose and coauthors Glynda Hull, Kay Losey Fraser and Maria Castellano, addressed this mismatch between student behavior and instructor expectation in their essay "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse." In this case study, the authors use "an empirical fine-grained analysis of classroom discourse with broader historical and cultural analyses" to present a situation where an instructor made a (probably erroneous) decision about a student's intelligence based on the student's conversational style (294). The authors found that the frequent contributions by Maria did not match the teacher's expectations for behavior by remedial students. The teacher diagnosed Maria with cognitive defects despite Maria's improving writing. In fact, the teacher predicted that "Maria wouldn't pass the next writing class the first time through 'because it requires coherent thinking'" (295). The essay asks: "How is it that [an] annoying conversational style can become a measure of intellectual ability?" (296). The significance went far beyond the instructor's being irritated, because "this mismatch, this small but noticeable discontinuity, was to work to [Maria's] disadvantage" (290). By the end of
the term, Maria seemed to have "internalize[d] her teacher's opinions of her abilities" and lowered her career expectations (302). What is needed, the essay says, is for teachers to remediate themselves and look deeper (301). In other words, teachers need to find ways to include, not exclude, students.

Mismatched communication styles are not the only way students can become excluded. Mismatched interpretations of classroom materials, such as literature, can be another. In the article "This Wooden Shack Place," which Rose coauthored with Hull, a student's less conventional interpretation of a poem was at odds with the instructor's expectations. University English departments tend to advance certain traditional ways of looking at works in the canon (which still largely excludes authors of color). The student, Robert, interpreted certain details about the girl in Garret Hongo's poem "And Your Soul Shall Dance" in ways that contradicted a more traditional reading. For example, Robert concluded that the girl who walks to school "beside fields of tomatoes and summer squash" in a "plaid dress, and blouse" from a Sears catalogue must come from a family with money since they could afford to order clothes (273). Through an extended interview with the boy, Rose discovered that the student's "mis-reading" of the poem — his characterization of what he saw going on in the scene — made sense according to Robert's working-class non-White farming background. That is, there was a logic to Robert's "errors." Yet, the authors point out that this sort of "eccentric" contribution is ironically often overlooked (even at a time when "complicating" or "problematizing" issues is valued in sophisticated literature classrooms). They point out that,

[i]f the teacher's goals are to run an efficient classroom, cover a set body of material, and convey certain conventional reading and writing
strategies to students who are on the margin of the academic community, then all these conversational disjunctions are troubling. (281)

As was the case with Maria, teachers who don't look beyond their expectations can make exclusionary judgments. But alternatives exist.

Rose and Hull posit a different model, one of increased instructor and student interaction, a method that worked with Robert. It is not difficult, they say, but the difference is essential because it is based on different assumptions, assumptions that the real stuff of belonging to an academic community is dynamic involvement in generating and questioning knowledge, that students desperately need immersion and encouragement to involve themselves in such activity, and that underprepared students are capable – given the right conditions – of engaging in such activity. (281)

The right conditions to which Rose and Hull refer are those arising from teachers' personal involvement with students in order to open the conversation to everyone. Rose believes that teachers must find ways to bridge the apparent illogic of student work in order to resist labeling such errors defective, inadequate or wrong. By changing their assumptions, teachers can learn to reach out so that all students are included. Essays like these by Rose and his coauthors are particularly valuable to show teachers how unexamined assumptions can lead to unintended exclusions with cumulative and potentially disastrous consequences. What is particularly useful about these essays is how they also show ways that teachers can develop more inclusionary approaches.

While discussing the collaborative research of Rose and Hull, I want to note several points, all of which relate to inclusion. One is that each of their projects involved students in remedial classes, a topic that I will address more fully in the next
chapter. Another point to notice is the social context of their methodology.

Collaborative research and writing is more common in the social sciences — part of Rose's background is in educational psychology and cognitive process research — than it is in writing in the humanities. What this means is that the idea of making knowledge jointly is seen as more of a communal effort. Such a communal effort is in itself inclusive. Interestingly, once the field of composition studies made its social turn in the mid 1980s and more attention was paid to student-generated knowledge in the composition classroom — whether by teachers leaning toward an expressivist or toward a social-epistemic approach — more scholars have turned their attention to investigating and enacting collaborative writing practices in the classroom. However, few scholars have so far undertaken to write up their scholarly work collaboratively. Rose's collaborative writing, then, is less typical for the field and particularly consistent with his commitment to inclusion.

Connected to this communal research is the choice of research methodology. Rose and Hull employ qualitative case studies with a strong component of interviews and conversational analysis. By interacting personally with the students being studied, the researchers are able to represent the students' points of view and involve them in the research process. In two particular cases, the researchers reveal how they interacted with the students, going beyond the impersonal reserve characteristic of much research. In "This Wooden Shack Place," Rose discusses the poem with his student Robert to elicit responses and compose a joint interpretation. In "Rethinking Remediation: Towards a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing," Rose and Hull not only research the case of the African American student
Tanya through interviews but also intervene in her education by "outlining a pedagogy to move Tanya toward a conventional discourse" (25). I believe that this type of personally-connected research aligns well with a dedication to inclusion. Thus, Rose's methodology and pedagogy embody his beliefs. Increasingly, feminist scholars involved in qualitative studies are calling for this same kind of methodology.

In these essays, as well as in other research by Rose, the point is made how the often-unspoken expectations for mainstream, middle-class, predominantly White classrooms can work against students on the margins attempting to enter. For Robert, Michelle, Tanya, and Maria — all students of color — their cultural backgrounds compounded their difficulties in classroom interaction. In "Remediation as Social Construct," Rose and his coauthors make it clear that teachers must find ways to navigate such differences in order to ensure inclusion.

In addition to these cases of exclusion, Rose has also investigated positive examples of inclusionary practices. In Possible Lives, Rose observes Michelle Taigue's summer program for Navajo and Hopi high school students. Taigue, who as a student suffered rejection due to her Native American heritage, now runs a program based on the power of inclusion. Rose provides an example and analyzes what happens. In a class where a student offered the single word "Love" as a summary of The Ballad of the Sad Café, Rose points out that "Suzy's one-word answer could hardly qualify as a summary of action, and in many classrooms such an answer would either be negatively evaluated or politely sidestepped" (397). But the teacher's thoughtful questions eventually drew from Suzy an elaborate and elegant explanation that made her choice of that word "love" seem perfectly right. Instead of being
discounted because of her reply, Suzy was brought into the literacy club, the group of those who know how to talk about ideas and writing. Rose's point is clear – inclusion is created by determined teachers. But without such special efforts by instructors, students like Suzy, Maria, and Robert can be excluded and their contributions ignored and devalued even by well-intentioned teachers.

Being well-intentioned is not enough. The way Rose was able to help Robert understand the Garret Hongo poem by working individually with him outside of class illustrates another key component of Rose's research into exclusion – the factor of personal attention and mentoring. Rose's individual work with such students as Harold, Lucia and Robert reveals the power of such personal attention.

Rose knows the power of personal attention from his own life, which may be why he feels that inclusion must be more than just opening doors. Inclusion must be proactive. Teachers must go out of their way to bring at-risk students. Mentoring became a key factor in Rose's own education when Rose's high school English teacher Jack MacFarland drew Rose and a few classmates into the world of literacy with outside discussions of literature. As Rose points out in Lives, "There were some lives that were already beyond Jack MacFarland's ministrations, but mine was not" (33). With MacFarland, Rose began to bloom. Rose needed more individual mentoring to overcome his lack of preparation for college. At Loyola, Rose received additional personal attention from professors who took an interest in his situation and kept him from failing. Rose repaid this debt by mentoring his own students.

For example, Rose worked personally with the Vietnam veterans in the remedial writing classes that would prepare them to enter UCLA. Lives details Rose's
encounters with various students to show how a teacher can provide encouragement.
Rose's detailed scenes and dialogue demonstrate how students who trust an instructor
can learn. Rose illustrates several episodes. In one case from Lives, former inmate
Willie Oates, "all forearms and pectorals and husky silence" comes up to the podium
after a remedial writing class, pounds his fist, and shouts "You—are—teaching—
the—fuck—outta—me!" (146). In another case from Lives, Rose recounts how he
.teaches Sergeant Gonzalez to "read" the poem "Butch Weldy" by asking, "Could we
really understand [this] without all this detail?" (150). Walking through the poem line
by line, Rose shows his student how "detail makes the whole thing come alive" (150).
After that session, the student's next paper was "richer in detail than was his previous
work, and it displayed attempts to deal with the uncertain" (151). In other words, the
student's writing and thinking were approximating more closely the academic style
expected in college, thanks to Rose's intensive discussions.

Another example of student empowerment is demonstrated in Lives in Rose's
work with Olga, an older female student at community college, who was struggling to
read Macbeth. In the Public Television interview with Bill Moyers, Rose explains
how students such as Olga all too often turn away from English literature classes,
feeling lost, "incompetent and unworthy and mad" because the language seems
difficult and different at first (Tucher 224). Rose tells Moyers about Olga's struggles to
show the value of her achievements:

When she finally got through [Macbeth] — and it was a battle — she said,
"You know, Mike, people always hold this stuff over you. They make
you feel stupid with their fancy talk. But now, ... I can say, 'I, Olga,
have read [Macbeth].' I won't tell you I like it, because I don't know if
I do, or I don't. But I like knowing what it's about. (Lives 161)
Rose uses Olga’s story to illustrate to Moyers what is at stake when teachers invite students to join the literacy club. By understanding *Macbeth*, Olga has acquired a special kind of literacy that John Guillory termed "cultural capital." Knowing about Shakespeare, most English teachers would agree, is a good thing. But in his interview with Moyers, Rose explains why Olga’s achievement was particularly important:

[Her sense of achievement] was powerful to me, because that is not the sort of thing you read in the humanist tracts on the great books. It’s not that Olga became a “better human being.” It’s not that she gained a kind of “discriminating vision” that allowed her to better distinguish between good and evil. It is not that her linguistic capacity was enriched by the encounter with the great word. What she got from her reading of *Macbeth* was a sense that she was not powerless, and she was not dumb. She understood something that had become a symbol of everything that had limited her before. And she felt good about the kind of power she had. (Tucher 224)

Olga now had a sense of empowerment that came from a knowledge of the canon, a knowledge she might not have had without Rose's personal attention. With Olga, Rose did more than just assign *Macbeth* in class. He did more than just invite her in to the world of literacy; he pushed and pulled. He did not give her the power; he helped her get it for herself. And he did it by understanding Olga's point of view.

Looking at situations from the student's point of view can be not only essential, as in Rose's discussion with Robert about the clothes from Sears, but also vastly rewarding as Hull and Rose point out in "Rethinking Remediation:"

One of the rewards . . . that comes from working with marginal students is that they force you again and again to scrutinize your own reactions, to question your received assumptions about literacy and pedagogy, about cognition and the purposes of discourse. (151)

It is these very rewards and this very challenge of working with the less-prepared non-traditional students that can be particularly inspiring for those who teach at the
community college level. Oregon's community college students include laid-off loggers, injured construction workers, single mothers, and high school dropouts, all of whom invest their "time, money, and – most of all – self-esteem" to achieve inclusion in the academy (Troyka "Perspectives" 18). Working with such at-risk students means offering inclusion, opening academia to those who might otherwise be stuck on the margins. To paraphrase Rose in Lives, "they have to be let into the academic club" (141).

This chapter's examples of individual student exclusion and inclusion in Rose's oeuvre exemplify his theme of inclusion and argue for its importance. But any analysis of inclusion as a theme of Rose's must take into consideration not only this chapter's focus on individual students but also his attention to a broader, more culturally situated consideration of the many barriers that interfere with inclusion in the social benefits of literacy. This chapter has shown how Rose not only looks at how students can (and do) exclude themselves because of mistaken assumptions about their own abilities, but also looks at how students can also be (and are) excluded by teachers and an educational system that assigns judgments of deficit to student work that does not meet expectations. Rose's growing shift from focusing on individuals to a critique of institutions will be considered in chapter three.
Chapter Three: Inclusion in the Institution

Students will float to the mark you set. I and the others in the vocational classes were bobbing in pretty shallow water. Vocational education has aimed at increasing the economic opportunities of students who do not do well in our schools. Some serious programs succeed in doing that, and through exceptional teachers — like Mr. Gross in Horace's Compromise — students learned to develop hypotheses and troubleshoot, reason through a problem and communicate effectively — the true job skills. The vocational track, however, is most often a place for those who are just not making it, a dumping ground for the disaffected... mostly the teachers had no idea of how to engage the imaginations of us kids who were scuttling along at the bottom of the pond. Lives on the Boundary 26

In the previous chapter I explored Mike Rose's focus on issues of inclusion and exclusion at the individual level in the classroom, tutorial center, and mentoring relationship. By doing that, I showed how Rose characterizes the interactions between a teacher and an individual student and how those interactions can function to include or exclude. I discussed Rose's research on different aspects of these encounters to show what he saw as the causes of teacher misjudgments and the consequences of misjudgments for exclusion. Because a classroom is the actual site of learning, ground zero if you will, it makes sense to look closely at the day to day experience of student learning. A classroom, however, does not exist in a vacuum — but in an institution. And each institution exists within the wider realm of education and academia. Therefore, an exploration of inclusion and exclusion — both as component and effect in education — must consider not only the student's immediate experience, but also how that relates to the educational situation.
This chapter, then, will look at Rose's attention to the issues of inclusion and exclusion within institutions. In doing that, I will follow Rose's gradual shift during the 1980s from his cognitively-based research projects to his later work analyzing the effects of students' social situations on their learning and their success in school. This kind of social turn — the way that Rose's attention becomes increasingly focused on social situatedness — suggests that Rose might be viewed as moving from the cognitivist writing process camp of compositionists into the camp that James Berlin defines in "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class" as social-constructionist or social epistemic. I am not sure that such a categorization is particularly helpful, however. Further, such bounded categories seem contradictory to Rose's frequent critiques of rigid rules and narrow labeling. Rather, it is sufficient to note the way Rose's increased social focus allows him to view the issue of inclusion from broader and richer perspectives. Taken together, then, Rose's research on inclusion and exclusion in different settings reveals his continued attention, indeed his passionate commitment, to inclusion.

Rose's investigations into how inclusion and exclusion operate in both small and large-scale situations provide useful examples for educators. Rose's microanalysis of individual interactions shows teachers how they may inadvertently be excluding students and suggests ways to avoid doing that. His macro analysis shows the broader cultural implications and consequences of inclusion and exclusion arising from institutional decisions, arguing for both the possibility and necessity of more inclusive approaches. Both individual and institutional perspectives are important. And since inclusion on both the student level and the institutional level frequently involves
remedial education, this chapter will particularly consider how Rose has considered institutional remediation and how remediation relates to inclusion and exclusion.

Remediation is often viewed as a remedy to cure, correct or counteract a problem. Remediation, however, is one of those over-determined terms that mean different things in different circumstances. As Lisa Ede, director of Oregon State University's Center for Writing and Learning explains,

Writing judged as remedial at Harvard or Berkeley might be judged as good or even exceptional some place else. The distinction between developmental and remedial [or basic writing] is also complicated and hard to pin down. From one perspective, any required writing course before the required first-year writing course is remedial in that students are required to take it before taking the required course. People sometimes try to distinguish between developmental and remedial courses, but it's usually in a sort of ad hoc or institutionally situated way. (Ede "email")

Rose's own experience with a formal type of remedial program demonstrates some of the difficulties or problems that can arise. In the epigraph from Lives on the Boundary that begins this chapter, Rose describes his experience in his parochial high school's Voc. Ed. program around 1960. While some remedial programs are designed to help students move into college level work, as Ede mentions above, Voc. Ed. often is not. As Rose described his experience as a student in Voc. Ed. in Lives, he characterized the curriculum differently: "the curriculum isn't designed to liberate [students] but to occupy [them], or, if [they're] lucky, train [them], though the training is for work the society does not esteem" (28). A program like this that maintains the social status quo and keeps students at the low educational level it has assigned to them seems counter to an inclusionary remediation.
For Rose, then, what actually aided his inclusion came not from the Voc. Ed. curriculum, but rather from informal mentoring and supplemental education in both knowledge and critical thinking skills that he received from individual caring teachers. In *Lives*, he describes in detail the personal assistance various teachers provided, first as he was moved into his high school's college prep track after years in Voc Ed, and then again as he moved from high school into college classrooms. While this help did indeed remedy and improve his educational preparation, many scholars would not characterize the help he received by the term remediation because that help was informal and not institutional. This distinction about the providers and locations of remediation is important because most discussions of remedial education focus on institutional programs.

Another distinction that Rose's experience with remediation raises is that of goals. His Voc. Ed. program aimed to teach basic job skills rather than helping the students improve their academic skills enough to move up to the college prep track. In other words, the program did not foster Rose's inclusion in academia. Other remedial programs such as university EOP programs do aim to facilitate inclusion for the underprepared students who need extra help to succeed in college.

It is clear, then, that an understanding of the term remediation depends on the circumstances in which it occurs. Remembering that Rose's research on remedial programs was conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s helps clarify the context of his use of the term.

Another component of context is the position from which Rose writes about remediation. Rose has provided remediation as a teacher, tutor and administrator.
Rose has directed several remedial programs at UCLA. At UCLA's Tutorial Center, he both administered programs and tutored individual students. As director of the UCLA Summer Freshman Preparatory Program, Rose also designed curricula to boost the reading, writing and thinking skills of underprepared incoming students. These various remedial settings provided Rose with opportunities for both individual and institutional perspectives.

Given his connections to remediation as a consumer and a provider, it is not surprising that Rose advocates compassionate efforts to help students on the margins. He sees remediation as an important part of the process for students who need help overcoming differences in cultural backgrounds and educational preparation. This help enables them to enter the scholarly conversation, whether by participating in classroom discussions or by writing academic essays.

Rose profiles one particular successful remedial program in Possible Lives. As part of his description of positive pedagogy, Rose praises a college preparatory program that works with Navajo and Hopi high school students to ready them for acceptance into White mainstream college classrooms. Says Rose,

an educational system that defines itself as democratic and open needs such programs ...[as] an important link between the usually segmented domains of secondary and post secondary education, an institutional mechanism to assist in the difficult transition from high school to college. (366)

By mentioning not only the implications of remediation for success in college but also by characterizing the system as democratic, Rose makes explicit a connection inherent throughout his work about the relationship of education to full participation in democracy.
For Rose, then, remediation is important, yet as much as Rose supports remediation in principle, many particular programs fall short of his ideals. By criticizing shortcomings of various remedial approaches, Rose calls for programs that do more to include students in the academy. Thus, Rose's criticism of remedial programs is an important part of his argument for inclusion.

Rose's essay "The Language of Exclusion" addresses one reason why remedial programs often fail, which is the problematic way that some institutions regard remediation. In this essay, Rose elaborates on how faculty and institutional criticism of remediation is typically aligned with an elitist position that characterizes students who are underprepared as not belonging in college, a position contrary to Rose's. Instead of blocking students from college until they are adequately prepared elsewhere, Rose wants colleges to accept the responsibility of preparing incoming students. Some institutions, however, are ambivalent about this responsibility. Rose points out that even when they provide remedial programs, such as UCLA's Freshman Preparatory Program or the various Educational Opportunities Programs (EOPs) nationwide, host institutions are often ambivalent. In fact, despite being theoretically inclusive, such programs often stigmatize their participants in ways that exclude. In "Narrowing the Mind and the Page," Rose expands his critique of negative attitudes about remediation and addresses the problem of how the underprepared can be helped without the stigmatizing terminology that too often characterize the attitudes of faculty and institutional remedial programs.

The criticisms of institutional remediation in "The Language of Exclusion" and "Narrowing the Mind and the Page" are indicative of Rose's shifted focus to a more
social outlook. Documenting the exact moment of this shift is complicated by the fact that Rose's research focus changed slowly. Publications before and after Lives address both individual and institutional aspects of inclusion. For example, Rose's first published scholarly article, "When Faculty Talk About Writing" (1979), reported on attitudes toward remediation expressed at a UCLA campus-wide conference about student writing skills, while the following year, "Rigid Rules" analyzed writer's block in individual student clients at the UCLA tutorial center. Lives provides many extended narratives of individual students, yet it also contains Rose's analysis of inclusion in institutions. Thus Lives participates in both aspects of this inquiry.

In addition, Lives itself provides an important clue to Rose's changing perspective. He was working, he says, at UCLA's Tutorial Center (both as tutor and administrator) in the 1980's when he began receiving inquiries from the university administration for statistics about his students' income levels, race and ethnicity. He admits in Lives that this was a new way for me to look at education. My focus had been on particular students and their communities, and it tended to be a teacher's focus, rich in anecdote and observation. Increasingly, my work in the Tutorial Center required that I take a different perspective: I had to think like a policy-maker, considering the balance sheet of economics and accountability . . . to argue for our programs, for in an academic bureaucracy admissions statistics and test scores and retention rates are valued terms of debate.

All teaching is embedded in a political context, of course, but the kind of work I had done before coming to the Tutorial Center tended to isolate me from the immediate presence of institutions [. . . Now] I was learning [. . .] how to work within the policy-maker's arena. And though it was, at times, uncomfortable for me and though I would soon come to question the legitimacy of the vision it fostered, it provided an important set of lessons. Probably the central value of being at the Tutorial Center was that it forced me to examine the broad institutional context of writing instruction and underpreparation. (186)
Thus, not only did his experience at the Tutorial Center move Rose to see inclusion in a broader institutional way, but it also encouraged Rose to write about inclusion from a different angle.

Furthermore, I suggest that the very act of writing *Lives* over an extended period during the late 1980s encourage this shifted perspective and created a bridge connecting his early work with the later work. Even the style of *Lives* – the blurred genre blending academic analysis with popular literary narrative – enacts a broad social awareness that enhances Rose's arguments about remediation by providing background details about the students in order to contextualize their experience.

