

Are Textbooks Contributions to Scholarship?

Gerald J. Alred and Erik A. Thelen

Some innovative textbooks . . . represent primary means of communicating the results of extensive research. Such means of conducting research and formulating theory require considerable investments of time, imagination, expertise, and energy. When they meet appropriate standards of scholarship, therefore, they should carry appropriate credit in tenure and promotion review.

Scholarship in Composition: Guidelines for Faculty, Deans, and Department Chairs.

Despite statements like the one above from a CCCC pamphlet, many people are unwilling to assign any credit to textbook writing as a scholarly activity.¹ In a recent article for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Debra Blum surveys textbook authors and publishers and finds that at most research universities, "it is not considered academically respectable—indeed, it may even be academic suicide for professors without tenure—to take time away from writing scholarly books, monographs, and journal articles to publish a textbook" (A12). In fact, in most academic departments, textbook authorship has long been viewed as trivial at best and, at worst, as a form of faculty moonlighting.

Scholarly Labor and Profit

As we discuss later, some of the prejudice against textbooks is based on the suspicion (which we share) that many publishers, seeking to maximize their market share, debase the integrity of textbooks. But many in the academy also see textbooks as mass-market commodities which must by definition fall outside a scholar's proper work. One administrator we spoke with stated bluntly that the primary objection to textbook authorship is that faculty should not be rewarded academically for a "commercial venture." The subtext of financial gain and double-dipping for textbook authors is the basis of the humor in a cartoon published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The cartoon shows a faculty committee seated around a conference table. The committee chair, holding a vita, says: "The fact that his textbook sold 80,000 copies last year, I'm assuming,

Gerald J. Alred is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. His most recent book is *The Professional Writer: A Guide for Advanced Technical Writing* (1992), and his current project is a book on the theory of indirectness in negative messages. Erik A. Thelen is a Ph.D. candidate in the same department, completing his dissertation in Rhetoric and Composition. He is an award-winning teacher of writing and has served as a reviewer for numerous textbook publishers.

should not be held against him" (Cable B7). The notion that scholars should be interested only in modest rewards for their labors dates from the time of the Sophists. But it may help explain why, as Ross Winterowd points out, "scholars and authors and scholar-authors have paid too little attention to the rules, ethics, the tradition, or the results" of textbook publishing, despite the considerable time and intellectual effort an author may invest in such a project (139).

Ironically, a scholar's financial reward for writing a textbook is usually quite modest. George Beakley, writing in *Engineering Education*, estimates that typical engineering texts (which are often more profitable than composition texts) will earn a single author \$8.50/hour for 1,200 hours of work—and only half of that amount for a coauthor (300). But many textbook authors put in 1,200 hours of work for much less. And quite a few authors earn *no* profit because their book fails to earn enough to pay for their expenses. Beakley's advice to would-be authors is that "you should not consider writing a [text]book unless you have a burning desire to share your ideas with others. Most beginners find that a book writing project takes substantially more time than anticipated, and the profit generated is usually smaller than first expected" (300).

Whatever an author's motivation, the notion that textbooks are somehow disreputable because they may earn profits for authors is simply bogus. It denies that academics receive royalties from traditional scholarly books, stipends for invited lectures and professional reviews, salary increases from job offers by competing institutions, and so on. In essence, it denies that "scholarly worth" translates into financial value for both the individual and the institution. More importantly, as a matter of principle, the profit a scholar may or may not earn from a textbook or any other product of his or her labor should *never* be a test of its propriety or scholarly worth—the only consideration must be the nature and quality of the work itself.

Textbooks and Controversy

While the issue of profits and textbooks is seldom discussed openly, complaints about the substance of composition textbooks appear with some regularity. In 1978, for example, Donald Stewart surveyed composition research and pedagogy and offered the chastening observation that the prefaces of most composition textbooks do not indicate an awareness of important research in the field done after 1960 (174–75). Nearly a decade later, Kathleen Welch lamented the persistence of this state of affairs: "Of the hundreds of pounds of freshman writing books produced each year, few are constructed with any overt indication that composition theory has ever existed" (269).

In one of the most pointed indictments of textbooks, Stephen North suggests that they are merely distillations of classroom "lore." In *The Making of Knowledge in Composition*, North concludes that many textbooks serve only as a means for teachers to preach the "faith" of literacy, as he describes it:

One might look, for example, at Ken Macrorie's books, or Elbow's *Writing with Power* or Brannon, Knight, and Neverow-Turk's *Writers Writing*. Here, in more intimate, self-conscious personas, the monolith of correctness is recast in a less important form, and attention shifts to the act of writing. But of course the result is no less propaganda. The only difference is that an alternative set of political values is at work. To frame it in somewhat oversimplified terms, the "traditional" texts present writing as a matter of learning to conform, with an emphasis on decorum as a means of identifying individual with group; whereas the "non-traditional" books present it as a liberating activity, a means of defining individual as separate from group. The point here is that writing is necessarily more complex, and more variable, than either position can depict—encompasses both of them, and more. In either case, then, the users of such books are presented with proselytizers who differ only in their particular doctrinal allegiance: in short, with propaganda. (31)

Though seldom cast in such stark language, the view that textbooks are merely compilations of helpful tips, coupled with the fear that they carry out political agendas of powerful groups, suggests a deep ambivalence toward textbooks. Critics sometimes lament that textbooks are little more rigorous than a conversation in the faculty lounge, and at other times they decry the powerful ideological devices that they discern rippling beneath the slick covers.