Rose describes his changing perspective on remediation and inclusion again, but slightly differently, in an interview that took place shortly after the publication of *Lives*. Talking with Susan Palo of *Writing on the Edge*, Rose calls the shift a "widening of my conceptual lens" (12). He tells Palo that he dates this shift from 1985, the time he wrote two essays – "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research" and "The Language of Exclusion." In the interview he points out how "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block" moves beyond a narrow focus on the challenges of a particular assignment to "take into consideration the situational and affective or emotional aspects of composition as well as the cognitive [aspects]" of student learning (14). Thus, while the essay focuses more broadly on student situations, it still looks at individuals. He contrasts this to "The Language of Exclusion," which he calls "very much a social, cultural examination of the language that we use in universities to talk about writing instruction . . . what some folks would
call cultural criticism" (14). This is the crucial shift I am documenting, from micro focus on single student-teacher interactions to macro focus on institutional attitudes about inclusion. While Rose continues to investigate how individuals learn, his writing from the mid 1980s on nearly always includes a component of broader cultural awareness. And, as my first chapter on context points out, this turn in Rose's work from a more cognitively-based research on writing process to a more social emphasis on student learning coincided with similar theoretical and pedagogical changes in the field of composition studies, though it would be problematic to claim any explicit causal relationship.

One particular pedagogical change in composition and composition studies in these years that is connected to this social turn was the development of remedial courses for the underprepared basic writers who flooded college classrooms as part of the open admissions movements. These non-traditional students, who were often older than the typical eighteen-year old first-year students, pushed composition scholars into new areas of research. As part of this new research, Rose addressed the exclusionary ways that some remedial programs processed and sorted incoming students. "When Faculty Talk About Writing," "The Language of Exclusion," "Narrowing the Mind and the Page," and Lives each discuss problems with testing, evaluating, labeling, and segregating based on judgments about various definitions of lack.

The first problem in this process comes with placement tests, which may be based on unfamiliar skills and cultural literacies that the students do not possess, so that poor results misrepresent a student's intelligence. An example of this is the case from Lives of the adult GED student Millie, which I discussed in my introduction.
Detailing Millie's trouble with standardized tests, Rose shows how such tests can confuse students who are unfamiliar with the types of reading skills that are taught and valued in mainstream classrooms.

These tests often result in students' being characterized with deficit labels. Such labels can be damaging, as Rose shows in *Lives* through the story of his own high school experience in the Voc Ed. track. In another case from *Lives*, Rose recounts a UCLA student's memory of a classmate who suffered from being labeled a "slow learner." Lilia recalls how the girl was affected:

> She said it was awful. She had no friends because everyone called her dumb, and no one wanted to be seen with a dumb person ... Because they were calling her dumb, she started to believe she was really dumb. (241)

Lilia understood her classmate because Lilia herself had been placed in a class for slow learners after she flunked first grade as a recent immigrant from Mexico. She told Rose, "And with myself and my brother, it was the same thing. When we were in those courses we thought very low of ourselves" (241). What happens, then, is that when students are labeled as deficient, this causes them further emotional issues that can affect cognition, compounding their problems. Furthermore, testing and labeling often lead to segregated classes whose lower status compounds the damage to the students in them.

This final problem, that of remedial programs that are not as helpful as they could or should be, was one Rose attempted to overcome by designing what he felt were more effective programs for underprepared students. In the remedial writing courses for Vietnam veterans in the early 1970s, Rose invented a curriculum to develop the critical thinking skills he knew these students would need when they
moved on to the university. In Lives, he describes how he crafted reading and writing assignments that required analysis more challenging and sophisticated than that usually deemed appropriate for remedial students. Rose not only felt that teaching anything less was doing the students a disservice, but he also felt that assumptions that students could not perform at this level were not only wrong but exclusionary.

Rose's experiences teaching the veterans and the knowledge he gained from that led in part to his critiques of remedial programs in his 1983 article "Remedial Writing Courses." In an interview shortly after the publication of Lives, Rose explains,

[O]ne of my agendas [is] to dispel the notion held by both an elitist educational system and by a sometimes well-intentioned but problematic developmental educational system (people who teach developmental students, developmental studies programs, remedial courses) that these students can't do this work, and therefore they substitute a remedial curriculum that, for example, is built on narrow reading and writing tasks or is focused on the student's personal experience alone. I wanted to show both these audiences that, again and again, in my experience, students who have been assumed to be incapable of engaging in a traditional, elitist curriculum can in fact engage in it just fine when the conditions are right. (Palo 17)

That is, Rose's teaching experience proved to him that students deemed remedial could learn under the right conditions. In this interview Rose does not go on to suggest what those conditions might be, but in "Remedial Writing Courses," he proposes a pedagogy and a curriculum that would "steadily and systematically introduce remedial writers to transactional/expositional academic discourse" so they could successfully move out of the university's remedial program and into mainstream college courses (196). Rose's position on including students in mainstream college courses is characterized by Julie Ann Hagemann in "Worthy Co-Workers' in an Inclusionary
Pedagogy: A Critical Reading of Authority in the Work of Patricia Bizzell, David Bartholomae and Mike Rose:

Rose is concerned as well that students feel they have a right to be in the academy, but he focuses on how well they understand the nature of academic inquiry. He sees the canon of Western intellectual history as a series of on-going debates about the nature of such abstract ideas as truth and beauty. And his goal is to help students understand the terms of these debates so they can join in these intellectual pursuits (4).

That is, Rose's goal is to ensure that students acquire the academic skills to succeed intellectually, skills he believes they are capable of attaining. This is why he critiques remedial programs based on "skill and drill" projects and simplistic essay assignments that do not advance students' analytical skills and ability to work with intellectual abstractions. It is typical of Rose's commitment to inclusion that while critiquing aspects of remedial programs that he sees as ineffective, he does not stop with negative assessment, but goes on to offer positive alternatives.

Some of these alternatives include substituting analytical assignments in place of such typical remedial course assignments as narration and description, which he says are too simplistic and, thus, not helpful at developing academic skills. Assignments like these, Rose argues, not only underestimate students' abilities but also fail to prepare students for the types of assignments typical in academic disciplines. As he says in "Remedial Writing Courses," most university departments expect students to reflect on "a broad range of complex material" from lectures and readings (195). "There were simply no assignments calling for the student to narrate or describe personal experiences" (195). In place of narration or description essays, "Remedial Writing Programs" suggests writing assignments built on a sequence of critical thinking skills, similar to the process Rose devised for the veterans, which he
described in Lives. As I explained in chapter one, Rose subsequently incorporated this pedagogy into the composition textbook Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing that he coauthored with Malcolm Kiniry, one his fellow teachers in the veterans program.

"Remedial Writing Courses" does more than evaluate assignments and suggest improvements, however. In this article, Rose also takes the opportunity to address the way that certain writing styles are privileged in the academy so that students' inability to use these styles can lead to their exclusion. What is needed, then, is to teach those styles. That brings Rose to claim,

What we must do, therefore, is carefully define and describe the kind of writing demanded of students in the academy (which – lest this suggestion seems mind-shackling) – is also the kind of writing students would use to challenge the academy) and then focus on that kind of writing. (197)

What I find particularly interesting about Rose's comment here is the way that he acknowledges and then deftly defuses a potential criticism from a left-leaning social activist or social-epistemic position that academic writing courses perpetuate institutional power structures by reinforcing academic conventions. It might be argued that because remedial writing programs have a larger percentage of students from the working class, the programs should teach writing skills that would empower their students to resist elitist systems that have excluded them in the past. A simplified characterization might be to ask whether institutions view their remedial programs from a cultural literacy or a critical literacy perspective. By saying in the quote above that "the kind of writing demanded of students in the academy... is also the kind of writing students would use to challenge the academy," Rose seems to be arguing that
good writing skills can serve either a cultural or a critical agenda and that, therefore, teaching these skills is liberating whether students choose to support or resist the academy (197). In fact, Rose explicitly advocates the teaching of academic conventions in "Teaching University Discourse" and demonstrates teaching strategies.

Regardless of whether remedial writing programs have explicitly activist or liberatory agendas, the very idea of turning outsiders — who have been labeled cognitively deficient and placed into remedial programs — into insiders via the acquisition of academic discourse conventions could be problematic because of class differences. Underprepared students frequently come from working class backgrounds unlike the elite upper class status typically associated with academia. In addition, remedial students are often considered to lack critical thinking skills. Since critical thinking is the skill most necessary for the life of the mind, and is, therefore, the intellectual heart of liberal studies, students labeled remedial seem unsuited for academic work. When a socio-economic class difference is combined with an academic snobbery about intellectual ability, then underprepared working class students labeled cognitively deficient may be considered doubly unsuitable for inclusion in academia.

Now in terms of Rose's attitudes toward this situation, I turn again to Lives. Discussing the work done at tutorial centers — work considered remedial by the institutions that fund it — Rose reflects in Lives on the irony of a university's ambivalence toward its remedial students:

What emerges in the culture's institution [i.e. a university] that most touts humane, liberal learning is a rigid intellectual class system . . . These class divisions of the mind are so powerful that they can override and even contract one's stated beliefs about the social order. Several
faculty whose work embodied a radical critique of culture were
dissmissive of the work that [the tutorial center] did. And I heard
remarkable stories of distinguished Marxist academics at other schools
who flat out refused to teach undergraduate courses. In their scholarly
articles, they pursued a critique of meritocratic capitalism, yet in their
dealings with students, they replicated the very elitism they assailed in
print. (198-199)

The irony is that left-leaning scholars of liberatory pedagogies might be excluding
students rather than reaching out to include them. Exclusionary attitudes, then, appear
at all levels of the university, from the remedial courses and tutorial center to the
upper division courses, and from the administration to the faculty members.

This question of mental capacity or potentiality is one of the key points in
"Narrowing the Mind and the Page." While that article dates to 1988, the behavior
and attitudes it describes appear to endure in institutions where remedial writing
classes are separated from the English or Humanities departments, with lower level
courses taught in developmental departments or EOP programs. Rose exemplifies this
pattern with a description in Lives of a developmental writing class he visited at a state
college in Ohio. Here he found that "[s]tudents designated 'developmental' at this
school must take a year's worth of very basic English before they can move into
standard Freshman Comp" (206). He describes the minimalist workbooks specified
and the rule that students must not write anything longer than a sentence, since that
would constitute "writing" and thus be the province of the English Department. Rose
claims that "the separation was strongly influenced by the English Department's desire
to be freed from basic instruction" (207).

Not only do the exclusionary attitudes of some university faculty apply to
remedial students and programs, but these attitudes also apply to regular first year
composition classrooms which help students practice academic discourse skills that faculty find lacking. In "The Language of Exclusion," Rose points out the paradoxical marginalization of writing courses by their host institutions:

The writing course holds a very strange position in the American curriculum. It is within this setting that composition specialists must debate and defend and interminably evaluate what they do. And how untenable such activity becomes if the very terms of the defense undercut both the nature of writing and the teaching of writing, and exclude it in various metaphorical ways from the curriculum. (342)

Rose backs up his portrait of ambivalence by the academy toward the teaching of writing with a brief historical survey of how first year composition classes were instituted at Harvard in 1874 to correct weak writing and spread from there to become standard at nearly all colleges (342). By doing this, Rose shows that this controversy is not new but ongoing. Yet this prevalence of first-year composition courses, as Rose points out, comes with administration and faculty worries "that the boundaries between high school and college are eroding" if students arrive at college without having mastered writing skills (342). Some academics, says Rose, "deny some of the [composition] courses' curricular status by tagging them remedial [and] wish the courses could be moved to community colleges" (342). In seeing even mainstream first-year writing courses as in some way remedial, academics in effect seem to exclude composition instruction from the valued work of universities. As part of this ambivalent attitude, Rose says, "English departments hold on to writing courses but consider the work intellectually second-class" (342). The irony of this exclusionary attitude toward writing classrooms, Rose shows, is that "writing...is essential to the very existence of certain kinds of knowledge" (348). If this is true, then that should lead to valuing writing instruction at all levels of education, a contentious issue when
composition instruction still struggles for equal status with literature. In one of his most recent articles, "A Call for the Teaching of Writing in Graduate Education" (2001), Rose points out that this issue of ambivalence not only continues but also applies at all levels of instruction. As he describes a writing course for graduate students that he co-taught at UCLA, Rose reveals continuing university resistance. After all, the assumption is that graduate students should already have perfected their writing skills. Therefore, courses to help them write better must be unnecessary and remedial.

Because of the many unhelpful academic attitudes about both the existence of various remedial programs and his own disappointment with the construction of some of these programs, Rose urges a new way of looking at the need to help underprepared students. As Rose explains in "The Language of Exclusion:"

Remediation. It is time to abandon this troublesome metaphor. To do so will not blind us to the fact that many entering students are not adequately prepared to take on the demands of university work. In fact, it will help us perceive these young people and the work they do in ways that foster appropriate notions about language development and use, that establish a framework for more rigorous and comprehensive analysis of their difficulties, and that do not perpetuate the raree [or freak] show of allowing them entrance to the academy while, in various symbolic ways, denying them full participation. (357)

It is clear that in saying this, Rose is not advocating against remediation, a field in which he has worked productively for years. Rather, by pointing out that too often students labeled remedial are more harmed than helped by attitudes that see them as outsiders who do not really belong among the regular students, Rose wants to see changes toward more effective assistance based on a sincere effort at acceptance and inclusion.
Rose's passionate beliefs about inclusion are the antithesis of exclusionary gatekeeping, a term associated with maintaining high standards. While his remark that "many entering students are not adequately prepared to take on the demands of university work" seems a concession, Rose claims that it is the institution's responsibility to correct underpreparation as much as it is the individual's responsibility to learn. This position is characterized by Jeff Smith, a colleague of Rose's at UCLA, in his article "Mike Rose, Allan Bloom and Paul Goodman: In Search of a Lost Pedagogical Synthesis."

For Rose, the university's task is to better fit itself to the unique diversity of actual students as we find them. If that means using, say, rap music . . . in order to draw someone in, to get a student moving down a path that might eventually lead to Shakespeare, fine. The greater evil is exclusion. (726)

In calling for the university to bring students into the academy and help them meet standards, however, Rose is not advocating a lower level of educational excellence. Rather, academic standards should be guidelines to help students succeed, instead of barriers to keep the underprepared out. Standards must be maintained, says Rose, for the right purposes. In his Public Television interview with Bill Moyers, Rose clarifies this position:

I'm calling for an educational philosophy that is more compassionate and more of an invitation than the ones we've often had. But that at the same time is not soft-hearted, not patronizing, and finally, doesn't abdicate the responsibility of the teacher. (Tucher 224-5)

Rose elaborates on this position about standards and teachers' responsibilities in a 1991 guest opinion essay, "Education Standards Must be Reclaimed for Democratic Aims," published in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Here, Rose demonstrates the problems of standards when they are "applied to students' work in ways that shut
down rather than foster learning," (A32). He illustrates his point in this editorial with the case of a student named Vince. Rose points out how rigid standards worked against Vince's success in the writing classroom:

The teacher seemed to value a literary style and rejected as inadequate Vince's more straightforward prose. Such teachers match student work against an internalized model of excellence and find the work lacking, rather than using their knowledge of genre, rhetorical strategy, and style to assess the way a paper could be improved, given what the writer seems to be trying to do. This kind of teacher functions more like a gatekeeper than an educator. (A32)

The use of standards to exclude students like Vince whose writing doesn't seem to match the teacher's expectations comes from the attitudes Rose fights against as he critiques remedial programs.

While Rose claims that educational standards should be used to include all students and encourage a more democratic class system, I want to acknowledge some other ways in which the idea of helping working class students move into academia and the middle class might not be universally desired. Upward mobility as a beneficial inclusionary process may be seen by some as subliminally linked to a White, middle class perspective. As Ann Green points out in "Difficult Stories: Service-Learning, Race, Class, and Whiteness," "For those of us who are middle class, this means acknowledging differences of class, caste, and culture and not assuming that those who are working class or poor want middle class culture or aspire to middle class materialism" (277). Therefore, teachers must question the ways that even the most well-intentioned inclusionary approaches may be based on unspoken valuations of class status.
As a further irony, consider how such ambivalence about class status echoes the counterintuitive resistance that some remedial students have to reading Rose's *Lives on the Boundary*. Both Candace Spigelman in ""Taboo Topics' and the Rhetoric of Silence: Discussing *Lives on the Boundary* in a Basic Writing Class" and Marilyn M. Cooper in ""We Don't Belong Here, Do We?' A Response to *Lives on the Boundary* and The Violence of Literacy" address the way that marginalized students resist considering issues of their exclusion from the academic elite. Thus, reading and discussing *Lives on the Boundary*, which seems as if it would be an empowering assignment in a remedial writing class, turns out to be problematic when students resist Rose's depiction of the challenges they face in acquiring the education necessary to move them toward what the middle class deems the American dream. Yet this apparent contradiction can be seen another way. The same students may be conditioned to see the obstacles to their progress as being in themselves and not in a society that might be stacked against them. In fact, the American dream encourages this view of individual responsibility for success, putting the burden on students and not on institutions.

The problem with putting the burden on students, as Rose points out in *Lives*, is that even when given a chance to make up in remedial programs the education they missed, many students give up. The challenges they face are not only acquiring background knowledge and critical thinking skills, but also undoing the harmful effects of neglect and deficit labeling. Argues Rose, many students finally attribute their difficulties to something inborn, organic: "That part of my brain just doesn't work." Given the troubling histories many of these students have, it's miraculous that any of them
can lift the shroud of hopelessness sufficiently to make deliverance from these classes possible. (30-31)

While Rose himself did succumb for a while to hopelessness in high school, he had the help of his mentor Jack MacFarland and others. Yet, while Rose has become a valued professor, many of his Voc. Ed. classmates and other remedial students remain excluded from academia. Rose points out how society continues to exclude them in a paradoxical twist on America's beliefs in individual achievement. In Lives, Rose expands on this problem from his perspective as a teacher in a disadvantaged elementary school:

American meritocracy is validated and sustained by the deep-rooted belief in equal opportunity. But can we really say that kids like those I taught have equal access to America's education resources? Consider not only the economic and political barriers they face, but the fact, too, that judgments about their ability are made at a very young age, and those judgments, accurate or not, affect the curriculum they receive, their place in the school, they way they're defined institutionally. The insidious part of this drama is that, in the observance or the breach, students unwittingly play right into the assessments. Even as they rebel, they confirm the school's decision [...] There is no need for the elitist protection of quotas and exclusionary exams when a kid announces that he just wants to be average. If you want to insist that the children [we] taught had an equal opportunity in American schools, they you'll have to say that they had their equal chance and forfeited it before leaving the fourth grade. (128)

While his fourth grade students might not see the connections between classroom achievements and their future, Rose's older students do. As Rose makes clear in Lives, his adult students in the early 1980s saw exclusion from academic literacy as exclusion from the middle class. Rose documents this situation clearly in Lives, where he characterizes his classroom of Vietnam veterans as an "academic boot camp" that would prepare them to win not with bullets but with words (133). Rose says that his students saw their writing classes as "one last go at [education]" (134). They held
"onto an American dream: [that] [e]ducation held the power to equalize things," and that education was the way to move up in society, to move off the boundaries into the mainstream, to move "out of the pool of men society could count on so easily to shoot and be shot at" (137). On the simplest level, the veterans might have been remembering the academic deferments that allowed college students to avoid military service in Vietnam. On a larger level, these men may also have seen the connection between education and social power.

Rose describes the connection he sees between education and upward mobility in his interview with Bill Moyers shortly after the publication of *Lives*. Rose tells Moyers that his students had an eagerness to learn writing because they believed it was essential to their future:

They wanted to know how to do things with language. They knew damn well that to be able to do things with language was going to enable them to improve their lives. They held on to that American dream about education improving one's lot. I mean, by the time I was teaching them I was already beginning to get cynical about the reality of that dream. But for them it was real and vital. [...] It's astounding how tightly folks [...] have held to that American dream. (Tucher 222)

Rose does not want his cynicism about the realistic possibilities of his students to cloud their hopes. Rather, Rose wants to help his remedial students toward their futures by inviting them into the literacy club. Access to learning is the very inclusion Rose addresses.

Near the end of *Lives*, Rose uses an example to show how different educational settings affect not only a student's physical access to learning but also her ability to participate. Lilia is the Mexican immigrant I mentioned earlier in this chapter, a girl who had been labeled a slow learner and, as a consequence, had a poor opinion of
herself. As Rose reports what happened to Lilia through several primary and secondary schools and then after she participated in a summer program at UCLA for eighth graders called Migrants Engaged in New Themes of Education (MENTE), he makes his point:

In moving from one school to another — another setting, another set of social definitions — Lilia was transformed from dumb to normal. And then, with six powerful weeks as a child on a university campus — "opening new horizons for me, scary, but showing me what was out there" — she began to see herself in a different way, tentatively, cautiously. Lilia began the transition to smart, to high school honors classes, to UCLA. (241)

Thus, Lilia moved from exclusion to inclusion and became for Rose a sign of hope that those who fail (at one point) can succeed.

Rose's continual dedication to inclusion at individual and institutional levels has led me to assert inclusion as the theme that unifies Rose's oeuvre. Having looked at Rose's research on inclusion in this chapter and the previous one, I will turn in the next chapter to look closely at Lives on the Boundary and, to a lesser degree, at Possible Lives to see how this theme of inclusion is enacted and advocated in those two books.
Chapter Four: Inclusion in Lives on the Boundary and Possible Lives

This is a hopeful book about those who fail. Lives on the Boundary concerns language and human connection, literacy and culture... It is a book about the abilities hidden by class and cultural barriers. And it is a book about movement: about what happens as people who have failed begin to participate in the educational system that has seemed so harsh and distant to them.

Any consideration of Mike Rose's oeuvre must necessarily address Lives on the Boundary, the work for which he is most widely known both among the general public and his fellow scholars. Given my project of composing a reading of Rose based on a theme of inclusion, Lives has particular significance because its content, approach, theorizing and style strongly support the coherence I am suggesting. Lives' usefulness for a reading of Rose's oeuvre is strengthened by its timing. Coming in 1989, Lives anchors a productive period in Rose's career when his focus on inclusion was shifting from individuals to institutions. This same decade 1985-1995 saw Rose moving from cognitively-based research to a more socially grounded approach. Lives is valuable for the way it documents both this shift in focus and the gradual development of Rose's ideas about exclusion and inclusion. Finally, despite the many disappointing instances of student exclusion in Lives, the book also shows, in ways that the scholarly work cannot so easily show, Rose's hopefulness about student success, as the epigraph from Lives at the start of this chapter reveals.

Before embarking on a detailed consideration of Lives, let me give a brief overview. While it is useful to have a summary of events — and I will provide that shortly — it is more important to convey first the overall texture of the book. Lives is a
hybrid mix of literacy narrative, teaching narrative, memoir, autobiography, history of education, and theory written in a creative non-fiction style. This blurred genre is rich in detailed descriptions crafted with the eye and ear of the poet, which is not surprising considering that Rose edited his college literary magazine and has published many individual poems as well as a chapbook, *Melodious Bones*. Rose's interest in creative writing is shown by his dedicating nearly a whole chapter in *Lives* to his development as a poet in "The Poem is a Substitute for Love." Further, his article in *Vocational Guidance Quarterly* called "The Feel of a Writer's Work: An Inquiry into the Phenomenology of Work," characterizes the satisfactions of creative writing:

"Writers' values, personal concerns, charged memories, et cetera, find expression and shape through their work" (241). This comment seems particularly relevant in light of Rose's own experience in writing *Lives*.

In *Lives*, Rose's portraits of family, friends, teachers, and students – and, of course, of himself – bring the people to life, so that this book really is a collection of lives. Consider, for example, Rose's evocative sketch of Lou Minton, a man who began by renting one of Rose's family's tiny cabins and became Rose's stepfather after Rose's father died. This portrait of Minton is indicative of the way that Rose's characters seem inseparable from their settings. In this case, the setting is Rose's childhood home on South Vermont Avenue in a run-down working class neighborhood where life seemed "short and brutish or sad and aimless or long and quiet" (18):

The loneliness in Los Angeles fosters strange arrangements. Lou Minton was a wiry man with gaunt, chiseled features and prematurely gray hair, combed straight back. He had gone to college in the South for a year or two and kicked around the country for many more before
settling in L.A. He lived in a small downtown apartment with a single window and met my mother at the counter of Coffee Dans's [where she worked as a waitress]. He had been alone too long and eventually came to our house and became part of the family. [Lou had a car] and would take me to the vast, echoing library just west of Pershing Square and to the Museum of Science and Industry in Exposition Park. He bought me astronomy books, taught me how to use tools, and helped me build model airplanes from balsa wood and rice paper. As my father’s health got worse, Lou took care of him. (22-23)

The way Rose portrays Minton in this passage is typical of his technique throughout Lives, as Rose not only characterizes the people he encounters but adds the flavor of his experiences with them. As he writes later in Lives, "[i]t is an unfortunate fact of our psychic lives that the images that surround us as we grow up – no matter how much we may scorn them later – give shape to our deepest needs and longings" (44). Thus Rose's childhood home — with the small, almost shabby house, where his family moved in hopes of a better future — would linger in Rose's memory and color his experiences. Often in Lives, Rose evokes the emotional effects of his childhood and his classrooms.

During these years, Rose attended parochial primary and secondary schools along with rowdy, tough boys drawn from multi-ethnic working class neighborhoods. With his classmates in the Voc Ed track, Rose spent sophomore English reading aloud from Julius Caesar, reshuffling parts to begin again until the semester was over. When Rose was moved into the College Prep track, Jack MacFarland, his senior English teacher, became his mentor. MacFarland not only inspired Rose about literature, he also arranged for Rose to attend Loyola University, helping with admissions, tuition, and, later, additional tutoring. Rose writes vignettes of his
childhood and schooling with skill, vivid observation, and psychological insight. Still, Rose moves quickly over this period, covering ten years of his life in just thirty pages.

After setting the background, Rose details his college experiences at Loyola. As he describes his classes, his professors, and his slow progress mastering analytical academic thinking and catching up on material he had missed while in the Voc Ed classes, he generalizes about how people learn. Interwoven with sections of academic analysis are personal stories: his father's death, his stepfather's suicide. Simply, almost casually, he shows the affective as well as the socio-economic effects on his education. Later in Lives, Rose uses episodes from his high school and college years to exemplify these effects.

As Rose describes his college education and his entry into a graduate program in English at UCLA, the direction of Lives seems to shift. Rose stops sharing as many personal details of his private life. Instead, he turns the focus on his students, his experiences in the classroom, and his developing theories of education as he recalls the years he spent with the Teacher's Corps, then teaching in a variety of classrooms, and finally working at UCLA's Tutorial Center. The rest of Lives is a rich mix of narratives drawn from his interactions with students. Each interaction is followed by reflection and analysis, contextualized, from time to time, with brief background commentary about the history of education in the United States.

Thus, while Lives is partly a literacy narrative outlining Rose's education and entry into teaching and partly a teaching narrative grounded in his classrooms and tutoring sessions, it is not a detailed chronology of Rose's life or work. For example, Lives does not mention his scholarly research and writing, such as the research into
writing blocks he had conducted by the time of the book's publication. Only one of his scholarly articles – "The Language of Inclusion" – appears in the bibliography. Also, while Lives' timeframe stops around 1980 – just about the time Rose was starting his 1981 PhD dissertation – no reference to his doctoral program is made. Nor is Lives based on research in the way that his scholarly articles are. Thus, while Rose seems constantly alert to experiences that reveal how people learn, most of the material in Lives is drawn from recollections rather than resulting from research conducted on purpose for the book. I see Lives, then, as an inquiry into and an argument about the inclusion of underprepared, mostly working class, students, using Rose's own experiences along with those of his students as material for grounding his ideas and his theories.

The way that Lives provides details about students' home lives – picturing for readers how Rose did his homework in the small trailer behind his parents' house or describing Harold's mother sitting in her darkened living room – supports Rose's claims about how social situations affect students' success and inclusion in the classroom. This chapter, then, will address the various ways that Lives embodies Rose's theme of inclusion.

I will begin by showing how Lives documents inclusion and exclusion through examples of Rose's and his students' experiences, as well as through more traditional arguments about inclusionary and exclusionary practices. These narratives indicate how Rose sees inclusion and the factors that affect inclusion. The way Rose conducts interviews and analyzes the conversations in Lives resembles, less formally, the more detailed qualitative case study methodology that he employs in many of his scholarly
essays. Thus not only does Rose write about inclusion; he also uses an inclusionary methodology. As a teacher-researcher who goes beyond merely observing a student to becoming an active participant in the student's learning process, Rose works to ensure the inclusion of the students he studies. Also, in documenting his conversations with students by recording their own words and phrasing, Rose preserves their voices. Retaining the individuality of his student subjects gives them respect and authority.

In addition, in Lives, Rose reflects on his own life, evaluating and analyzing various episodes. As he does this, Rose writes in a way that moves from specific personal instances to generalizations, educational history and theory. This approach allows Rose to theorize and research in a non-academic yet rigorous way. By presenting academic analysis and theory in public discourse, Lives achieves an accessible style. Blending memoir, literacy narrative, teaching narrative, and history, Rose creates a hybrid text. This blurred genre technique enables Lives to reach a wide audience. By providing examples from Lives to show this method of analysis and by analyzing Lives' style, I will show how these strategies add to a unified reading of the oeuvre that focuses on inclusion. I will conclude with a brief look at Possible Lives.

Beginning, then, with the question of content, the very first page of Lives sets the pattern for stories about students struggling for acceptance. Rose opens Lives with the struggle of Laura, a student from a poor part of Tijuana who attempted Rose's remedial English class four times in her first year at UCLA and dropped out each time because she was afraid to "make lots of mistakes and look stupid" (1). Rose builds on Laura's situation and other examples through an extended analysis of his own experiences as a student and (later) teacher.
Rose's recollections of his years in the Voc Ed track ground his discussion of exclusion. As I mentioned in chapter two, neither Rose nor his parents understood what the system had done or knew enough to protest and rectify the error. Stories of his Voc Ed classmates who cope with their disillusionment at what they see as life's bad luck by aiming to be "average" create for readers an insider's view of student experience at that level. Rose supplements these Voc Ed experiences with his new struggles when he transfers into College Prep and later when he enters college and uses his experiences to examine how students in general might experience exclusion and inclusion.

One of the memorable profiles of Rose's own students comes as Rose enters the Teachers Corps. The extended documentation about Harold Morton, the illiterate fifth-grader whom I described in chapter two, mixes a teacher's compassionate efforts with a researcher's careful observations. Rose details his efforts at helping Harold read and write, reaching beyond the various diagnoses of Harold's deficiencies that implied that these efforts were hopeless. Descriptions of the thick impersonal reports about Harold's dreary progress through the disadvantaged public school where, time after time, Harold was excluded by institutional decisions and classroom practice, are combined with details of Rose's conversations with the boy about fishing and Rose's visits to Harold's house.

With Harold and other students, Rose typically moves from his interaction with a student to a subsequent analysis designed to help readers understand how the student is experiencing inclusion or exclusion. For example, consider the case of Suzette, the student in Basic English whom I described in my introduction. Suzette
had been sent to the UCLA Tutorial Center to learn how to correct her fragments.

Interviewing Suzette, Rose discovered that she made these errors in an attempt to approximate a more academic style. Here's how Rose describes his conversation with Suzette:

"I didn't want to keep putting 'She was, she was, she was.'" [said Suzette.]
"You were trying to avoid that kind of repetition? . . . Why? How did it sound to you?"
"Well, it's just not the way people write essays in college. . . . It doesn't sound very intelligent." (171)

Having determined Suzette's reasons for writing fragments in this way, Rose showed her new ways to create varied sentences. He then comments on the futility of standard tutoring approaches for remedying grammar errors by basic writers: "Going back over rules about sentences needing subjects and verbs would probably not do much good . . . [because] Suzette didn't have a damaged sentence generator" (171-2).

In his discussion of Suzette's composing process, Rose refers to Mina Shaughnessy who "used to point out that we won't understand the logic of error unless we also understand the institutional expectations that students face and the way they interpret and internalize them" (171-2). By describing Shaughnessy's theory in this way, Rose does two things: he provides necessary background for readers of *Lives* who might not be familiar with Shaughnessy's work, and he applies the theory to the situation. Further, when Rose shows samples of satisfactory sentences that Suzette produced on her own once she saw some models, he demonstrates that she is not cognitively deficient, a label often applied to students in remedial classes to justify their poor performance. Thus Rose shares with his general audience the arguments he
has advanced earlier in his academic articles. Rose does not overtly make a claim such as - "and this is how I came to understand exclusion" - but the message is clear.

Rose uses this same pattern of example and analysis in his research with Millie the adult literacy test taker (research I describe in chapter one), as well as in the cases of Lucia, Olga, and Willie Oates (which I describe in chapter two). In his studies of these students, Rose shows the ways that a personal approach can often give important perspectives about a topic like exclusion, perspectives that quantitative or interpretive studies might not reveal.

Rose's approach in Lives - a close reading of both his own and his students' experiences - repeats in a less academic manner the techniques Rose uses in his scholarly work. For example, the encounters with UCLA students at the tutorial center that Rose describes in Lives echo the more detailed analysis Rose did for his dissertation and monograph on writing blocks. Likewise, the same careful method of walking a student through a text that Rose describes in Lives when he shows Vietnam veteran Sergeant Gonzalez ways to read the poem “Butch Weldy” is repeated in a more exacting and analytical way when Rose probes his student Robert’s understanding of a poem for “This Wooden Shack Place” for College Composition and Communication. While Rose uses similar methods of interacting with both students, “This Wooden Shack” differs from the story of Sergeant Gonzalez in Lives in its detailed technical observations, its conversational analysis, its explicit methodology, and its academic discourse style. In Lives, Rose personalizes his writing by foregrounding the interactions between teacher and student.
Rose also personalizes *Lives* by including a number of stories about his own experiences as a student and as a teacher, yet from the start Rose makes it clear that *Lives* is not a traditional memoir:

This is not to say that I see my life as an emblem. Representative men are often overblown characters; they end up distorting their own lives and reducing the complexity of the lives they claim to represent. But there are some things about my early life, I see now, that are reflected in other working-class lives I’ve encountered: the isolations of neighborhoods, information poverty, the limited means of protecting children from family disaster, the predominance of such disaster, the resilience of imagination, the intellectual curiosity and literate enticements that remain hidden from the schools, the feelings of scholastic inadequacy, the dislocations that come from crossing education boundaries. This book begins, then, with autobiography — with my parents’ immigration, my neighborhood, and my classrooms — but moves outward to communities beyond mine, to new encounters with schooling, to struggles to participate in the life of the mind. Those who are the focus of our national panic [literacy crisis] reveal themselves here. (9)

Thus Rose clarifies that *Lives* is broadly about working class students and not just about himself. He says this another way in his interview with Susan Palo after the publication of *Lives*: "I'm using the family portraits and my own life in service of a larger point. It somehow makes the personal stuff less, well, confessional and self-referenced to use it as part of an argument about our misperceptions of the intellectual capacity of poor people" (20). In saying this, Rose shows how his has chosen his method to advance his argument.

Despite *Lives*’ commitment to working class students, some social critics have seen the book as not radical enough or too accepting of the status quo. In his article "Articulation Theory and the Problem of Determination: A Reading of *Lives on the Boundary*," John Trimbur critiques the idea of narrative and particularly autobiography as bourgeois, arguing that:
The autobiographical impulse to narrate a life, therefore, is not a straightforward one but rather the result of a particularly bourgeois cultural project of making and owning a sovereign and inalienable life, free from the ascriptions of birth, status, and social obligation in traditional society. (244)

Although Trimbur is critical of autobiographical narratives in general, he does admire certain aspects of Lives, claiming that Rose has skillfully reinterpreted the genre:

*Lives on the Boundary* takes a lot of risks. To recount his life, Rose turns to the familiar coming of age narrative that has historically and culturally been encoded with the entrepreneurial values of individual initiative, professional maturity, and personal success. Rather than presenting a critical analysis to demystify the genre (as radical theorists typically do), Rose has sought to rearticulate the narrative from the inside – to disconnect its cultural meanings and political valence from its usual ideological function of reproducing capitalist social relations and instead to join together the narrativity of his own life to the ongoing struggle for democracy and social justice. (251)

It is this rearticulation of a usually self-centered and expressivist genre for broad social goals that persuades Trimbur, who finally praises Rose's work, observing that "[f]or Rose, literacy is a matter not simply of the limits of an oppressive social order" (250).

Finally, Trimbur argues, Rose has taken the "master narrative" and used it to speak against American culture (250). Rose, says Trimbur, sees "literacy [as a] quite concrete pressure ... that surrounds all Americans and can be tapped for the purposes of human development and liberation" (250). And, in fact, this is just what Rose has done with *Lives*. Rose has taken a literacy narrative or memoir and used his own life and examples from students' lives to connect with readers, even readers who are the very students he describes. While marginalized or non-traditional students undoubtedly comprise only a small percentage of his primary audience, Rose clearly honors and respects them. Moreover, by intertwining his own life experiences with those of his students, Rose builds credibility.
Rose's intertwining of experience and reflection forms an important part of his method of theorizing, which I see as one of Lives' most effective features. What Rose does is elucidate a detailed personal example by following it with generalization and analysis. For example, after describing his own experiences in school, he provides brief summaries of education in America in order to situate his experience in context and reveal its significance as a relevant example. This method is similar to the way scholars explain quotes by following them with interpretation. One of the many examples of this technique in Lives occurs when Rose describes the cognitive challenges he faced when he was transferred from his high school's vocational program to the College Prep track. Rose extrapolates from his personal experience to how students in remedial programs feel and uses this to elaborate on general theories about education. In the following discussion, I have emphasized the sentences where Rose moves from personal story to analysis.

In the first example, Rose begins by pointing out that the classroom habits he acquired in Voc. Ed. didn't match the expectations in College Prep: "I was an erratic student. I was undisciplined. And I hadn't caught onto the rules of the game: Why work hard in a class that didn't grab my fancy?" (30). Another problem Rose faced was catching up on material he had never mastered. In math class, for example, he recognizes the types of problems that are assigned, but he cannot remember how to solve them. He says, "Let me try to explain how it feels to see again and again material you should once have learned but didn't" (30, emphasis mine). Rose uses his reaction to this situation to generalize about how students finally stop struggling with difficult assignments: "the tension wins out and your attention flits elsewhere. You
crumple the paper and begin daydreaming to ease the frustration" (30). This image of the perplexed and angry student embarrassed at not knowing how to do the work he should have learned is probably familiar to many teachers. Here, in Lives, Rose helps readers imagine how the students' frustration leads them to give up. Rose says that many students in remedial classes experience the same problems he did of being embarrassed, angry, and frustrated at their inability to follow the assignments. By showing how students give up and "crumple the paper," Rose demonstrates how emotions affect learning. Further, and what may have longer lasting effects, is what happens to these students' beliefs. Rose claims that they decide their problems are due to their own deficiencies:

No wonder so many students finally attribute their difficulties to something inborn, organic: "That part of my brain just doesn't work." Given the troubling histories many of these students have, it's miraculous that any of them can lift the shroud of hopelessness sufficiently to make deliverance from these classes possible. (30-31)

As Rose explains to readers how students in remedial programs experience their lack of success, the emphasized phrase – "let me try to explain how it feels" – marks the turn from a specific example to generalization, which allows Rose to advance to broader analysis. This is a typical rhetorical pattern in Lives. In this example, Rose moves smoothly to show how students in remedial programs come to view themselves as being cognitively deficient. By making such defeating self-assessments at the same time that well-intentioned remedial programs make similar deficit assessments about the students' intelligence, students work to exclude themselves even as the system segregates them. This tendency to define low achievement in terms of low intelligence hinders attempts to help students through remedial programs, a situation
that Rose argued against in "Narrowing the Mind and the Page." By couching his argument in a personal scene for *Lives*, Rose makes his academic material accessible to general readers.

Here's another example from *Lives* of this technique of moving from story to analysis. This case focuses on Rose's struggles in his first semester at Loyola. Though he was admitted to college (provisionally), Rose was hampered by his lack of general background information from his years in Voc. Ed., and this exacerbated his lack of assurance about his academic skills. Looking back at his first semester, says Rose, "I begin to remember what a disengaged, half-awake time it really was. I'll describe two of the notebooks I found " (42). Rose's description of this notebook as holding merely sporadic lists of titles and miscellaneous facts with no clear understandings from the lectures reminds him how ill-prepared he was to follow the professor's arguments. Analyzing the lack of coherence in his notes leads Rose to point out how unclear his thinking was. Rose tells readers that he was "out of my league," and he generalizes that this is a common feeling for underprepared students (43). He also draws on his experience to show why confused and underprepared students often do not take advantage of available assistance. Instead of seeking out his professors during their office hours, he stayed away for fear of revealing his ignorance. Says Rose, "If I had had the sense, I would have gone, but they struck me as aloof and somber men, and I felt stupid telling them I was . . . well – stupid" (41-43). Again, by reflecting on his own experience, Rose helps readers understand how students can be excluded from education. Using personal anecdotes from both high school and from college, Rose points to the pervasiveness of the problem in different grade levels and settings.
Showing readers how underprepared students experience their situation, Rose demonstrates that anger, fear, or embarrassment affect a student's ability to perform regardless of natural intelligence.

In the preceding passages, Rose again moves from describing specifics about his life to demonstrating the effects of being unprepared. This technique of using personal examples to move toward theory is particularly effective for public discourse because it helps readers connect examples with theory and, thus, not only follow his arguments about student exclusion and inclusion but also participate and be included in his analytical process.

Rose also applies this method of moving from story to analysis beyond his own experiences. As I noted at the start of this chapter, Rose begins Lives with sketches of first-year UCLA students who tell him that they are finding college work cognitively challenging. Rose explains that Bobby had shone at his inner-city high school and had participated in Rose's summer preparatory program yet the young man still finds himself overwhelmed by the cognitive difficulty of the assignments he faces in the university's linguistics class: "They're asking me to do things I don't know how to do," Bobby says (5). He follows his description of that conversation with an analysis of what is at stake for students who had excelled in high school but now find themselves baffled by the academic demands of the university and falling behind in their work. Students like Bobby have trouble understanding why the learning strategies that had worked in high school no longer work at college. They cannot imagine that they could go from success to failure in so short a time. Bobby's rhetorical question – "We don't belong at UCLA, do we?" – highlights the exclusion
that is at stake for him and others like him (5). By foregrounding the risk of failure and exclusion these students face, Rose establishes his inclusionary theme in Lives right at the beginning.

As these examples suggest, in Lives Rose demonstrates a sophisticated sense of rhetorical situation and appeals. His blend of narrative, analysis, history, and theory yields a book that appeals to a broad readership. Mindful of his scholarly audience yet not wanting to put off "ordinary" readers, Rose crafted a compromise in terms of academic conventions. Lives provides brief endnotes referencing citations, but since these endnotes are not superscripted, readers are not distracted though they also might not realize the notes exist. Instead of an academic works cited page, Rose ends Lives with a brief bibliography. Nor is an index provided. The book, then, accommodates the varying needs of his readers.

The hybrid style of Lives serves as a useful example of how to present academic analysis for public use. Some other authors have used a similar style for similar purposes. For example, in their blurred genre style, use of personal narrative to focus on the education of working class ethnic students, and argument about educational policies, Lives resembles Richard Rodriguez's 1981 literacy memoir Hunger of Memory. In fact, these two texts are often paired on reading lists and in curricula. One difference is that Lives analyzes students, classrooms, and teaching methods in a more applicable manner.

Rose describes in the preface to Lives how he came to this hybrid writing approach:

In trying to present the cognitive and social reality of [the educational underclass of underprepared students] – the brains as well as the heart
of it – I have written a personal book. The stories of my work with literacy interweave with the story of my own engagement with language. Lives on the Boundary is both vignette and commentary, reflection and analysis. I didn’t know how else to get it right. (xii)

A little later, at the end of Lives’ first chapter, “Our Schools and Our Children,” Rose comments again on how form followed function as he drafted his narrative:

I started this book as an account of my own journey from the high school vocational track up through the latticework of the American university. At first I tried brief sketches: a description of the storefront commerce that surrounded my house in South Los Angeles, a reminiscence about language lessons in grammar school and the teachers I had in Voc. Ed., some thoughts on my first disorienting year in college. But as I wrote, the landscapes and inhabitants of the sketches began to intersect with other places, other people: schools I had worked in, children and adults I had taught. It seemed fruitful to articulate, to probe and carefully render the overlay of my scholastic past and my working present. The sketches grew into a book that, of necessity, mixed genres. Autobiography, case study, commentary – it was all of a piece. (8)

This style, then, serves Rose’s theorizing to embody and advance his inclusionary project.

Rose’s style is not without risks, however. One such risk is the possibility that Rose’s text might be less often engaged by scholars. In an interview with me, Rose acknowledged the price he has paid for his inclusionary style. His comment, discussed in chapter one, is worth repeating here:

Take a book like Lives on the Boundary or Possible Lives, say, and it’s so interesting how many people love that book but [the books] never appear in people’s bibliography. Say somebody’s writing about social class and composition and [they] quote Henry Giroux who writes about political theory, yet they won’t quote from Lives, and why is that? One reason is that [Lives] is not a specially theorizing book; [it] does not enter the academic conversation with the specific theorizing moves that academic conversations tend to be based on – and yet the reviews – maybe David Bartholomae [was one who pointed out] the way the theorizing is embedded in the narrative. [Lives] doesn’t foreground the theory and doesn’t put neon lights around it. [And this lack of
foregrounding] wouldn't affect the practitioner folks but it would affect whether Lives gets cited in some articles in CCC [College Composition and Communication] about social class and composition. (Rose)

While Lives on the Boundary was warmly received by the academic community, as indicated by favorable reviews in academic journals, by the fact that it won both the MLA's Mina P. Shaughnessy Prize and the CCCC Outstanding Book Award, and by the frequency with which it is excerpted in college readers, Rose's claim in the interview above shows that he sees the fact of its style and non-traditional methods of theorizing as having limited its academic use.

Rose is not along in having his work discounted because it does not follow the conventions of academic discourse. In her forthcoming book Situating Composition: Composition Studies and the Politics of Location, Lisa Ede addresses the issues scholars face when choosing a less academic writing style. Explains Ede,

bell hooks has written on numerous occasions about her determination to write scholarly books that "ordinary" people can read. As a consequence of her refusal to follow such scholarly conventions as footnoting, hooks's work has at times been challenged. In "Theory as Liberatory Practice," hooks observes that "Students at various academic institutions often complain that they cannot include my work on required reading lists for degree-oriented qualifying exams because their professors do not see it as scholarly enough." (71, qtd in Ede 291).

Like Rose, hooks' determination to write books that "ordinary" people can read has caused some scholars to devalue her contribution.

There are benefits, as well as risks, of Rose's accessible style, for works like Lives have the potential to influence public policy in a way that more scholarly texts do not. As I mentioned in chapter one, this is an issue that Bruce Herzberg addresses in "Service Learning and Public Discourse," an article that calls for scholars to write texts that can play a role in public policy debates. Herzberg points out that Lester
Faigley, chairman of the 1996 conference for *College Composition and Communication* told the convention audience that "writing teachers and all academics [should] enter public discourse, not only to present our world for ourselves but also to engage in the serious questions of public policy that affect us and about which we have knowledge to share" (466). Herzberg cites Rose as one who "has shown how to straddle the line between academic analysis and public discourse," and thus acknowledges Rose's contribution to the field and to public debate about education (466).

This is a contribution that Rose continues with *Possible Lives*, for, like *Lives*, *Possible Lives* also blends description with passages of academic analysis as Rose researches a variety of primary and secondary classrooms around the country where successful inclusionary teaching practices are taking place. In an interview conducted after *Possible Lives* was published, Rose explained his goals:

[T]he main reason I wrote *Possible Lives* was to enrich the conversation about public education. A friend of mine calls it granularity: engaging in the particular, trying to document case after case of positive teaching approaches. Over the past decade, public discussion about public schools has shifted from criticism to dismissal and despair. It has the effect of shutting down our vision of what is possible. I wanted to complicate the public conversation about public schools — not just to argue, "Ah, ladies and gentlemen, I have found 50 great public school classrooms. Therefore, the glass is half full."

Rather, my intention was to ask: What do these classrooms represent to us? What possibilities do they give rise to? What can we learn from these exemplars? (Scherer para 10-11)

*Possible Lives* differs from *Lives* in that it is grounded in case studies of classrooms that Rose visited, rather than in Rose's own experience. In *Possible Lives*, Rose is an observer on the scene, watching and listening to teachers and students and recording these scenes with the same rich description, details, and dialogue that he uses in *Lives*. 
Individuals come to life in extended and evocative narratives and interviews. Yet even though Rose is in these classrooms to conduct research, he also intervenes, at times, to help struggling students. This participatory approach to his research is characteristic of Rose and consistent with an inclusive pedagogy. Because of the resemblances in content and approach, theorizing and writing style between the two books, I see *Possible Lives* as a kind of sequel to *Lives*. 

Given those similarities, what is new or different in *Possible Lives*? One answer is the even stronger sense of hopefulness that this work conveys. In *Possible Lives*, Rose doesn't just argue that a change to a more inclusionary educational practice is possible; he demonstrates how it can and does happen. Another difference is revealed in the titles of the two books. I see a shift in mood from an image of students hovering on the boundaries of education to an image of students moving toward fulfilling their potential. This move toward greater hopefulness recalls the epigraph from *Lives* that opens this chapter:

> This is a hopeful book about those who fail... it is a book about movement: about what happens as people who have failed begin to participate in the educational system that has seemed so harsh and distant to them. (xi)

While Rose characterizes *Lives on the Boundary* as "a hopeful book about those who fail," I see *Possible Lives* as a hopeful book about those who succeed. I do not want to exaggerate this difference because both books show achievements and successes, yet I do sense a distinction that a comparison of the books' subtitles suggests. The paperback edition of *Lives* is subtitled *A Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of America's Educationally Underprepared* (vi). On the other hand, *Possible Lives* is subtitled *The Promise of Public Education in America*. Thus, I see a
somewhat more optimistic tone in *Possible Lives*. The educational progress students make in these exemplary classrooms works to ensure their inclusion as they move toward college. Such successful students would have fewer of the struggles that Rose describes so well in *Lives*, and, therefore, would be less at risk for exclusion. That movement toward greater inclusion gives *Possible Lives* a kind of fulfillment. For both books, the emphasis on "lives" in the titles reflects the way the books emphasize students, whether at-risk students crossing the boundaries between exclusion and inclusion in the first book or students moving ahead fulfilling their potential in the second.

By comparing content, methods, and style in *Lives* and *Possible Lives*, I hope readers see how they work together to support a reading of Rose's oeuvre as unified by a theme of inclusion. The perceived unity of this reading is important because it facilitates the identification and, therefore, the expanded application of Rose's many contributions. I will summarize these contributions in the concluding chapter that follows.
Conclusion: Rereading Rose

*We are in the middle of an extraordinary social experiment: the attempt to provide education for all members of a vast pluralistic democracy. To have any prayer of success, we'll need many conceptual blessings: A philosophy of language and literacy that affirms the diverse sources of linguistic competence and depends our understanding of the ways class and culture blind us to the richness of those sources. A perspective on failure that lays open the logic of error. An orientation toward the interaction of poverty and ability that undercuts simple polarities, that enables us to see simultaneously the constraints poverty places on the play of mind and the actual mind at play within those constraints. We'll need a pedagogy that encourages us to step back and consider the threat of the standard classroom and that shows us, having stepped back, how to step forward to invite a student across the boundaries of that powerful room. Finally, we'll need a revised store of images of educational excellence, ones closer to egalitarian ideals – ones that embody the reward and turmoil of education in a democracy, that celebrate the plural, messy human reality of it. At heart, we'll need a guiding set of principles that do not encourage us to retreat from, but move us closer to, an understanding of the rich mix of speech and ritual and story that is America.*
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In this epigraph that appears near the end of *Lives on the Boundary*, Mike Rose admits that the road toward inclusion is not easy. Earlier in *Lives* he had warned that "it would be an act of hollow and evil optimism to downplay the problems of American schools" (7). Rose never denies the challenge, but by the end of *Lives* and in *Possible Lives*, Rose outweighs pessimism with possibility. I want always to remember the quote from *Lives* that could be Rose's motto: what fosters learning "is hope, everyday heroics" (242). The road to inclusion, then, is a road that leads to hope.

Those who participate in these everyday heroics are students and their teachers, working together in a classroom. Community college classrooms offer me a
chance to be one of those everyday heroes helping students achieve their dreams.

Thinking of those classrooms reminds me of the many wonderful experiences I have had with my students.

One experience in particular comes to mind. It took place in a writing class at Rogue Community College in Grants Pass, Oregon. At the beginning of fall term 2001, Phil M., a 44-year old father of three and long-time janitor at a local high school, came into my classroom with great anxiety. He shyly confided that he had always wanted to become a middle school mathematics teacher but feared he couldn’t handle the writing requirements. “I’ve never written an essay before in my life,” he said fumbling with his books and folders. “I don’t even know what an essay looks like.” I reassured him that learning how to construct an essay in Writing 115: Introduction to Expository Writing was like learning any other skill. “I’ll show you what essays look like and how writers build them,” I told him. “It’s just a process. We’ll go step by step.”

The rewards of helping students like Phil encouraged me to enter OSU’s graduate program so that I could do more to open the academy to those who might otherwise be left out. I want to do what Rose advocates in Lives: step forward to invite a student across the boundaries (238). That desire to reach out is what motivated me to write this thesis.

Now that I am concluding this project, I want to do several things. I want to revisit briefly Rose’s contributions to the study of rhetoric and composition. I also want to look toward future assessments of Rose, whose work offers other rich fields
for inquiry. After doing this, I will return to the theme of inclusion that unifies Rose's oeuvre and gives hope to his vision of education, and to my own.

Throughout this thesis, I have emphasized Rose's many varied contributions to research in rhetoric and composition and to public discussions of education. I would like to summarize these contributions here. Rose's contributions include his important early research on writing blocks, which continue to be cited in the literature. I see two main benefits from his writing block work. First, Rose's research into the ways students block themselves is an important insight that can help me and other teachers work with our students. Second, his demonstration of the various internal logics behind these blocks helps dispel notions of cognitive deficit that so often accompany writing anxiety and resultant failures. In several works, but especially in "Narrowing the Mind and Page," Rose seeks to remove reductionist labels that imply cognitive deficits. Such labels hamper students more than help them and serve to exclude more often than to include.

Connected to this work on writing blocks and growing out of it are Rose's significant contributions on the social-cognitive and socially-constructed aspects of writing. Rose's collaborative work with Glynda Hull investigating student-teacher cognitive dissonance forms a major part of this research. In "This Wooden Shack," Rose and Hull investigate the disparities (and inequalities) in student versus traditional literary interpretations, thereby foregrounding an issue that pertains to both literature and composition classrooms. Every teacher grapples with ways to recognize and handle differing student readings of texts. Building on these different readings, Rose and Hull provide an important look at the ways that teachers assess their students'
intelligence. These sometimes limiting judgments that teachers make based on misreading their students' behavior can have exclusionary consequences. Rose and Hull challenge educators to look for the logic in what appears to be erroneous thinking by students. I find these insights particularly useful for community college classrooms where students arrive with varying backgrounds and reading practices, but the insights are relevant to all teaching.

Another of Rose's contributions to the field of composition study is his theory of cognitive sequencing in the teaching of writing. As I explained in chapter one, this theory stresses the need to teach cognitive skills such as summarizing, classifying, and analysis in order of complexity, building on each other. In Lives, in several important scholarly articles, and in his coauthored textbook, Rose advances this pedagogy with its interdisciplinary emphasis. I see this contribution as valuable for teaching writing at all levels, but, perhaps, particularly in community college classrooms because many community college students have not completed high school and, therefore, might have missed lessons in critical thinking. By considering their students' prior learning experiences and whether or not the students might have had certain skills before, teachers can make the more effective choices when selecting textbooks and curriculum to help the students move ahead. By writing Critical Strategies, Rose and Kiniry contribute a useful curriculum for inclusion.

Any consideration of students' prior educational experiences must also include an awareness of students' background and social situations. In case after case in Lives, Rose shows how students in the classroom do not exist in a vacuum but come to class from home cultures to which they return when the bell rings. Rose's portrayal in Lives
of the challenges facing students — such as the single mother Lucia struggling with reading Thomas Szasz — shows a teacher-researcher's interest in going beyond the classroom walls to understand his students. By making students' locations explicit, Rose reminds readers how the entirety of students' lives affects their experiences in school. This "messy human reality" is what teachers must remember (238). This attention to students as whole and complicated people and the view of them as worthy participants in the classroom point to a socially constructed pedagogy. By replacing facts and figures with faces, Lives provides teachers with valuable insights as they move from theory to classroom practice. In Lives, Possible Lives, and in all of Rose's research, a preference for a qualitative approach that is materially grounded in his experiences is consistent with his powerful commitment to students' inclusion.

In summarizing Rose's contributions, I want to go beyond the theories and emphasize the importance of the books Lives and Possible Lives themselves. Their value is greater than the sum of their theories, research, examples, and style. As texts, the books have lives of their own, inspiring educators to greater hope about how much their teaching can make a difference. Finally, I want to acknowledge the personal factor and note that Rose has given teachers a powerful, compassionate metaphor of education as an invitation and an embrace.

As I look back now at Rose's many contributions, I want to reemphasize how I see all his work leading toward inclusion, particularly for the underprepared or those whose cultures or backgrounds make it harder for them to move quickly and seamlessly into mainstream academic life. This inclusionary effort is particularly persuasive in Lives where Rose's blurred genre style introduces important ideas about
education into the public discussion. I hope my analysis of Rose's use of this style shows its effectiveness. Such a style is aptly suited to his commitment to inclusion.

If similar writing becomes increasingly popular for scholars, it will be due in part, I believe, to Rose's books. Lives on the Boundary and Possible Lives provide a valuable service in bridging the academic and public worlds.

Although my thesis stops with Possible Lives, Rose's research continues, so I would like to mention it briefly. In his forthcoming book, The Mind at Work: Valuing the Intelligences of American Workers, Rose reuses the blurred genre style of Lives and Possible Lives and repeats the patterns in those books of making academic research accessible for a general audience. Rose considers cognition outside the classroom, exploring the various intelligences of non-academic work. The book incorporates and modifies some of his recent research, including three studies about learning in a hands-on manner. The first of these, his 1999 "Our Hands Will Know: The Development of Tactile Diagnostic Skill," describes the way students in a physical therapy program acquire skills to treat their patients' needs. His 2000 "Teaching Tools" narrates observations of troubled teens in an alternative program learning to trouble-shoot plumbing problems. In "Widening the Lens on Standardized Patient Assessment: What the Encounter Can Reveal about the Development of Clinical Competence," (2001), Rose and his coauthor LuAnn Wilkerson use a recall protocol to investigate how medical students refine their diagnoses through improved patient interviews.

In The Mind at Work, Rose continues his method in Lives, blending materially grounded research and analysis with narrative examples. For example, the new book's
version of "The Working Life of a Waitress" removes some of the empirical data included when the article was first printed in the journal *Mind, Culture, and Activity* (2001) as a sociological study of cognition skills in the restaurant business and adds more biographical narration about his mother's working years.

This new work by Rose on situated non-academic cognition suggests one line of research for future scholars of Rose to pursue. The question of differently valued intelligences that Rose raises opens a second line of research on Rose: a consideration of how Rose's work argues for a more inclusive and equitable American democracy, particularly in the current political climate with its calls for a narrow back-to-basics focus in education and its struggles with increasingly multicultural classrooms. A third line of inquiry into Rose's oeuvre could arise as scholars begin to reassess composition scholarship of the 1970s and 80s. I hope that when this happens Rose's contributions will receive more attention. As part of this reconsideration, others might find it helpful to look at Rose's oeuvre in the context of Berlin's taxonomies as a kind of test case of the merits and limitations of those taxonomies. Whether these or other lines of research are pursued, I look forward to more work addressing Rose in the years ahead.

In suggesting other avenues of research on Rose, I am aware that future scholars may read Rose in ways that I have not. While I have tried to demonstrate the inclusive theme I see in his oeuvre, I appreciate Rose's diversity and recognize the possibility of other perspectives. As Kenneth Burke has pointed out, any "reflection of reality, by its very nature... must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a deflection of reality" (45). Thus, my own reading via inclusion
inevitably excludes other views. For example, I can envision a possible reading around a theme of situated cognition – focused on how and why people learn or fail to learn in certain circumstances – as a way of tying the new book, *The Mind at Work*, to his early writing block research. Such a project might also lead to questions about how fruitful it might be to consider Rose's oeuvre in the light of educational psychology, the field in which he received his doctorate and in which he teaches currently at UCLA's Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. But in pointing out ways of reading against the grain of my thesis and imagining other projects on Rose, I want to leave readers with a clear sense of the advantages I see in composing this reading of his oeuvre around inclusion. These advantages include making the work more readily accessible and applicable.

In the end, I want to draw readers' attention to the positive effects of Rose's emphasis on inclusion. Although Rose began by addressing the exclusion/inclusion tension in the negative – pointing out practices, theories, and policies that result in exclusion – *Lives on the Boundary* justifiably calls itself a "hopeful book about those who fail" because it documents how some who failed at one point (including Rose himself) later succeeded (xi). Countering sad stories of students, such as fifth grader Harold Morton, *Lives* offers stories of success. Near the end of *Lives*, Rose tells of the successful return to graduate school of Concepcion Baca, a student from Rose's first freshman summer writing program. Baca left UCLA after two years but finally returned to finish her studies and pursue a dissertation. In sharing her story, Rose points out "how much of myself I saw in her," (204), a student who finally found her way back in. Rose's move from a focus on exclusion in the 1979 "When Faculty Talk
about Writing" to an emphasis on promise and possibility in 1995 in *Possible Lives* is Rose's ultimate message about inclusion and hope. This is the reading of Rose I leave with my readers.
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Chronological List of Titles by Rose in this Thesis
(Includes work single authored and coauthored, single edited and co-edited)

1979
"When Faculty Talk about Writing."

1980
"Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block."

1981
"The Cognitive Dimension of Writer's Block: An Examination of University Students."
"The Feel of a Writer's Work: An Inquiry into the Phenomenology of Work."
"Teaching University Discourse."

1983
"Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal."
"Speculations on Process Knowledge and the Textbook's Static Page."

1984
*Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension.*

1985
"Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research."
"The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University."
*Melodious Bones.*
*When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems.*

1988
"Narrowing the Mind and the Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism."
*Perspectives on Literacy.*
"Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."

1989
"Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."
*Lives on the Boundary.*
"The Social Construction of Remediation."
"Response to Richard Rorty's Speech 'Education, Socialization & Individuation.'"

1990
"This Wooden Shack Place: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading."
*Critical Strategies for Academic Writing: Cases, Assignments, and Readings.*
1st ed.

1991
"Education Standards Must Be Reclaimed for Democratic Ends."
"Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse."

1993
*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text with Readings.*
2nd ed.
*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text and Reader (Teacher Workbook)* 2nd ed.

1995
*Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America.*

1997
"Saving Public Education."

1998
*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text With Readings.*
3rd ed.

1999
"On Values, Work, and Opportunity: We May Be Selling Our Young People Short."
"'Our Hands Will Know': The Development of Tactile Diagnostic Skill – Teaching, Learning, and Situated Cognition in a Physical Therapy Program."

2000
"Teaching Tools."

2001
"A Call for the Teaching of Writing in Graduate Education."
"The Working Life of a Waitress."
"Widening the Lens on Standardized Patient Assessment: What the Encounter Can Reveal about the Development of Clinical Competence."
*Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook.*
Appendix B

Subject Index of Works by Rose in this Thesis
(Includes work single authored and coauthored, single edited and co-edited)

*Note: Many of Rose’s works touch on more than one subject; therefore, some works are listed more than once.*

Academic Discourse:

"A Call for the Teaching of Writing in Graduate Education."
"The Language of Exclusion."
"Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal."
"When Faculty Talk About Writing."

Cognitive Composition Research/Writer’s Block:

"Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer’s Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research."
*When a Writer Can’t Write: Studies in Writer’s Block and Other Composing-Process Problems*
*Writer’s Block: The Cognitive Dimension*

Cognition and Learning (other than Composition):

"On Values, Work, and Opportunity: We May Be Selling Our Young People Short."
"Our Hands Will Know.: The Development of Tactile Diagnostic Skill – Teaching Learning, and Situated Cognition in a Physical Therapy Program."
"Teaching Tools."
"Widening the Lens on Standardized Patient Assessment: What the Encounter Can Reveal about the Development of Clinical Competence."
"The Working Life of a Waitress."

Inclusion:

"Mike Rose." In *Bill Moyers: A World of Ideas II: Public Opinions from Private Citizens.*
"Education Standards Must Be Reclaimed for Democratic Ends."
*Lives on the Boundary.*
*Mike Rose: Educating the Disadvantaged.*
"Narrowing the Mind and the Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism."
"On Values, Work, and Opportunity: We May Be Selling Our Young People Short."
Inclusion, continued.

*Possible Lives.*
Possibilities for Children."
Response to Richard Rorty's Speech 'Education, Socialization & Individuation.'"

Literacy Issues:

*Lives on the Boundary.*
*Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook.*
*Perspectives on Literacy.*
*Possible Lives.*

Logic of Student Errors:

*Possible Lives.*
"Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."
"This Wooden Shack Place."
"Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."

Pedagogy & Textbooks:

*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text with Readings.*
3rd ed.
*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text and Reader.*
2nd ed.
*Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing: A Text with Readings.*
2nd ed.
*Critical Strategies for Academic Writing: Cases, Assignments, and Readings.*
1st ed.
"An Interview with Mike Rose: 'Imagine a Writing Program.'"
"Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal."

Remediation:

*Lives on the Boundary.*
"Narrowing the Mind and the Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism."
"Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal."
"Remediation as a Social Construct"
"Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."
"Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."
Student-Teacher Mismatch:

*Possible Lives.*
"Remediation as a Social Construct."
"This Wooden Shack Place."
"Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."
Appendix C

Extended Annotated Bibliography of Selected Works by Mike Rose
(Includes work single authored and coauthored, single edited and co-edited)

Note: The passages excerpted in italics are ones I find particularly representative or characteristic of the text or as opening interesting questions into the text.


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This collection of essays updates and expands the 1988 anthology Perspectives on Literacy with the addition of Cushman as a new co-editor. Several authors appear in both collections with different essays, e.g. Ong, Havelock, Heath, and four specific essays reappear. In particular, this new collection includes Bartholomae's "Inventing the University" originally from Rose's edited anthology When a Writer Can't Write and reprinted in Perspectives on Literacy. Every essay has previously appeared in journals such as College Composition and Communication or other collections such as Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The editors updated the older edition both to accommodate changes for the new century and to broaden the critical scope. The introduction says that the earlier Perspectives on Literacy was to "offer a range of perspectives on what was then more of an emerging field: Literacy studies. As well, we hoped our collection would equip readers with material to better understand and respond to educational issues of the time" (2). Further, literacy studies has become a developed field with a "social turn." The categories reflect "the field's 'big ideas'" (3)

BRIEF SUMMARY: This collection of 38 essays is divided into seven sections: Technologies for Literacy; Literacy, Knowledge, and Cognition; Histories of Literacy in the United States; Literacy Development; Culture and Community; Power, Privilege, and Discourse; Mobilizing Literacy: Work and social Change. Part six has the most focus on academic discourse, reprinting Bartholomae's "Inventing the University." James Paul Gee's "Introduction to Literacy" and discussion of Discourses along with Lisa Delpit's critique show how composition teachers attempt to acculturate students into academic discourse, which involves not only showing them what to say and when and how, but also offering them a chance to live in the academic world.

EXCERPT: In his essay "The Nineteenth-Century Origins of Our Times," Harvey J. Graff writes, Pessimists, the great majority, promoted education for the poor to train them to accept their inferior status – the desire was to control the lower class, not assist in their
advancement. They believed that properly religious and moral education could replace vice, idleness, and disorder among the poor with virtue, order, and happiness. (213)

* * * * *

Hull, Glynda and Mike Rose. "Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing." Written Communication 6 (Apr 1989): 139-54

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The authors' note says: "An earlier version of this article was presented at the Right to Literacy Conference in Columbus, Ohio, September 1988. (see "Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing")

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: This article "describes a research project on remediation at the community college, state college, and university levels designed to provide ... information ... [about the] large number of students [who] enter American higher education unprepared for the reading and writing tasks they encounter" (139). This work was supported by "the Spenser Foundation, the Center for the Study of Writing, and the James S. McDonnell Foundation Program in Cognitive Studies for Educational Practice" (139).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Because this is very nearly the same article as the 1988 "Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing," this summary and excerpt are briefer. Here, the authors state that they:

focus on a piece of writing produced by a student in an urban community college, examining it in the context of the student's past experience with schooling, her ideas about reading and writing, the literacy instruction she was receiving, and her plans and goals for the future. Our analyses suggest that the student's writing, though flawed according to many standards, demonstrates a fundamental social and psychological reality about discourse — how human beings continually appropriate each other's language to establish group membership, to grow, and to define themselves in new ways. (139)

EXCERPT: Compare with the excerpt given for the former version of the article, "Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing."

Labeled "remedial," "nontraditional," "developmental," "underprepared," "nonmainstream," these students take special courses and participate in special programs designed to qualify them to do academic work. Yet, we do not know very much about what it is that cognitively and socially defines such students as remedial. (139)

* * * * *
Hull, Glynda and Mike Rose "This Wooden Shack Place: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading." College Composition and Communication. 41 (3). (Oct 1990): 287-298.


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This essay uses narrative case study techniques and qualitative discourse analysis also used in "Remediation," and "Rethinking Remediation." Rose and Hull worked on all three essays.

AWARDS: This essay won one of the prestigious 1991 Braddock Awards given annually by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) recognizing scholarly work in the field of composition studies.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Hull at that time was visiting assistant professor in the School of Education at the UC Berkeley. Rose at that time was Associate Director of Writing Programs at UCLA. Of their collaboration, they say the two of us have been involved for several years in a study of remedial writing instruction in American higher education, attempting to integrate social-cultural and cognitive approaches to better understand the institutional and classroom practices that contribution to students being designated remedial. (287)

BRIEF SUMMARY: Here Hull and Rose summarize an interaction over the interpretation of a poem in a remedial composition class at UCLA between instructor and a student whose "misreadings" suggested cognitive difficulties. Through an extensive documentation of Rose's conversations with the student as the poem was discussed, following up with an analysis of the motivations behind each comment, the article shows how an instructor's expectations and traditional interpretations can work against understanding an individual student's variation which may be nevertheless logical and coherent, and result in a diagnosis of "error."

EXCERPT: This is a paper about student interpretations of literature that strike the teacher as unusual, a little off, not on the mark. When we teachers enter classrooms with particularly poems or stories in hand, we also enter with expectations about the kind of student responses that would be most fruitful, and these expectations have been shaped, for the most part, in literature departments in American universities. We value some readings more than others – even, in our experience, those teachers who advocate a reader's free play. One inevitable result of this situation is that there will be moments of mismatch between what a teacher expects and what students do. What interests us about this mismatch is the possibility that our particular orientations and readings might blind us to the logic of a student's interpretation and the ways that interpretation might be sensibly influenced by the student's history. (287)

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This essay was apparently first a presentation at the MLA's Right to Literacy Conference 1988 and subsequently published in the collection about that conference, listed above. This is very nearly the same article as the one listed in the endnotes to the 1991 "This Wooden Shack Place" article as Hull and Rose's 1989 essay "Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing." *Written Communication* 6 (Apr 1989): 139-54

Footnote 1 says that this student's sample was also discussed by co-author Hull in her article "Literacy, Technology and the Underprepared: Notes toward a Framework for Action" from the *Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of Writing* (10) (1988): 103, 16-25.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: This article refers to a research project that the authors are conducting "on remediation at the community college, state college, and university level . . . to provide some information on what it is that cognitively and socially defines an underprepared student as underprepared@ (54) but gives no further information on where that project was published or whether it was completed. The article was first a paper presented at the MLA Conference.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Hull and Rose analyze a student's paper to "reveal[ ] some of the complexities behind the writing problems on basic writing students and suggest[ ] ways to teach students like [her] more effectively" (53). The first draft by this student was so deeply flawed mechanically in conventions of spelling, grammar and punctuation, and more troubling, was also deeply flawed in organization and comprehension. Interviews with the student revealed some of the emotional and instructional reasons -- memories from past instruction (rules, humiliations) that guided her work (the logic of her errors). This student clings hard to her literacy myth of success (I can do it) in the face of deep handicaps. But Rose and Hull suggest that this student is actually making a literacy move by appropriating the language of the nurses she hopes to join and recommend a pedagogical approach that pushes her further into the discourse of her chosen community for social and cognitive reasons, coming back later to work on conventions. The authors make a powerful statement about what it means to join a discourse community, how we academics and educators often don't investigate assumptions, and how we can help marginal students make the same move.

EXCERPT: *At the same time that we outline a pedagogy to move Tanya toward a conventional discourse, we are aware of what her unconventional performance can*
teach us. We are struck by her "plagiarism," for example, not only because it is a
startling departure from traditional ways of using a source text but because it puts
into the foreground what is often an unquestioned practice in the Western essayist
tradition. We academic writers internalize rules and strategies for citing source texts,
for acknowledging debts to previous scholarship, for separating what we can claim as
our own ideas from the intellectual property of others. And we do so, once we have
learned the tricks of our trade, almost without thinking, producing essays that seem to
mark clearly where other people's ideas end and ours begin. Such clearly documented
writing may let us forget or even camouflage how much more it is that we borrow
from existing texts, how much we depend on membership in a community for our
language, our voices, our very arguments. We forget that we, like Tanya, continually
appropriate each other's language to establish group membership, to grow, and to
define ourselves in new ways and that such appropriation is a fundamental part of
language use, even as the appearance of our texts belies it. (61)

* * * * *

Hull, Glynda, Mike Rose, Kay Losey Fraser, and Marisa Castellano. "Remediation as
Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse." 

ESOL Pedagogy: Readings and Activities for Engagement, Reflection, and
Inquiry. Vivian Zamel and Ruth Spacek, eds. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence
Erlbaum, 2002: 159-192.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The article cites Rose's 1988 "Narrowing the
Mind and the Page." See also the other work Rose coauthored with Hull, Fraser and
Castellano.

AWARDS: This essay won the 1992 Braddock Award.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author notes say that Glynda Hull "is an
assistant professor in the School of Education at the University of California-Berkeley.
. . . Mike Rose is Associate Director of Writing Programs at UCLA . . . Kay Losey
Fraser is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at UC-Berkeley . . .[and]
Maria Castellano [is] a graduate student in UC-Berkeley's School of education" (299).
Fraser and Castellano are identified as working with Latino students. It may be that the
student code-named "Maria" in this essay is Latino.

The end notes to the version printed in the Braddock Awards (459) cite that this essay
is part of a larger study, "Literacy, Underpreparation, and the Cognition of
Composing" which I haven't yet located.

BRIEF SUMMARY: This essay analyzes interactions which the authors observed and
videotaped in a remedial writing classroom as a teacher, June, leads a class discussion
to "help students access their own knowledge . . . when writing an academic essay." Key is the teacher's belief that the students "don't have a lot to bring with them in terms of academic experience" (286). By analyzing the interaction between teacher and a particular student, the essay shows how the teacher's "perception of [the student's] cognitive abilities" is influenced by the pattern of discussion which doesn't meet the teacher's expectations for a "teacher-led" remedial classroom. "Maria's" responses, interruptions and persistence in topics "did not map well into the norm for this class . . . [a]nd this mismatch, this small but noticeable discontinuity, was to work to her disadvantage" (Braddock 290). June concluded that Maria had cognitive difficulty, thinking continuity problems, and predicted that, despite Maria's reasonably good writing, she "wouldn't pass the next writing class the first time through because it requires coherent thinking" (295). The authors point out that June mistook Maria's "annoying conversational style . . . [as] a measure of intellectual ability" (296). The consequences of this were severe since Maria began to doubt her own abilities and to underperform. Authors also point out that Maria's style matched that for honors classrooms Maria had been in during high school.

The article addresses the "cultural context of school failure," "examining assumptions," and "remembering teacher development" with Mina Shaughnessy's four steps in her essay "Diving In."

EXCERPT: The authors say that their research has made us uncomfortable with much of the research that focuses on differences, whether such difference grows out of the recognition that communication styles at school aren't like those at home or that people come to intellectual tasks in different ways. The problem is that all American educational research -- ours and everyone else's-- emerges from a culture in the grips of deficit thinking, and any analysis that delineates differences will run the risk of being converted to a deficit theory. (Braddock 308).

****


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: Compare to the 1991 essay "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse," which they also co-authored.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: A collaborated presentation at The Tenth Annual Ethnography in Education Forum. University of Pennsylvania, Feb. 1989. Rose continues to work with all these authors. Garrett is later named Castellano.

BRIEF SUMMARY: I have not located a transcript of the presentation to summarize.
EXCERPT: I have not located a transcript to excerpt.

*****


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: Although it does not call itself that, it is clearly a teacher's manual for the second edition of Kiniry and Rose's textbook Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing because the cover calls the book "Resources for Teaching." It can be identified as a manual for the 2nd edition of the textbook because it is the only one of the three which is similarly subtitled "A text and reader" and because the references to page numbers and article titles match. The title calls this volume a second edition, though I have yet to locate a first edition of the teacher's manual. Therefore, it may be that the edition number relates to the textbook's edition number. The preface of the third edition of the textbook mentions "a thoroughly revised instructor's manual" though I have not found a copy of that instructor's manual yet.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Many textbooks have teacher's manuals, which might offer suggestions on using the assignments, answers to questions posed in the assignments, and, sometimes, blank forms for photocopying as student exercise sheets.

BRIEF SUMMARY: The Section "To New Teachers" includes information on sequencing assignments and how to present background material. The manual follows the format of the textbook and gives additional discussion of the individual readings including ways to use and group them and ways to "shortcut."

EXCERPT: The comments that follow are meant to encourage instructors to make Critical Strategies for Academic Thinking and Writing their own, to draw connections and make assignments that fit the needs of their students ... We begin with an introduction that discusses some ways to use Critical Strategies, including a section designated for new teachers but helpful, too, to instructors who have not used this text before. ... We want to encourage students to view these strategies as choices that put them at the center of their own learning, as way to think critically about the range of academic materials they encourage here and in their other courses. (iii)

*****


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This first edition of their coauthored textbook was expanded and revised into a 2nd and 3rd edition. I don't know how it relates to any other work by Kiniry. Some of the concepts relate to the 1983 article
"Remedial Courses: A Proposal and a Critique" where the author notes on the bottom of the title page say, "Special thanks must go to Mal Kiniry, who has significantly revised the sourcebook of interdisciplinary materials used in [UCLA's Freshman Preparatory Program]"(109). On the title page of the 1985 "The Language of Exclusion" this information is given: "[w]ith Malcolm Kiniry, [Rose] is currently preparing a sourcebook of cross-disciplinary writing materials for Bedford Books" (341), which may be the same sourcebook. That sourcebook is likely a precursor to this textbook.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The authors say that this curriculum began "nearly twenty years ago in a preparatory course for adults entering college" modified with writing across the curriculum, or "English for specific purposes" (vi).

BRIEF SUMMARY: The preface states that the rationale for this book is that many college students, at all levels "have trouble when they must generate concise definitions or summarize a scholarly discussion," a process the authors consider "sophisticated cognitive-rhetorical activities" (v) which "require immersion in certain kinds of language use B ongoing practice, modeling, and successive approximation" (v). This textbook is designed for use in freshman composition courses to teach these "thinking-writing activities, which [they] ... call ... critical strategies" (v)

EXCERPT: From the "Preface for Instructors" and headed "The Rationale for the Book:" The labels vary – critical thinking, academic discourse, higher-order cognition – but the fundamental issue seems to be the same. A high percentage of college students – from those entering community college to those enrolled in upper-division university courses – have trouble when they must generate concise definitions or summarize a scholarly discussion, when they need to detail a laboratory procedure, explain a method, or evaluate a taxonomy, when they're asked to compare two theories, analyze a text, or argue a position. Though some policymakers are beginning to label such activities "the new basics," these are, in fact, very sophisticated cognitive-rhetorical activities – that is, activities that involve the complex interplay of thinking and writing. We forget, sometimes, how hard it is to learn how to do them. They require immersion in certain kinds of language use – ongoing practice, modeling, and successive approximation in settings where teachers have the training, time, and reasonable class load to comment and advise. (v)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This is a revised version of Kiniry and Rose's 1990 first edition textbook with a changed title. This edition adds the term Academic Thinking to the title before Writing. The preface points out new features. First, they have tried to make the book more accessible by adding an introduction for students about the book's rationale. Second, they have attempted to encourage
engagement by opening each chapter directly with a problem. Third, they say the assignments are quite different, fewer, and more focused and with more guidance. Fourth, they say that the readings are more "self-explanatory and self-contained" (x). Fifth, two new concluding chapters demonstrate field research and the discourse of a major.

The "Preface for Instructors" does not seem to mention the existence of the contemporary teacher manual listed below co-authored with Gross and Kiniry.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Publishers like to revise and update their textbooks, with new readings and new approaches.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Part One teaches six "Critical Strategies:" Defining; Summarizing; Serializing; Classifying; Comparing; and Analyzing, with examples and assignments across the curriculum. Part Two provides "Readings for Academic Writing" in six sections: Women and Power; Caribbean Fiction; The Causes and Treatments of Schizophrenia; Apes and Language; Field Research: What's Funny?; and Field Research: Exploring the Discourse of your Major.

EXCERPT: Summarizing calls for the ability to see connections between general, more abstract points and the specific points supporting and complicating them. It also means seeing how those generalizations are related. The more readily we can see a pattern in the general sentences of a piece, the easier it is to summarize and the more confident we feel in our accuracy. (61)


REPRINTS: Most of the articles in this anthology were previously printed. Four of these are included in the 2002 sequel, Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This is the second anthology Rose worked on editing, and his first published collaborative work. Unlike When A Writer Can't Write, which was directed mostly at teachers with helpful ideas, this collection represents a wide range of background for scholars concerned about a "literacy crisis."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Rose was invited to teach at Carnegie-Melon University in Pittsburgh, PA, where he shared syllabi with Kintgen and Kroll. Editor notes says that Rose "holds masters degrees in education and in English and a doctorate in educational psychology from UCLA . . . and is currently Associate Director of the UCLA Writing Program." Kintgen was Professor of English and Chair of the Literacy Committee at Indiana University. Kroll was Associate Professor of English at Indiana University.
This book project may have been partly funded by Rose's 1986 postdoctoral fellowship for his project "The Misjudgment of Literacy" from the National Academy of Education (NAE) funded by The Spencer Foundation, according to the NAE's website. (http://www.nae.nyu.edu/intor.htm 23 June 2003)

BRIEF SUMMARY: This collection of 28 essays is divided into four sections: Theoretical Perspectives; Historical Perspectives; Educational Perspectives; and Community Perspectives. Together they investigate various aspects of literacy. The introduction explains that the book has arisen out of the crisis mentality in order to provide the general reader or concerned citizen with a more informed way to consider the situation. A brief overview of reading and writing skills in Europe and America from the Dark Ages to the present provides context and situation. Explanation is made of why reading and writing have not always been intricately linked. Rather, reading skills and instruction have traditionally been far more common and necessary than writing skills and instruction. Even today, says the introduction, the upper class and upper class jobs need and use far more and far more complex writing. Various literacy myths are explained and exploded including literacy as a demonstration of cognition, and literacy as a guarantee of economic success. Only in the areas of rich social / community life (democracy) or personal satisfaction does literacy seem a key requirement. The concept of functional literacy is put forth: Kenneth Levine is quoted as saying that “functional literacy can be defined as the possession of, or access to, the competences and information required to accomplish transactions entailing reading and writing [in] which an individual wishes -- or is compelled -- to engage” (xv).

EXCERPT: As the editors (jointly?) explain in the introduction:

*When the purposes of language in the classroom differ too radically from other purposes of language in students' lives -- when the academic community and the outside community are too far apart, the compromise between the personal and the conventional too difficult -- resistance and failure are the likely results. And these differences . . . may derive not from the individual personalities of student and teacher but from the institutional organization of education, for instance the power relations between student and teacher, dialect differences between them, or even the demands place on both by standardized examinations and lesson plans. On the other hand, when the purposes of literacy in the classroom can be related to students' other interests, education is much more successful.* (xviii)

***


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The research here had already been partly described in the article 1980 "Rigid Rules." The dissertation evolved into the 1984 book *Writer's Block* and the 1985 anthology *When a Writer Can't Write* along with his essay for that book on "Complexity."
AWARDS: According to the author notes on the 1983 "Remedial Writing Courses" article, Rose's "dissertation research won him one of the 1981 NCTE Promising Research Awards" (109).

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Dissertation for PhD in Educational Psychology. Rose was teaching at UCLA and possibly also by this time Associate Director of the freshman writing program. He may also have been working at the tutoring center. In his 1985 essay "Complexity," he explains further that as he was choosing the topic of writer's block for his dissertation, "several influential faculty . . . tried to dissuade me" (227) because the topic was too vast.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose's research methodology involves empirical qualitative case studies of ten UCLA students, five of whom were self identified as "blocked writers" and five who were not. He uses simulated recall protocols to reveal the writers' thoughts as they composed, with particular interest in what sorts of rules the student writers were invoking in that process, which might be hindering their production of text. This cognitive research methodology and results resemble Sondra Perl's work in "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers" (Research in the Teaching of English. 13.4 (December 1979): 317-36.), though Rose goes further to show the causes of the students' ineffective composing methods.

EXCERPT: In his dissertation's "Statement of the Problem," Rose says:

Autobiographical and biographical material reveals that even the greatest of writers—from Melville to Forster to Styron—have been stymied. The researcher's pilot surveys suggest that at least ten percent of UCLA's English Students block frequently, and the boom of "writing blocks" workshops stands as a reminder that writer's block is a problem outside of the classroom as well. And the problem might not simply be one of discomfort and missed deadlines. Extrapolating from Holland's (1980) report on the related problem of writing anxiety, it is possible that sustained experiences of writer's block influence students' career choices. Blockers could have trouble envisioning themselves in jobs requiring reports or extensive memoranda.

The odd thing is that though writer's block is a familiar, even popular, notion, it is one of the least studied dysfunctions of the composing process. Skill problems have long been examined and a bewildering panoply of treatments—from sentence-combining to role-playing—has been built. But when the capable writer cannot write, we are puzzled and often resort to broad affective explanations, e.g., "He's afraid of evaluation," "He's too hard on himself. Significantly, the one possibly related topic that does appear in the research literature is "writing apprehension" or "writing anxiety"—again, affective. It is possible that this affective bent explains why writer's block has never been the object of the educator's scrutiny: it is perceived as a mysterious, amorphous emotional difficulty, not as a delimitable problem that can be precisely analyzed and then remedied through instruction and tutorial programs. Before one can hope, then, to help people through writer's block, the basic questions have to be answered—what is writer's block and what causes it? Then the applied,
more practical stage of such investigation can emerge: how can one help students, businessmen, even professional writers unlock their unfortunate brains to start the flow of words once again? (1-2)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article/chapter relates to the 1980 article "Rigid Rules," the 1981 dissertation, the 1984 book Writer's Block, and the volume in which this article appears. This is the last time Rose would focus strictly on the subject of writing blocks.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: It is not yet clear to me if Rose wrote this essay before beginning to assemble the anthology or during the editing process, seeking to update his earlier work.

BRIEF SUMMARY: This appears to be a re-thinking and an overview of the 1984 book Writer's Block to which it refers. Some different aspects of cognitive research are offered along with case studies. I suspect that Rose's explorations into cognitive research for this article subsequently provided him the background for his 1988 essay against cognitive reductionism, "Narrowing the Page."

EXCERPT: In the anthology's preface, Rose says of this essay:
I summarize my earlier studies of the cognitive dimension of writer's block and suggest that researchers can investigate such complex writing problems by using multiple and converging methods drawn from a variety of orientations and disciplines. Such eclectic inquiry involves some philosophical difficulties, and I attempt to resolve those. I also offer a research framework that honors the emotional and situational, as well as the cognitive, dimension of the writing act and illustrate its use with a brief case study. (xii).

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This opinion piece relates to beliefs about education and democracy prevalent throughout Rose's work, most particularly in Lives on the Boundary, Possible Lives, and the "Response to Richard Rorty."
CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE WORK: This is listed as a "Point of View" so it may be a regular feature of the journal. I do not know whether Rose submitted it or they solicited it.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In this opinion piece for fellow educators, Rose addresses the issue of how standards are used to define identity, so that, therefore, it is essential that standards are explicit, fair, and a boon to learning. Rose uses a narrative case study of a recent PhD graduate who came from the working-class Mexican-American background and who found himself underprepared for the types of argumentative assignments common in college work despite his high-school "college preparatory" English class. "This discontinuity in requirements and the criteria used to assess performance – in this case the shift from grammatical analysis to the development of an effective argument – is common" says Rose (A32). Standards, says Rose, often work to exclude, work to "limit, rather than advance, the academic excellence . . . desire[d]" (A32). Rose poses a series of rhetorical questions to get readers thinking about standards and how they work.

EXCERPTS: As someone who teaches underprepared students, I find many of the policy discussions concerning these students to be less and less useful in the daily work of helping them reach their full academic potential in the classroom. The discussions are becoming polarized, intractable debates that pit equality against excellence in ways that oversimplify the complexities of teaching and learning. The issue of standards – the criteria one uses to assess competence – illustrates this polarization.

Clearly defined standards that are employed fairly facilitate learning and show students that their teachers believe in their ability to meet academic expectations. (A32)

****


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: In some ways, this article relates most closely to Lives on the Boundary, since it addresses how authors experience the creative writing process.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author note says that Rose is "coordinator of curriculum and instruction for the freshman Summer Program and a lecturer in English at the University of California, Los Angeles" (236). Rose offers gratitude to Dr. Charles Healy "for the encouragement to write this article and to Kevin Fitzsimmons, psychologist and litterateur" for assistance (243).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose addresses how a vocational or guidance counselor might explain the experience and joys of being a creative writer to prospective students or clients "trying to mold a future in a world of work" (243). Using selected author
interviews published in The Paris Review, Rose evaluates issues of "training," "work habits," "work satisfaction," "the fusion of the worker and the work," "work that allows direct expression of values and personal concerns," and "work that allows the creation of the new, the experience of being god-like" through quotes from authors such as Henry Miller, Allen Ginsberg, William Styron and Ernest Hemingway.

EXCERPT: Freud spoke of aesthetic participation. Maslow of a paradoxical heightening yet transcendence of ego. Though people might experience this through their children, through nature, through a love, through music or film, rarely do they experience it through work. Our writers are an exception. Though a good deal of their work involves a very conscious shaping, revising, editing, and a fair amount of uninspired production...all writers discuss times when they are immersed in their work.... There is a seeming paradox – but nonetheless phenomenological reality – here: while creative writing offers a heightening of one's powers and participation, it also can provide moments of loss of self, even loss of control. (239-240)

* * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article seems close to Rose's 1979 both "When Faculty Talk About Writing" and his 2001 "A Call for the Teaching of Writing in Graduate Education." The work here on cognitive research into writing is addressed at more length in 1988's "Narrowing the Page," an article that had previously been a talk, so perhaps he was already working on that article concurrently with this one.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author notes say that: "Rose is Director of Freshman Writing" at UCLA and, "[w]ith Malcolm Kiniry, he is currently preparing a sourcebook of cross-disciplinary writing materials for Bedford Books" (341), a work I haven't seen but which is mentioned as follows in the 1983 essay "Remedial Courses": [Kiniry] who has significantly revised the sourcebook of interdisciplinary materials used in [UCLA's Freshman Preparatory Program]"("Remedial" 109).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose announces five common errors in the current thinking about the situation of "academic illiteracy":

1. writing being judged by the presence of [quantifiable] error;
2. writing being considered as a skill to be learnt once, rather than a discipline;
3. many students being considered to be lacking this skill and requiring treatment;
4. many students being considered to be academically illiterate;
the problem being considered to be temporary and originating "elsewhere," so that once other parts of the educational system do their job, the university can quit having to "remediate" these ineffective writers.

Rose begins with a survey of freshman composition courses since 1874. He then addresses cognitive research into writing. He shows how capitalism's (he doesn't use this term) emphasis on product efficiency, positivism, and correctness implied that good writing could be taught through drills on rules. After rebutting the points above, he returns to a common theme: the conflict (and disdain) at research universities about teaching writing and the "linguistic assumptions" facing freshman writers.

EXCERPT: To discuss writing as a skill, then, is to place it in the realm of the technical, and in the current, research-ascendant American university, that is a kiss of death. Now it is true that we commonly use the work "skill" in ways that suggest a complex interweaving of sophisticated activity and rich knowledge . . . [But] A skill, particularly in the university setting, is, well, a tool, something one develops and refines and completes in order to take on the higher-order demands of purer thought. Everyone may acknowledge the value of the skill (our [UCLA Faculty] senate praised our [writing] course to the skies as it removed its credit), but it is valuable [in the way that] the ability to . . . draw a map is valuable. It is absolutely necessary but remains second-class. It is not "an integrated body of knowledge." (347)

** **


The subtitle is often truncated to "The Struggles and Achievements of America's Underprepared," even on the list of books by Mike Rose on the page facing the title page of his 1995 Possible Lives, but the title page and copyright page of the paperback edition of Lives on the Boundary list the subtitle twice as shown above.

Selections from Lives on the Boundary are much anthologized. One example is the beginning of chapter six (133-155) reprinted as "Reclaiming the Classroom" in Dialogue on Writing: Rethinking ESL, Basic Writing, and First-Year Composition. Eds. Geraldine DeLuca, Len Fox, Mark-Ameen Johnson, and Myra Kogen, Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002: 9-27. (see below)


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This literacy narrative sums up all the themes which will be addressed throughout Rose's career – inclusion, education as
invitation, mentoring, compassion – and it does it through a technique Rose frequently uses – extended narrative case studies and anecdotes.

AWARDS: *Lives on the Boundary* was awarded the MLA's tenth annual Mina P. Shaughnessy Prize. The book also won the NCTE's David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English for 1989 (*College English* 53.3 (March 1991): 358)

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: In the preface, Rose explains that it started as a series of sketches before it ended up as a mix of "autobiography, case study and commentary" (8). He also tells interviewer Susan Palo about the genesis of the work. See that article below in the bibliography.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In this blurred genre literacy narrative memoir, Rose reveals his own struggles to achieve academic literacy and how that affected his commitment to teaching. He outlines his various teaching experiences and extrapolates from them his theories on inclusion and education as invitation. Although written 10 years after his first published article, this book provides useful background as to how and why he has been addressing these issues throughout his career.

EXCERPT: *This is not to say that I see my life as an emblem. Representative men are often overblown characters; the end up distorting their own lives and reducing the complexity of the lives they claim to represent. But there are some things about my early life, I see now, that are reflected in other working-class lives I've encountered: the isolation of neighborhoods, information poverty, the limited means of protecting children from family disaster, the predominance of such disaster, the resilience of imagination, the intellectual curiosity and literate enticements that remain hidden from the schools, the feelings of scholastic inadequacy, the dislocations that come form crossing educational boundaries. This book begins, then, with autobiography . . . but moves outwards to communities beyond mine . . . to struggles to participate in the life of the mind. Those who are the focus of our national panic reveals themselves here, and what we see and hear is, simultaneously, cause for anger and cause for great hope. (8-9)*

****


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The acknowledgements say that some of Rose's poems have appeared in journals such as *Bogg, CoEvolution, Maelstrom Review, Milkweed Chronicle, Occasional Review, Pinchpenny, Poetry/L.A., Taurus, Third Eye* and *Visions*. Since the book's title page says it is "Vol. X of the Black Buzzard Press Illustrated Chapbook series" and bears an ISBN, it is clear that this publisher was somewhat established.
CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: In *Lives on the Boundary*, Rose describes starting to write poetry while in graduate school, but was not encouraged by his professors. The chairman of his department "made clear to me the department's attitude toward my own direct involvement with the writing of poetry versus the analysis of it" (*Lives* 75). He sent poems to his friends in letters. "The poems had an interesting moment here and there . . . but essentially these were verse melodramas about love and loneliness – sappy and imagistic, Tammy Wynette signing haiku" (*Lives* 81). His friends offered encouragement and suggestions: "And gradually the goo started to drain out of my poetry" (*Lives* 82). Later Rose would make chapbooks to give to friends and submit to small press magazines (*Lives* 157). In an interview with Susan Palo included in this bibliography, Rose says he published many individual poems (Palo 18-19). Since the time frame he describes in *Lives on the Boundary* is before his PhD (1981), it is also before the publication of *Melodious Bones*, but the book does not date the individual poems, so some of the poems may have been written during the period he describes in *Lives*.

The author note says, "Mike Rose lives in Venice and directs the Writing Program at UCLA. He has published books and articles on the wiring process, on curriculum, and on the place of writing in higher education. His poems have not appeared in the New Yorker."


EXCERPT:

"Big girls now, I gave my poems the boot"

and after an intense though abbreviated grief,
they're up and about –
reading travel brochures,
studying voice,
jogging.

tonight they're going to a singles' bar,
Brazilian colors flying –
orange skirts fluttering across slim ankles.

sidle up to them.
ask one to dance.
praise her rhythm.

and after an intense though abbreviated conversation,
she will slide onto your tongue
and you will speak in music –
she will have found her page, her concert:
sugar daddies she would die without.    (n.p.; last poem in the book)


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: See connections between this essay and "The Language of Exclusion," but note the three year time lapse in publication.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: According to the author notes at the bottom of the title page (267) Rose was Associate Director of Writing Programs at UCLA. The note says that this extensive article is based on a paper read at conferences and university colloquia, but it doesn't say which ones.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose investigates four types of cognitive research that have been used to explain the writing problems of college students and discusses the challenges that arise from applying them to "remedial writers"(48). He summarizes the theories and methods of Cognitive Style: Field Dependence-Independence; Hemisphericity; Piaget's Stages of Cognitive Development; and Orality-Literacy. He concludes that while each of these offers some interesting perspectives, they fail for four reasons. First, the theories tend to make reductive binary dichotomies, which conceal more than they reveal. Second, they minimize individual student differences. Third, they get too global and Adrift away from careful, rigorous focus on student writing." Fourth, these models "inadvertently reflect cultural stereotypes . . . about race, class, and gender" (48-49). The fact that this article was reprinted in Landmark Essays 2001 implies that colleagues continue to find it relevant. Readers can infer that choosing to look for cognitive explanations is a way to avoid responsibility -- on the part of the student, on the part of the parents, on the part of society, and on the part of educators.

EXCERPTS: For cognitive style to be a legitimate construct, it has to be distinct from general intelligence or verbal ability or visual acuity, because cognitive style is not intended to be a measure of how "smart" someone is, but of the manner in which she or he engages in an intellectual task. (27)

Much of this essay has concerned researchers and theoreticians, but at the heart of the discussion is a basic question for any of us working with poor writers: how do we go about judging the thought processes involved with reading and writing when performance is problematic, ineffective, or stunted? If I could compress this essay's investigation down to a single conceptual touchstone, it would be this: Human
cognition – even at its most stymied, bungled moments – is rich and varied. It is against this assumption that we should test our theories and research methods and classroom assessments. . . We must be vigilant that the systems of intellect we develop or adapt do not ground our students' difficulties in sweeping, essentially one-dimensional perceptual, neuropsychological, psychological, or linguistic processes, systems that drive broad cognitive wedges between those who do well in our schools and those who don't. (50-1)

* * * * *

Rose, Mike. "On Values, Work, and Opportunity: We May Be Selling Our Young People Short." Education Week. 19.1110 Nov 1999: 60 & 43. (Note: article begins on page 60, continues on 43)

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: Rose's focus on cognitive learning in skilled trades, particularly for adolescents who are not succeeding in mainstream schools or academia, relates to other recent work such as the 2000 "Teaching Tools." The focus on hopefulness about young people relates particularly to Rose's Possible Lives.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: I do not know if Rose offered this "commentary" or whether the journal solicited it.

The biography lists Rose as "professor in the graduate school of education and information studies at the University of California at Los Angeles and author of Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America." This is the same bio as used in "Teaching Tools." Rose is not identified with the Writing Program at UCLA.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose introduces the context of society's fears of literary crises and eroding values among young people to demonstrate that students taking carpentry, auto mechanics, and plumbing in high school show a high level of dedication, a strong work ethic, and a concern to do the job right. Rose points out that this vocational work teaches conceptualizing, problem solving, etc. His critical point is the lack of opportunities society provides for these students.

EXCERPT: These young people are meticulous about the work they do, aware of the consequences of error, exhibiting both pride in and commitment to doing a good job. There are ethical ramifications here – Nancy likes her work to the safety of others – and a process of self-definition . . . In addition to values related to use and function, I, as well, saw ample evidence of values that are more aligned with craft and aesthetics . . . The development of values occurs best in situations where young people are engaged in ongoing, meaningful activity. . . . The question we should be asking is not: What has happened to our young people? Rather, we should think hard about the kind and number of opportunities we provide for them to develop and exhibit behavior and values that have personal and social benefit. (60, 43)

* * * * *

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: In terms of Rose's research on cognition in skilled work outside of the writing class, this article relates to "Widening the Lens;" "The Working Life of a Waitress;" "On Values, Work, and Opportunity: We May Be Selling Our Young People Short;" and "Teaching Tools."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: As Rose explains, "As is the case with so many research projects, this one has a personal dimension to it. During the time I was commencing the pilot studies on skilled work. Some old back trouble was stirring up, so I began seeing a physical therapist at an orthopedic rehabilitation unit attached to the University of California at Los Angeles Medical Center . . . and I was struck by how much the guy knew about the body . . . and how skillful he seemed to be at picking things up through touch, observation, and talk . . . it hit me that physical therapy provided interesting parallels with the knowledge and practice of the skilled work I was beginning to study" (125). Through the therapist, who works in the master's program at Mount Saint Mary's College, Rose arranged to observe classes.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In a blurred genre article with an academic focus and tone, Rose provides qualitative observations and vignettes, or brief narrative case studies, of students learning physical therapy. The article's abstract states:

Relying on observational and interview data from a clinical practice class in a graduate physical therapy program, I examine, within a situated cognition framework, the teaching and learning of a concept in biomechanics, the manual techniques and tactile discrimination skills that accompany it, and the diagnostic frame of mind that informs concept, technique, and skill. In examining this complex set of practices, I hope to add to and quality the literature on working knowledge, participation and competence, and situated learning and pedagogy. (133)

Further down Rose states: "This article will be developed, primarily, from my physical therapy data, though insights gained from my other research, and an occasional reference to it, will appear as well" (134).

EXCERPTS: For about a year and a half now, I have tried to gain a better understanding of the cognitive processes involved in skilled work, the array of conceptualizing, problem-solving, troubleshooting activities involved in carpentry, auto mechanics, electrical wiring, plumbing. To help me frame this research, I have observed high school students as they learned the fundamentals of this work, and I have interviewed their teachers and other experts in these trades. To provided bases for comparison, I have also spent some time observing and interviewing people involved in learning a "low tech" skill, such as flower arranging, and people involved
in several service industries, like waitressing and bartending, work that is not considered among the skilled trades but is known for the memory demands and other abilities it requires – planning on the fly, interpersonal adroitness – at least when it is well done. (134)

These pilot studies, and the fuller research that is emerging from them, touch on a number of issues currently in the burgeoning literature that is helping us reconsider cognition, learning, and teaching from a social and cultural perspective: situated cognition (e.g., Greeno 1998), apprenticeship (e.g., Brown et al. 1988), legitimate peripheral participation (e.g., Lave and Wenger 1991), and various articulations of cultural psychology (e.g., Cole 1996) and activity theory (e.g., Engestrom 1993; Wertsch 1995). This literature informs my studies, and I hope that the present article contributes to it. (134).

As Tim observed to the class, "You've got to try these [techniques] on each other. It doesn't make sense unless you try to feel it." One further element of this collaborative practice involved having one of the instructors perform the technique in question on one's own body – as we saw Sydney do with Kim in the above episode [relating to testing the reflex of the Achilles tendon] -- so that, as Nicole put it, "You'll know what it feels like. Then you can give better feedback to your partner." Reading the above vignette, Tim noted how hard it was to create the conditions for this kind of collaboration to occur. (142)

***


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This book functions in some ways as a sequel to Lives on the Boundary in terms of themes, blurred genre, and argument for inclusion.

AWARDS: Possible Lives received the 1997 Grawemeyer Award in Education from the University of Louisville (http://www.louisville.edu/ur/onpi/grawemeyer/education/previouis/97.htm 28 June 2003).

Possible Lives also received the Silver Medal for Non Fiction from the Commonwealth Club of California (http://www.commonwealthclub.org/bookawards.htm 22 June 2003; 28 March 2003)

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: In the Acknowledgements, Rose explains: During the early phases of this work, I was involved in another project with Glynda Hull, sponsored by the Spencer Foundation. The book that would become Possible Lives benefited in multiple ways from that support and conversation. During the last year of travel and writing, I received generous encouraging support from the
BRIEF SUMMARY: As the subtitle suggests and the introduction confirms, Rose's goal here is to celebrate and proclaim the promise of public education in a time when the public, the media, and the government are criticizing public schools for failing, failing to provide good enough instruction to yield good enough students to perform well enough on standardized tests to make American proud of its worthy students/employees. Rose visits various types of schools - preschool, one room school, inner city, rural, advanced placement and alternative - in each region -- southern California, New York, Baltimore, Kentucky, Mississippi Delta, Western Montana, Tucson - "to see what . . . the classrooms share, . how . . . they develop[ed and] [w]hat threatens them" (10).

Using an accessible narrative and descriptive style echoing the genre of Lives and situating these vignettes in their community context, such as the deprived neighborhood of Watts where he begins his tale, Rose introduces inspirational teachers and motivated students, some of whom begin to consider going on to college. He hopes he has honored the good work being done while acknowledging the challenges being faced. He praises the sense of safety, respect, shared authority, expectations, and responsibility in the classrooms and concludes that this climate conducive to education is due to the teachers, teachers who found effective and creative ways to use their knowledge of subject matter, of practice . . . within the institutional confines of mass education. (413-415, 420).

In his conclusion he admits that Possible Lives "is the product of my values [heavy emphasis on democracy as an experience, a phenomenon (413)], my perception and my pen" but concedes the amount of collaboration that has made the book possible and thanks his contacts for their assistance (436).

In this work of creative non-fiction, in the genre of the "New Journalism," a book clearly directed at the general public as well as at concerned stakeholders (educators, politicians, parents), Rose bows slightly to his academic background and provides a brief "note on method" with some end notes (not superscripted on the pages), and no index, nor a works cited or bibliography for the clearly huge amount of research that has backed up the facts he uses to elucidate his stories.

EXCERPT: When a local public school is lost to incompetence, indifference, or despair, it should be an occasion for mourning, for it is a loss of a particular site of possibility. When public education itself is threatened, as it seems to be threatened now - by cynicism and retreat, by the cold rapture of the market, by thin measure and the loss of civic imagination - when this happens, we need to assemble what the classroom can teach us, articulate what we come to know, speak it loudly, hold it fast to the heart. (433)

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This is a reprint of the beginning of chapter six of *Lives on the Boundary*. The material Rose describes here about lessons he learned during the period described in this chapter relate to the textbook he co-authored with Malcolm Kiniry.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The editors do not explain why they selected this excerpt (compared to the rest of the book) for inclusion. This is not the same excerpt selected by Andrea A. Lunsford and John J. Ruszkiewicz for their anthology *The Presence of Others* (3rd ed. 2000)

BRIEF SUMMARY: In this chapter, Rose describes the Veteran's Program where he taught and how that led him to see the needs of adults trying to acquire the literacy skills they would need to succeed in college and get out of the lower run social status they found themselves in. Upon being asked to teach, Rose develops a curriculum based on cognitive skills—summarizing, classifying, comparing, and analyzing.

EXCERPT: Morgan had meant grief for teachers since the day he got off his kindergarten mat. He had shined on innumerable lessons, sneered at too many ideas, turned thumbs-down on the mind. He had driven his parents nuts, wildly, almost suicidally trying to forge an identity. But he had something, and though his tolerance for diversity rivaled the Emperor Nero's, you wanted the guy to like you. I used to require students to see me after I'd returned their essays. One of the first times I was scheduled to meet with Morgan, he appeared in my doorway with his essay crumpled and proceeded, in a remarkable act of frustration, to bite off the corner of the paper. His grade wasn't so hot, and, to make matters worse, he found out that another student he couldn't stand had received a higher mark. He walked around the room and ranted and waved the paper and, finally, sat down begrudgingly and smoothed it out so we could work on it. We went at the essay point by point, and I remember how happy I was, thinking, "I got him now. I've really got him." (154-5)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The ideas in this essay presage the curriculum and sequencing that Rose and Kiniry develop in their textbook *Critical Strategies* (1990 etc). Further, the ideas here are described as part of the pedagogy Rose (and Kiniry?) developed for the classes they taught the Vietnam Veterans, as described in *Lives on the Boundary*.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Rose at that time was the Director of Freshman Writing at UCLA. According to the author notes at the bottom of page 109, "an earlier version of this paper was presented at the SWRL Educational Research and Development Conference, "Writing: Policies, Problems, and Possibilities," Los Alamitos, California, 7 May 1982.

Rose thanks Ruth Mitchell and Barbara Tomlinson for "insightful comments on that earlier version" as well as teachers who worked with him in the Freshman Preparatory Program" (109).

David Peck and Elizabeth Hoffman (of UCLA?) wrote responses to Rose's article that were published in *College English* 46 (1984): 302-06. These responses, plus Rose's rebuttal appear in the reprint in *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose asserts that basic writing classes to help college remedial writers don't work because they "misrepresent" the composing process. The typical topics and assignments (especially simple personal narratives) don't connect to the larger academic writing environment, nor do they motivate students to expand their repertoire of thinking strategies, nor lead to correct academic prose. A vigilance for mechanical error and a separation of reading and thinking from writing hinder writers who believe that correctness of expression counts more than thinking and ideas. Underprepared writers do not realize that thinking in most academic courses requires students to work with texts to extract and extrapolate meaning rather than inventing content from their heads. Rose advocates a program that "steadily and systematically introduced remedial writers to transactional/ expositional academic discourse" (196) and "alerted students to stylistic/rhetorical variation within the university" (196).

Peck and Hoffman objected to what they perceived as Rose's dismissal of all "personal writing." Rose's rebuttal acknowledges that calling "personal writing" "simple" would be inappropriate. However, he challenges "[their] assertion that research shows that "narrative and descriptive writing assignments . . . can teach writing structures and strategies as effectively as any other rhetorical forms" (214). Rose asserts that skills in narration and description do not transfer to other more complex forms more often used in academic prose, and thus, assignments in narration and description are much less useful in the long run.
EXCERPTS: Our surveys also suggested that various academic audiences write and read with an elaborate and—unfortunately for our students—often subtle, even tacit set of philosophical and methodological assumptions that determine what they will consider acceptable or unacceptable reasoning, presenting of evidence, and inferring. For example, an individual's reflections on personal events are considered legitimate evidence in many areas of sociology and anthropology, but are considered much less legitimate by behavioristic psychologists. Developing a sensitivity to the plurality of these assumptive foundations and the conventions that arise from them is crucial, for they shape the complex rhetorical relationship between writer and reader in the academy. (111)

I realize I am asking that we teach discourse structures often assumed to be beyond the grasp of remedial writers. One way to teach such complicated structures has been suggested through this . . . section. The approach simply entails a scaling down of potentially complex tasks and a graduate building of skill through carefully sequenced, increasingly complex assignments. (207 n.23)

* * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: Mentioned by Jeff Smith in his article "Mike Rose, Allan Bloom and Paul Goodman: In Search of a Lost Pedagogical Synthesis." College English. 55.7 (Nov 93): 721-745. (see below).

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Rose was one of nine professors who responded to Rorty's speech, which was a keynote address to the American Association of Colleges, which publishes this journal. The journal says it invited responses; nine were published. Rose, at that time Associate Director, Writing Programs, UCLA, is the only professor from the West Coast. The other respondents (not co-authors) are Paul F. Cardaci, Werner J. Dannhauser, William Scott Green, Madeleine R. Grumet, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, Elaine P Maimon, Douglas Sloan, and Wendy Winters.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In critiquing the speech, Rose points out Rorty's failure of logos and ethos, saying in part that (1) students who had spent 12 years being socialized and fed passive information could not suddenly in college become active questioning critical thinking individual and (2) that since nearly 50% of high school students did not go to college, those who didn't would never get the critical thinking training.

EXCERPT: While I was very interested in Richard Rorty's attempt to separate both conservative and radical agendas from philosophical theories about human nature and democracy, I was also curious, and finally troubled, by the model of education and the vision of society that emerged as he moved from argument to the creation of a utopian narrative. (21)
** **


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article draws on his research for his 1981 PhD dissertation on writer's block. See also his 1984 monograph on writer's block, which grew out of the dissertation.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Rose was at this time the director (associate?) of the Writing Program at UCLA.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose compares the writing process of ten undergraduates, five who suffer from writer's block and five who do not. Passing beyond more usual interpretations for block such as emotional (anxiety) or cognitive variation, Rose posits a simpler as well as more readily remediated explanation, namely that the five blockers suffered from a rigid adherence to rules which were sometimes conflicting, whereas the five non-blockers were able to use the rules as guidelines and heuristics but were willing and able to be flexible and make adjustments as needed for a particular assignment and further were willing and able to ask for feedback during the process from instructors and TA's which helped them move forward. Rose recommends that instructors (or writing center tutors) could help blockers with an interview of the writing history and method, which might reveal "the rigid rule or the inflexible plan that may lie at the base of the student's writing problem." Once these obstacles, these rules and plans, are revealed, often they can be "counter-balanced by functional ones if there is no emotional reason to hold onto that which simply doesn't work" (400). Rose asserts that students learn to be more aware of options and willing to select among them. Only one student, one whose rules "were in conflict, and perhaps that conflict was not exclusively cognitive" was not amenable to Rose's treatments.

EXCERPT: A NOTE ON TREATMENT: Rather than get embroiled in a blocker's misery, the teacher or tutor might interview the student in order to build a writing history and profile. How much and what kind of writing was done in high school? What is the student's major? What kind of writing does it require? How does the student compose? Are there rough drafts or outlines available? By what rules does the student operate? How would he or she define "good writing"? etc. This sort of interview reveals an incredible amount of information about individual composing processes. Furthermore, it often reveals the rigid rule or the inflexible plan that may lie at the base of the student's writing problem [which can lead to] . . . virtually immediate remedy. (399-400)

** **

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The beliefs about schooling that Rose expresses here are also expressed in all of Rose's work, but most explicitly in Possible Lives, "Response to Rorty," and "Education Standards Must Be Reclaimed for Democratic Ends."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: A head note by the magazine's editors refers to President Clinton's recent inaugural address as the inspiration for this piece. In response to Clinton's vision that 'the knowledge and power of the information age will be within reach . . . of every classroom,' the editors asked "progressive educators" -- including with Rose Jonathan Kozol, Amy Stuart Wells, Lisa D. Delpit, Norm Fruchter, Herbert Kohl, Deborah W. Meier, and Randall Cole -- what they thought should be done to improve schools. The editors say:

Their responses assess the currently fashionable solutions, examine the cultural and ideological roots of our neglect of schools, especially city schools, and propose a host of changes. Underlying them all is a respect for children and a determination to elicit every young person's potential.

They share another conviction as well: that no reform -- no national standard, no charter school, no parent participation, no breakup of large schools -- can ultimately succeed in a system in which some schools are short on desks, classrooms, textbooks, qualified teachers and working plumbing, while others boast a computer on every desk and a senior class trip to Cancun.

The fight for educational equity is being wages in legislatures and courts. And equity itself is not enough: An urban school filled with new immigrants requires more month than one in a wealthy suburb, not the same amount. Of all the notions the right wing has sold Americans, the idea that money cannot improve education may be the most dangerous (16).

BRIEF SUMMARY: This round up of short individual pieces (not co-authored) in his contribution, Rose expresses concern for "the scope and sweep of the negative public talk . . . [because] it excludes the powerful, challenging work done in schools day by day across the country, and it limits profoundly the vocabulary and imagery available to us. . . . This kind of talk fosters neither critique nor analysis but rather a grand dismissiveness or despair" (20-21). Rose says we need to look for reform in the "way we think about teaching and learning" (21), not in terms of curricula or equipment.

EXCERPT: [W]e need a language of schooling that, in addition to economy, offers a vocabulary of respect, decency, aesthetics, joy, courage, intellect, civility, heart and mind, skill and understanding. . . For that matter, think of how rarely we hear of a commitment to public education as the center of a free society . . . An important project for the left . . . will be to craft a language that is critical without being

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article grows out of Rose's research into "Rigid Rules" and how such rules might contribute to writer's blocks. Here Rose investigates whether the newest textbooks contain overly simplified and "unqualified restrictive statements about the composing process" (66) that some students might be internalizing, thus causing themselves to block. It is interesting to compare Rose's critiques of ineffective textbooks with his own subsequent textbook *Critical Strategies for Academic Writing: Cases, Assignments, and Readings* coauthored with Malcolm Kiniry (1990).

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author notes say that Rose "is a Lecturer on English at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he coordinates several lower-division writing programs" (65).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose concludes that even the newer and more sophisticated textbooks, despite saying "some very sensible things about writing [and] includ[ing] some of the valuable insights offered by linguistics and sociolinguistics" (70) are "still... an ineffective way to teach writing [because they] are, by nature, static and insular approached to a dynamic and highly context-oriented process, and thus are doomed to the realm of the Moderately Useful" (65) because "writing is simply too complex and unwieldy a process to be taught from a textbook" (70). Rose demonstrates that much of the advice is well-intended and theoretically useful but in fact misleading because individual writing processes are so variable, and because a written text, unlike a chemistry lab report, is such an open-ended assignment with many possible good solutions, and because writing does not proceed in the linear form text books list, and because the models (even student model essays) are often "too simplistic" (71) and "essentially belletristic" (71) which might appeal to the professor but are not much help in preparing students for academic writing.

EXCERPTS: Rose advises that we should have text books "that condense our best research on the composing process and its individual variations [with] texts-for-teachers [that] would also offer information on academic writing situations, ... audience demands, [and] a variety of curricula. For students [we need] ... packets of process exercises and interdisciplinary materials [with] writing assignments based on a range of materials [so that] writing in composition would then approximate writing in other English and non-English courses [and] student would learn to fuse thinking
and writing in the ways they must with the kinds of material they must use once their writing careers begin outside the doors of English Composition (73).

Another indication of the insularity of the texts is found in their treatment of invention, finding a topic, prewriting. I asked faculty, teaching assistants and graduate student tutors from seventeen disciplines (including English) to give me samples of paper topics and essay examination questions. Every one of the 45 topics and questions I received was specific. Invention, at this level, is unnecessary. It is only in Composition, and, for that matter, rarely thee, that our students need to "find a topic." The invention or prewriting techniques that students really do need have much more to do with weighing and focusing large bodies of information already known. But this was not treated in any of the texts. (72)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article grows out of Rose's research for his 1981 article "Sophisticated, Ineffective Books – The Dismantling of Process in Composition Texts."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author notes state that Rose is "Director of Freshman Writing at UCLA [who] won an award as an NCTE Promising Researcher in 1981 [for his dissertation] and that research will shortly appear as an early volume in the series, Studies in Writing and Rhetoric [to be called Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension (1984)]" (208).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose points out that despite "a new generation of textbooks that incorporate current work in rhetoric, psycho- and sociolinguistics, the composing process, and writing across the curriculum... the surprising thing is that such innovation goes on in the absence of fundamental research into what happens when students read current or traditional textbooks" (208). Rose claims that "students learn about the process of writing from a textbook less frequently and less effectively than many of us think" (208). He points out that textbooks are limited because they cannot address individual student differences, and, while a good teacher could supplement the textbook, many teachers don't. And since textbooks, by their very nature, imply that they are the source of correct information that could be memorized, some teachers and students wouldn't think to go beyond the book.

EXCERPT: [C]omplex, "open-ended" tasks demand individual modification of any method... when the task is less constrained – as are all discourse tasks – there are multiple ways of achieving success. Varied writing tasks – ranging from a reflection on a personal experience to an analysis of the Cuban missile crisis to an explication of "Among School Children" – might well demand numerous variations, even fundamental changes, even distortions of (to stick with our earlier example) the
tagmemic heuristic. The textbook, of course, cannot represent the variations the heuristic could effectively take. In summary, the textbook cannot respond to individual differences in the learner or in the task... How can the static page convey those properties? (210-11)

***


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: Rose's focus on cognitive learning in skilled trades, particularly for adolescents who are not succeeding in mainstream schools or academia, relates to other recent work such as the 1999 "On Values, Work, and Opportunity." The focus on hopefulness about young people relates particularly to Rose's Possible Lives.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The biographical note lists Rose as "professor in the graduate school of education and information studies at the University of California at Los Angeles and author of Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America." This is the same bio as used in "On Values." Rose is not identified with the Writing Program at UCLA.

Rose explains the circumstances of this article, that these visits are part of ongoing research of mine, a study of the thinking involved in skilled work, the array of intellectual activity involved in carpentry, auto mechanics, electrical wiring, plumbing. As part of my research, I've been observing young people . . . as they learn the fundamentals of these trades, and I have been interviewing their teachers and other experts. (42)

BRIEF SUMMARY: The abstract says: Author Mike Rose explores the minds at work in a high school program where troubled teens learn a plumber's tricks of the trade." Rose's uses his typical extended narrative case study approach to detail the learning by a group of young men as they learn how to repair sinks, toilets, and showers in low income housing under skilled instruction which emphasizes the thinking required to do a job right.

Rose states that vocational programs are often focused on economic and social outcomes, the physical skills involved. Here, he wants to focus on the part that is often overlooked "the cognitive dimension of the work, the thought that goes into it, the brains of it" (42). "Intelligence, character, and identity development" are too often linked to "social class and occupational status" (42).

EXCERPTS: What interests me is the intellectual skill involved in the work they're learning to do (42).

It's difficult, even with carefully designed studies and assessments, to determine whether someone truly learns or just mimics an intellectual process, but I think that the independence of thought and outcome here—the boys do not take the easy path of
agree with their teacher — suggests that they're appropriate the diagnostic frame of mind modeled by [their teacher]. (43)

It might unsettle our thinking about social class and education to think about Terry and Dwayne's work in terms of aesthetics, of conceptualizing and problem-solving. (44)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This essay relates most closely to "Remedial Writing Courses" as well as Rose's coauthored textbooks Critical Strategies for Academic Writing in that "Teaching University Discourse" explains the need for such teaching as well as suggestions for teaching.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The end notes for this essay say that it derives from a version of the paper at the 1979 Canadian Council of Teachers of English Conference. The author notes say that "Dr. Rose teaches in the Department of English of the University of California at Los Angeles" (89).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose begins by addressing the nature of writing as a "highly complex problem-solving task" that can be well studied through the lens of cognitive psychology. He continues to point out that the typical first year composition class modes of narration and description may not be particularly useful for university writing in other departments. On the other hand, he says that most college writing calls for exposition which he breaks down into seriation, classification, summary to synthesis, compare/contrast, and analysis. After some theoretical discussion, Rose offers a curriculum in the article's appendix for a ten week course, with sample readings and assignments. This article and the textbook correlate well with writing across the curriculum projects.

EXCERPT: It seems logical to assume that organization, evidence, the line of an argument are much more important to scholars than run-of-the-mill grammatical errors and infelicities. In fact, this is what preliminary survey data of mine suggests. Professors and teaching assistants, selected from an array of disciplines, rated organization and quality of thought as the key elements in determining a paper's grade and rated spelling and simple punctuation problems fifth in a list of twelve items (Rose 1979 "When Faculty"). So if our undergraduates are going to be asked to write in certain forms and if it is to those forms that faculty favorably respond, then we should create a freshman composition course that bridges faculty need and student skill. (90-91)

* * * * *
RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The same issue of faculty complaints about the illiteracy of their students reappears in Rose's 2002 article "A Call for the Teaching of Writing in Graduate Education."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: This essay reports on a writing conference sponsored by UCLA's Writing Research Project (WRP) held at UCLA in summer of 1979 for faculty, staff and teaching assistants from various departments in order to address the problem of students unprepared to write college level academic discourse.

BRIEF SUMMARY: The faculty complained about the problem that "an alarming number of students cannot write effectively; a small number are sadly inept" (272). All participants agreed that the minimum skills of thesis creation, evidence citation, and organization were transferable key skills, but the differing needs and assessment methods of different departments prompted the idea that "the teaching of writing should not be the sole responsibility of the English Department, but instead various "writing across the disciplines" strategies were considered. Rose identifies a key obstacle: the lack of professional reward for writing research and instruction at universities.

EXCERPT: HOW SHOULD WRITING INSTRUCTION BE ORGANIZED? If the faculty hit the slough of despond while discussing evaluation, they reached a heavenly concordance over the organization of writing instruction at UCLA: The teaching of writing should not be the sole responsibility of the English department. It seemed odd that English faculty were willing to give over one of their admittedly bothersome but politically valuable tasks. But the simple truth is that the department has struggled too long with too many variables that are beyond its control. First, the increasing decline in skills. As one English professor put it: "Organizing a paper in some rhetorical fashion for a particular audience is a foreign experience for many entering students." Second, community college transfers. These men and women have fulfilled all entrance requirements, yet consistently display lower skills than their non-transfer peers. Third, "prose-free" majors. Some students write a paper per week in composition course only to navigate their remaining three years sans prose. Finally, the linguistically rich Los Angeles basin. Los Angeles is teeming with a diversity of culture, language, and dialect that, frankly, baffles the traditionally trained teaching assistant and professor. All this considered, territory be damned. English faculty were weary and wanted help. (274-5)

* * *

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This essay uses the narrative case study format of articles such as "This Wooden Shack Place" and not as much blurred genre literary non-fiction style as Lives on the Boundary. The qualitative research and interviews also echoes earlier articles such as "This Wooden Shack Place." This essay continues Rose's interest in cognitive research, and his recent research into cognitive learning in skilled trades.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: I have not located any information as to how Rose came to write this article at this time, or whether it was to honor his mother's life work at her 80th birthday.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In this study of his mother's working life as a waitress over 50 (?) years, Rose studies questions of memory strategies, of cognitive skills in working efficiently in a confusing, rushed, environment, and research from psychological, sociological, and historical research. Rose acknowledges that his methodology is blurred genre moving from the traditional cognitive research to fieldwork through personal interviews and oral histories. His abstract says that he hopes that this work will argue for "the multiple disciplinary perspectives and kinds of knowledge needed to appreciate that complexity of everyday work" (3).

This work which is structured as a rigorous investigation into cognition, is also a memoir and tribute to his mother. He mentions the amount of scientific, psychological, cognitive, educational and historical research he used in Lives on the Boundary, so that it, too, would be far more than memoir, rather an argument for various approaches to the concept of literacy, the social and economic aspects of literacy in America. This then shows his reluctance to focus on his own life and to search out broader implications.

EXCERPT: Popular accounts stress the nurturing qualities of the hardship of [waitress's] work. Scholarly accounts in a few cases focus on memory skill or, more commonly, on the emotional sociology and/or gendered nature of waitressing. . . . Yet as I hope the foregoing demonstrates, in the complex activity system that is the restaurant, multiple cognitive processes and layers of emotion are interwoven. Memory, for example, draws on emotional material to aide in storage and recall. And customs of service and social display incorporate the cognitive, certainly in one's reading of people. One's social savvy, and one's folk knowledge of the ways of the restaurant . . . (20)


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This book presents and expands work Rose did for his 1981 dissertation on writer's block. As a result of his interest, he also edited
the 1985 anthology When a Writer Can't Write, which includes the essay "Complexity."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Rose at the time was the director of the Freshman Writing Program at UCLA.

BRIEF SUMMARY: In his preface, Rose states that his early interest in cognitive psychology while he was teaching composition and literature classes led him to do some of the initial research described in his essay "Rigid Rules" published in CCC in 1980. Moving beyond that research and incorporating the research from his doctoral dissertation, this short book outlines the case studies of ten students, five who were blockers and five who were able to move beyond their limits. This research has a quantitative component in terms of his tallying of questionnaires and recording of pauses and process, but the focus on individual students is qualitative.

Here he defines writer's block, offers an introduction on cognitive models for composition, cites previous studies of writer's block and describes his methodology -- the questionnaire and simulated-recall experiments -- follows with two case studies, a conclusion and an afterword suggesting "areas for further investigation." In the conclusion, Rose suggests various ways to teach, moving from structure to flexibility, from practice of certain stylistic options, for example, and then an examination as to where these best fit. Endnotes are provided but no works cited and no index.

EXCERPT: As I mentioned while discussing the study's implications for a cognitive model of composing, some writing rules are not multiopitional. Furthermore, there are times when almost any proposition or strategy might have to be taught rigidly. People often need narrow parameters and rote practice to master a particular technique. In order to balance out a particular student's overly distant, needlessly complicated prose, a teacher might have to have her temporarily write without recourse to the passive voice. To help a writer struggling to find form for his ideas, a tutor might need to present certain simplified discourse patterns, even the five-paragraph form. (footnote here refers reader to Arthur Applebee's Writing in the Secondary School, Urbana IL: NCTE, 1981: 82-83) On the positive side, we often help students grow as writers by forcing them to practice tight stylistic and formal patterns: complex syntactic schemes and rhetorical tropes . . . In the beginning of such instruction, a certain cookbookish regularity is necessary. The question is, then, how do we teachers avoid inculcating the rigid rules and narrow strategies that were constricting the blockers in "Rigid Rules" and the present study? The answers lie in slow weaning, in gradual loosening of structure and expanding of options, in several new contexts, in careful monitoring. [By practicing, for example, Christensen's generative stylistics on their own prose, students experience] movement from narrow drill to contextual exploration [which] assures a teacher that though students are mastering certain stylistic strategies, they are also coming to understand that stylistic options aren't executed in a discourse vacuum. (96-97)

REPRINTS: Some of the essays in this book may have been printed elsewhere. David Bartholomae's essay "Inventing the University," which seems to have been printed here first, has reappeared in several places.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The subject matter here clearly relates closely to Rose's earlier work on writer's block. This volume also connects with Rose's essay "Complexity," which forms the final chapter and was perhaps written on purpose for this book.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: At the time of this volume, Rose was working at UCLA as director of the Freshman Writing Program. In the preface, Rose says this is his first attempt at editing, and he thanks Linda Flower for her help. This book is part of a series called "Perspectives in Writing Research," and the series editors are Linda S. Flower and John R. Hayes, so it seems that Flower may have been responsible for getting Rose to work on this project. In the preface, Rose says he worked with the contributors for two years assembling the volume. Back cover blurbs by Charles Cooper, PhD of the University of California at San Diego and Lester Faigley, PhD, of the University of Texas at Austin praise the book.

BRIEF SUMMARY: This anthology contains 11 chapters: "Blocking and the Young Writer" by Donald H. Graves, "Emotional Scenarios in the Writing Process: An Examination of young Writers' Affective Experiences," by Reed Larson; "Writing Apprehension" by John A. Daily; "An Apprehensive Writer Composes" by Cynthia L. Selfe; "Problems with Monitor use in Second Language Composing" by Stan Jones; "Anxious Writers in Context: Graduate School and Beyond" by Lynn Z. Bloom; "Inventing the University" by David Bartholomae; "Diagnosing Writing-Process Problems: A Pedagogical Application of Speaking-Aloud Protocol Analysis" by Muriel Harris; "Psychotherapies for Writing Blocks" by Robert Boice; "The Essential Delay: When Writer's Block Isn't" by Donald M. Murray; and "Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method, and the Puzzle of Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research" by Mike Rose.

EXCERPT: In the preface, Rose says this book is:

an attempt, the first of its kind really, to bring together a number of investigations focusing on composing-process problems. The essays address various cognitive and emotional dimensions of disrupted composing and describe some of the situational variables that can contribute to it. One of the strengths of the collection is the variety of methods the investigations include: naturalistic inquiry, survey procedures, tracing of cognitive process, clinical—experimental techniques, text analysis, and literary analysis. These investigations involve children, adolescents, college students, and academic and professional writers and are concerned with both theory and practice.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This is the revised and updated version of the textbook, originally listed with Kiniry's name first. This edition has the words "Academic Thinking and Writing" much larger and bolder on the title page.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Again, the text is divided into the six critical strategies but that overarching title is less prominent. Readings are inserted into each of the strategies both in the assignments and in a mini reading section at the end of the chapter, rather than at the end of the book. "Defining Across the Curriculum" includes "Readings: Reconsidering Intelligence." Other "readings" sections are called "The Dimensions of Child Poverty," "Crime Stories: Constructing Guilt and Innocence," "U.S. Immigration Patterns," "Methods of Inquiry in Primate Research;" and "Caribbean Literature and Cultural Politics."

EXCERPT: From the "Introduction for Students: Critical Strategies for Academic Situations" and headed "The Movement of this Book."

*Our aim in Critical Strategies is to help you, as a writer, to think and write responsively and flexibly in academic situations. By writing responsively, we mean in thoughtfully close relation to what you've been asked to read or hear or observe. By writing flexibly, we mean with confident awareness of the many choices open to you. By academic situations, we mean the many opportunities you'll have in collect to reconstruct what you've learned and to articulate what you think about it. (1)*


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This article echoes Rose's 1979 "When Faculty Talk About Writing."

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The article says that in 1996 Rose "instituted a course in professional writing housed in the Social Research Methodology Division of our Graduate School of Education & Information Studies" (27). The use of the pronoun "our" implies that McClafferty is also at UCLA's Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, though no author bios appear at the beginning or end of the article. (A search of the UCLA GSE&IS web page locates her there as of August 2003). Also, from the first sentence, it appears that McClafferty does not teach the graduate writing workshop described here: "a class in professional writing
that one of us has been teaching..." (27). The acknowledgements mention course participants "on an earlier version of this paper" and "Professor Diane Durkin, who has taught the course, and Professors William Sandoval and Michael Seltzer for helping us think through the interplay of writing and method" (32).

BRIEF SUMMARY: The article addresses the point that graduate students need help to write more effectively and that they are mostly not getting the help they need because it is assumed that by the time students reach graduate school, they are expected to be able to write the right sort of academic discourse. Therefore, many might be reluctant to seek help. Rose's writing workshop helps to ease these students' inclusion into their professional academic worlds. The article goes on to describe writing workshops, with topics such as the interrelation of grammar, style, logic, and voice; crafting writing; audience awareness; becoming a better reader of other people's writing; and the writing process as a process of scholarly identity formation.

EXCERPT: Writing is an activity in which all academics engage. It is an activity that consumes a great deal of our time, both in the production of scholarship and in the teaching and mentoring of students. There is a small but growing research literature on writing at the graduate level, most of it dealing with the appropriation of disciplinary discourse conventions by graduate students during the course of study. But there is little professional discussion of what we can do to help our students write more effectively. And though some graduate faculty spend a good deal of time working with their students on their writing, there are few proposals to address writing specifically in the graduate curriculum. The irony here is that the quality of scholarly writing is widely bemoaned, both outside and inside the academy...yet we seem to do little to address the quality of writing in a systematic way at the very point where scholarly style and identity is being shaped. (27)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The research echoes Rose's ongoing interest in aspects of cognition in learning, with particular relation to his recent research into other non-writing situations.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: One wonders how the two authors came to write this piece, whether one or the other had the idea first and approached the other to work together, or whether the UCLA medical school asked them. Because the author biography says that Dr. Wilkerson is senior associate dean for medical education and professor of medicine at the UCLA School of Medicine, perhaps she initiated the article.
BRIEF SUMMARY: This article investigates the medical pedagogy of having fourth-year students interview and diagnose (and interact with) "standardized patient" (SPs) as a method of assessing student performance. The abstract states:

The standardized patient (SP) examination is used in a majority of medical schools to test clinical skills. This examination usually yields both numerical ratings of clinical skill and narrative comments by patients or observers, yet most empirical studies of SP assessment focus on the numerical ratings only. This quantitative focus can lead to a narrow conceptualization of the nature and development of clinical competence. The authors suggest that in addition to utilizing SP numerical ratings, medical educators also use the rich qualitative material produced in the SP examination (e.g., patient comments, videotapes of the examination) to explore students' development of clinical competence, which involves the purposive integration of basic science, technical skill, empathy, communication, professional role, and personal history. (856)

The authors supplemented the usual scoring checklist with patient comments on evaluation forms and videotapes to stimulate recall. The authors interviewed the students as they viewed their recently completed examination to recall thoughts and emotions during the 15-minute patient examination process where a student is "trying to efficiently access his knowledge, conduct a successful interview, and avoid both the cognitive and the social blunders that will undermine his attempt to present himself as a competent professional" (857).

EXCERPT: *First, there is something a bit paradoxical in simultaneously encouraging empathy – which can require one to access one's own emotional experience – and clinical distance. Second, is it really possible [for a medical student] to step outside one's personal and cultural history, one's religious and ethical believes, one's own experiences with illness (or elaborate defenses against thinking about one's vulnerability) one's fears and apprehensions, and still connect with [a patient] in a way that, at the least, appears authentic?* (858)

* * * * *
Appendix D

Extended Annotated Bibliography of Selected Works about Mike Rose


BRIEF SUMMARY: The abstract says it uses a "hermeneutic approach" to interpret published autobiographies of these public intellectuals in terms of the relationship between the authors' learning, on one hand, and their efforts to construct an integrated identity within mainstream academic culture, on the other.

EXCERPT: The challenge for these three authors was to define themselves within academia's accustomed ways of thinking, acting, and talking without, at the same time, amputating vital aspects of their past (related particularly to ethnicity and class). . . . To summarize, a fundamental assumption is that learning and identity are inextricably connected; you cannot have one without the other. What interests me, however, is the tension that often seemed to exist for these authors between what these two processes were trying to achieve in their learning and in their lives: both change and stability, both connectedness and self-definition, both a personal presence in the moment (immediacy) and an intellectual understanding of it (reflection). (22)


BRIEF SUMMARY: Abstract says the dissertation "examines the nature of teacher and student authority in the work of three basic writing theorists: Patricia Bizzell, David Bartholomae and Mike Rose" because "their work is a useful place to begin to reconsider the place of knowledge—in this case, academic reading and writing strategies—in the basic writing classroom.

EXCERPT: I offer here a more complex understanding of the work of Bizzell, Bartholomae and Rose— that is an understanding that is more historically and philosophically rich than what has been available heretofore. Weaving their ideas together, I see in their work a basic writing pedagogy that is founded on postmodern premises of social constructionism and is sensitive to Shaughnessy's social mission of Open Admissions and expressivists' questions about the nature of authority in the classroom. Articulating how Bizzell, Bartholomae and Rose construct the teacher-student relationship might help to bring together again in conversation composition
theorists who have split off from each other as a result of dichotomizing categories.

(4)

********


BRIEF SUMMARY: The abstract says that:
the field of Composition (his capitalization) has a paradoxical understanding of the pleasures of writing. On one hand, we assume that to improve student writing, we must first convince students to care about and even to enjoy writing. On the other hand, we suspect that an emphasis on the students' inwardly felt flashes of pleasure of "inspiration" can foster a rhetorically naïve, even solipsistic approach to composing, and that therefore our real goal is to familiarize students with the discursive conventions that enable clear, successful communication. Many in Composition know this conflict as the debate between Peter Elbow and David Bartholomae. We can resolve this contradiction by rereading particular discourses about writerly pleasure that would seem to neglect the powers of convention and the demands of successful communication. . . . By linking this new understanding of writerly pleasure to work by Richard Lanham, Mike Rose, and Sondra Perl [who is on the committee for this dissertation], I theorize ways by which familiar expressivist/"magical" exercises in freewriting and figurative language can generate not only writerly pleasure but also stylistic "clarity." (iii-iv)

Johnson writes about magic, rhetoric, ecriture feminine, cites Janet Emig and Helene Cixous. Of Rose's oeuvre, only "Rigid Rules" is cited.

EXCERPTS: I will try to show how, as a tool for accessing the other or the unconscious, freewriting serves as a tool for generating the experience of intersubjectivity or pleasure. Next, I will show how freewriting, by accessing intersubjectivity, also opens the way to successful communication or stylistic clarity. This notion will strike many as highly counter-intuitive, but I hope to substantiate it with comments form rather diverse sources: Peter Elbow describes, at a kind of common-sensical level, how and why freewriting can produce some of our clearest prose; Jacques Derrida offers complementary theoretical support. In short, Elbow's practical advice about freewriting jibes well with Derrida's theory of why the sheer material flow of language can lead with surprising directness to "clear" prose. (191)

Rose's nonblocked group provides us with an important clue as to how students with comparatively pleasurable, successful writing processes differ from their opposites. (195)

Rather than experiencing the conventions as rigid rules these more successful students approached the writing process with the notion that self-conscious reflection about
conventions is fine when it seems to help them compose but simply not to be undertaken when it gets in the way. (194)

***


CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Lindquist explains that she grew up in Chicago as an outsider, moved to southern California and felt herself one of the high school burnouts, kids who no longer cared to fit in. Moved back to Chicago, tried community college, ultimately majored in English, wrote her masters in theoretical linguistics. This dissertation grew out of her work as a bartender at a working-class bar, where she, although an outsider for her education and liberal views, knew how to become part of the discourse community of the regular customers.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Abstract says it is an ethnographic study of rhetoric to both explore dynamics of argument in social networks and "consider the rhetorical circumstances under which such an ethnographic account might take shape . . . [including] autobiographical narrative in the style of Mike Rose." A cursory survey shows that the dissertation does not mention or cite Rose, who is not listed on the work-cited page. The only connections to the work of Rose are to the concept of outsiders in the academic community and Rose's use of narrative style in Lives on the Boundary. No works by Rose are listed on the works cited page.

EXCERPT: One of the things that persists in resurfacing in the way Smokehousers [the bar customers] talk about work is that work must be separated from, and indeed, must be defined against, play. The two categories seem to show very little overlap. . . . The work/play opposition prefigures a distinction between . . . doing and thinking, between producing and philosophizing. As Le Masters observes about the group of working-class men in his own study, "these blue-collar aristocrats actually feel that they are earning an 'honest living' — that working with your hands is more honorable than 'stuffing pages' or earning a living with your mouth" (21).

***


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: The author bio says that Susan Palo teaches at the University of California, Davis, which publishes this journal, though it doesn't say what she teaches nor if she has published other articles. The ideas Rose expresses here about how writing should be taught also appear in his textbook, his article on "The Language of Exclusion," etc.
CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The author's note says that she:
interviewed Rose on a quiet Saturday in Venice, California, during a lull before the paperback edition (1990) of Lives on the Boundary and the publication of his most recent work, with Malcolm Kiniry, Critical Strategies for Academic Writing: Cases, Assignments, and Readings (1990). I was interested in the development of his ideas from his earlier work on writer's block. (7)

The interviewer's questions are indicated as WOE for the journal title.

BRIEF SUMMARY: This interview is particularly helpful because here is one of the rare places where Rose explains how he was introduced to the work of Flower and Hayes in the 1970's, how he was introduced to cognitive psychology, and how he began to apply that in his teaching. Rose explains the two camps in composition – process and content.

EXCERPT: WOE: Your earlier work focused on cognitive dimensions of, say, writer's block, but in the recent book [Lives on the Boundary] you have a line where you refer to the "effect of despair on cognition." The phrase suggests to me not only that you have widened your focus from writing to education but that your analysis of causality is extending beyond cognitive and even emotional factors to social and political dimensions. . . how did you make this move?

ROSE: I'm glad the move is evident. When I was doing the writer's block work – that's about 10-12 years ago, almost the first stuff I published – I was looking at one relatively unexamined dimension of a complex problem. . . But, if I were writing that book today, I would probably do it very differently. And I think that the shift, to answer your question, the widening of my conceptual lens came with a 1985 essay that I wrote as a chapter in When a Writer Can't Write [Complexity, Rigor, Evolving Method . . ]. There I call for a complex methodology that takes into consideration the situational and affective or emotional aspects of composing as well as the cognitive. It was with that essay that my work started to shift. The next thing that I wrote, if I remember correctly, is "The Language of Exclusion." That essay is very much a social, cultural examination of the language that we use in universities to talk about writing instruction. With the "Complexity, Rigor" essay I tried to consciously set out a research framework, and with the "Language of Exclusion" essay I engaged for the first time in what some folks would call cultural criticism. (14)

*****

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: The end note says that Scherer is editor of Educational Leadership.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Rose tells the story of the schools he visited for writing Possible Lives, with details about Wheelwright, Kentucky, and how "there was this wonderful, almost paradoxical, sense of grounding kids in local history and culture providing the tools to move beyond local place" (para 7). Rose says he wants to make a point about multiculturalism that can be negotiated in a combined and not binary way - "giving kids both roots and wings" (para 9) and that teaching tolerance and diversity is essential and can be accomplished by dedicated teachers.

EXCERPTS: In response to the interviewer's question: "All the schools you chose to visit were very poor or of modest means. Why was that?" Rose replied:

I tried to be representative of discipline, region, and grade level, but I wanted to load the book with portrait of places that were poor, at most, middle class. One reason I wrote the book was to show positive teaching, so I didn't want to stack the deck by looking only at affluence places. Second, my own heart responds more to places of poverty...

But the main reason I wrote Possible Lives was to enrich the conversation about public education. A friend of mine calls it granularity: engaging in the particular, trying to document case after case of positive teaching approaches. Over the past decide, public discussion about public schools has shifted from criticism to dismissal and despair. It has the effect of shutting down our vision of what is possible. I wanted to complicate the public conversation about public schools - not just to argue, "Ah, ladies and gentlemen, I have found 50 great public school classrooms. Therefore, the glass is half full." Rather, my intention was to ask: What do these classrooms represent to us? What possibilities do they give rise to? What can we learn from these exemplars? (para 10-11)

[After talking about the changes over the past decades, especially the increased threats of violence to students in schools and on the streets, and the media pressure on children, Rose continues:]

Those images are antithetical to reflectiveness, thoughtfulness, and to careful, slow, hard intellectual work. How can these kids develop positive ideas about education when so much around them contradicts those notions... I have never had a lot of truck with imported critiques of capitalism, but parents and teachers need to mount a critique of the notion that the market knows best. Where kids are concerned, it doesn't. (para 19-20)

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: Smith describes Rose as a “friendly and supportive colleague of [his] at UCLA” (721) and presents Rose in a warm light even while pointing out what he considers some drawbacks to Rose’s position. He characterizes Rose as “a prominent figure in composition circles – both source and exemplar of much of the thinking current among his fellow writing teachers” (721).

BRIEF SUMMARY: Smith uses Bloom’s Closing of the American Mind and Rose’s Lives on the Boundary to launch a compare and contrast essay contextualizing movements in composition instruction, before proposing a pedagogical synthesis in the outlook of Goodman. To do this, Smith defines two concepts of education from Page Smith’s Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America: the 19th century’s “Classical Christian Consciousness” versus the newer “Secular Democratic Consciousness.”

EXCERPT: For Bloom, what was “dispiriting” was the loss of the grand vision – the transformative goal and “distinctive visage” the university might offer the young. . . . Benchmarks . . . were no evil; they were a necessity. The ultimate benchmark, truth, was the key source of value. That’s what came first, and individual students either measured up (with teachers’ help, of course) or didn’t. Many, in all likelihood, wouldn’t. For Rose, the university’s task is to better fit itself to the unique diversity of actual students as we find them. If that means using, say, rap music (just the kind of pop-culture effluvia Bloom was most critical of) in order to draw someone in, to get a student moving down a path that might eventually lead to Shakespeare, fine. The greater evil is exclusion, precisely the thing Blooms’ vision of education was most likely to produce. (726)

****


BRIEF SUMMARY: Trimbur attacks the idea of narrative and particularly autobiography as bourgeois but concludes that Rose's work is acceptable because "[f]or Rose, literacy is a matter not simply of the limits of an oppressive social order"(250) and because Rose has taken the "master narrative" and used it to speak against American Culture. Rose, says Trimbur, sees "literacy [as] a matter not simply of the limits of an oppressive social order. It is also a quite concrete pressure and sensuous activity that surrounds all Americans and can be tapped for the purposes of human development and liberation" (250).

EXCERPTS: The narrativity of a life, in other words, is not something that is naturally given but rather is a strategic trope for what C. B. MacPherson calls the
ideology of "possessive individualism," in which the individual emerges as a social subject by taking on a proprietary relationship to his or her own life. The autobiographical impulse to narrate a life, therefore, is not a straightforward one but rather the result of a particularly bourgeois cultural project of making and owning a sovereign and inalienable life, free from the ascriptions of birth, status, and social obligation in traditional society. (244)

Lives on the Boundary takes a lot of risks. To recount his life, Rose turns to the familiar coming of age narrative that has historically and culturally been encoded with the entrepreneurial values of individual initiative, professional maturity, and personal success. Rather than presenting a critical analysis to demystify the genre (as radical theorists typically do), Rose has sought to rearticulate the narrative from the inside – to disconnect its cultural meanings and political valence from its usual ideological function of reproducing capitalist social relations and instead to join together the narrativity of his own life to the ongoing struggle for democracy and social justice. (251)

* * * * *


CIRCUMSTANCES OF WORK: This is the transcript (slightly edited) of the Bill Moyers public television interview with Mike Rose about education as invitation. The interview appears to have arisen in conjunction with the publication of Lives on the Boundary, which is mentioned.

BRIEF SUMMARY: Moyers elicits from Rose comments on Rose's own education and then on the concept of education as "invitation." Rose has always fought fiercely about the numbing effects of the "dumbed" down educational system. His concern with the empowerment of individuals through inclusion in the educational system is reflected in his work with students such as Olga. While telling Moyers about how students all too often turn away from English classes, feeling lost, "incompetent and unworthy and mad" (Tucher 224), Rose recounted a story from Lives on the Boundary about how he helped Olga, an older woman community college student, learn Macbeth.

EXCERPT: When she finally got through [Macbeth] – and it was a battle – she said, "You know, Mike, people always hold this stuff over you. They make you feel stupid with their fancy talk. But now . . . I can say, 'I, Olga, have read it.' I won't tell you I like it, because I don't know if I do, or I don't. But I like knowing what it's about." (Tucher 224)

[Knowing about Shakespeare, most teachers would agree, is a good thing. But Rose goes on to explain why Olga's achievement was so important to her]
[Her sense of achievement] was powerful to me, because that is not the sort of thing you read in the humanist tracts on the great books. It's not that Olga became a "better human being." It's not that she gained a kind of "discriminating vision" that allowed her to better distinguish between good and evil. It is not that her linguistic capacity was enriched by the encounter with the great word. What she got from her reading of Macbeth was a sense that she was not powerless, and she was not dumb. She understood something that had become a symbol of everything that had limited her before. And she felt good about the kind of power she had. (224)

********


BRIEF SUMMARY: The abstract says, "This study reports information [questionnaires, sample syllabi and writing assignments – the sorts of course materials Stephen North calls "lore"] received from basic writing instructors at colleges in the Christian College Coalition, a group of 77 Christian, liberal arts colleges in the U.S. and Canada [and] compares data from the respondents to current theories of basic writing instruction, most notably those of Andrea Lunsford and Mike Rose" (n.p.).

She finds that while many of the colleges she surveys have been using some of the types of assignments that Rose (and Lunsford?) criticize – narrative assignments and grammar workbook exercises – the small class size, the favorable student/teacher ratio, individual attention, and the preponderance of tenure track faculty teaching these basic writing classes has been beneficial to the students. Finally, she suggests that this study provides some of the "practitioner" research called for by North, Varum, and Phelps.

EXCERPT: Chapter One: Introduction: As a three-year veteran of teaching basic writing, I discovered that I still had a great deal to learn about a class that on the surface appeared to be fairly simple. I found that workbook grammar instruction was out of favor with experts and that the problem of underprepared college writers is neither new nor unique to my situation. In addition, I read fascinating, disturbing and challenging articles by such experts as Mike Rose, Lynn Quitman Troyka, and Andrea Lunsford which implied that all the work I had previously put into teaching my own basic writing course was wrong – not only wrong, but counter-productive . . . . Most important of all, I found that by just teaching a 'watered-down' version of the traditional composition course, I was actually doing my students more harm than good. (1-2)

********

BRIEF SUMMARY: The abstract says that "analysis of a series of texts – quasi-autobiographical works by Mike Rose and Howard Gardner... reveals the presence of both overt and covert forms of narrative organization..."

EXCERPT: With the exception of a handful of articles, composition journals and anthologies have, through their silence, affirmed the marginal status that composition textbooks consistently ascribe to narrative writing. A deeper and more reflexive understanding of narrative, in both its cognitive and its cultural dimensions, holds the same promise for composition studies. The realization of that promise, however, has been blocked by the discipline's comparative neglect of narrative and the steadily accumulating literature about it. Paradoxically, this neglect has been rooted in one of those disciplinary interests – composition as cognition – that a closer attention to narrative might most help to advance. We can begin to understand the logic of this paradoxical neglect by looking at a passage in Mike Rose's "Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal... Rose's focus on the connection between writing and cognition reflects the strong Cognitivist orientation of much research in composition studies in the late '70's and early '80s, and that orientation tended to bring with it a dim view of narrative and descriptive writing on the grounds of their cognitive thinness. When Andrea Lunsford contributed an overview of "Cognitive Studies and Teaching Writing" to the 1985 MLA collection Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition, she identified a 'set of cognitive strategies including generalizing, abstracting, inferring, and synthesizing... that are... crucial to both reading and writing" (158). Later, in the same paragraph, in a statement that echoes and validates Rose's discussion of a few years earlier, she reports that "Studies I have conducted over the last several years... indicate that narrative and descriptive writing tasks typically elicit far fewer generalizations or abstractions than do argumentative tasks" (Lunsford 158 qtd 5-6)

* * * * *


RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WORK: This videocassette (28 min) was originally produced in 1990 for the PBS television program "A World of Ideas" in which Bill Moyers interviewed Rose. See the published transcript listed here under Andie Tucher, editor.

BRIEF SUMMARY & EXCERPT: See the Tucher listing for a summary of the interview and excerpts.
Appendix E
Selected Additional Work by Rose


"Tales Out of School." *Rethinking Schools.* v.11, n.1 (Fall 1996).

"What We Talk about When We Talk about School." *Education Week* 25 Sept 1996.