Clearly, textbooks occupy a unique place in our professional practice: as devalued commodities, they reach a large and impressionable audience; as representations of our disciplinary practice, they are often lightning rods for controversy. It is hardly surprising, then, that textbooks should evoke such contradictory responses. What is (or should be) surprising, however, is that many in the academy still greet new textbooks with an indifference that is tantamount to disdain.

Are textbooks contributions to scholarship? The reactions to this question and the answers (positive or negative) are, we believe, significant registers of how our profession sees itself. In our unguarded assumptions about textbooks, we reveal how we construct our professional identities, how we compare ourselves to other disciplines, and how we value our experiences in the classroom.

Audiences Addressed, Audiences Constructed

One reason that many people find it so easy to reject textbooks as scholarship is their assumption that composition textbooks are, like textbooks in other fields, written principally for students and not for teacher-scholars. Such an assumption is understandable because the reader directly addressed is the student, after all, and it is the student who purchases the textbook. Moreover, some might suggest that any work which contributes to the body of knowledge in a field would not be readable by undergraduates. According to this view, a "scholarly textbook" is a contradiction in terms: influential scholarship is esoteric, remote, and inaccessible; successful textbooks are obvious, commonplace,

and “simple.” So, when North and others see textbooks as propagandistic, they ostensibly assume that the unsophisticated student is the reader at whom the propaganda is aimed.

Of course, publishers invest substantial resources in developing flashy covers and other superficial features, presumably for student readers. Nevertheless, both publishers and authors are well aware that while the composition textbook is directly addressed to the student audience, the textbook is constructed for the professional audience. From simply a marketing perspective, it is the instructor for whom textbooks are published because instructors, not students, make adoption decisions; it is for the profession, not students, that publishers set up their booths at conventions. When selecting reviewers for a text, authors and editors seek academics in the discipline, not students, to evaluate the manuscript. When refining the scope of a textbook, they weigh most heavily the perceived needs and expectations of their professional colleagues who will use the text to orchestrate their classrooms. They do not include or exclude something based on a view of students reading the text in isolation. On the other hand, most authors and conscientious editors entertain the hope that a good textbook can redeem a bad course for their student audience. As a result, they struggle to accommodate the textbook’s approach both to the instructor’s pedagogical concerns and to the students’ needs. This complex negotiation between the student audience and the professional audience is often shrouded, however, because textbook authors speak to their readers—instructors and students alike—through the shared fiction of the classroom.

In ways both obvious and subtle, textbooks also construct a fiction of the profession and its methods. Even in the sciences, Thomas Kuhn observes, textbooks are significant sources of authority from which not only students but even “scientists and laymen take their image of creative scientific activity” (136).

A textbook decision that one of our colleagues must soon make not only illustrates Kuhn’s point but also demonstrates in part how science textbooks and composition textbooks differ. Our colleague directs a writing program and must assign a composition class to a senior faculty member who is not a composition specialist. The faculty member told her that he would need “a lot of help” as he prepares for his teaching assignment. Although she will provide him with several important articles and other resources, she knows that his primary guide during the semester will be the textbook he uses in the classroom. As she reviews the textbooks on her shelves, she admits that she is concerned about the image of the program that he will take from a textbook she might recommend. We see her concern as quite reasonable. Beyond any superficial image the textbook might create, her colleague’s experience with the textbook in his classroom will be an engagement more prolonged and lively than the term “reading” usually evokes. Indeed, this textbook will influence his success in the classroom as well as his perception of his students’ success. Correspondingly, this textbook will influence the students’ perceptions of his professional credibility and the

authority of the enterprise. In its sophistication, its voice, its choice of examples, its organization, its conception of the writing process, and in a myriad of other ways, this textbook will powerfully define contemporary composition studies in our colleague's department.

This is not an isolated case. Most writing program administrators understand that the selection of a standard text at any level may be the single most influential decision in enacting the philosophy of the program. Long after the orientation sessions are finished and after the policy memos are dutifully filed, the textbook will accompany the instructor through the course. Beyond the local scene, the textbook will help construct the image of the program. When someone asks at a conference, "What text are you using for that course at your school?" the answer often *defines* the course, the program philosophy, and perhaps even the institution in the mind of the questioner.

Textbooks and the Production of Knowledge

Thomas Kuhn sees an altogether different relationship between the content of science textbooks and the development of the scientific disciplines. In his view, the discipline wholly defines its textbooks: "If I am right that each scientific revolution alters the historical perspective of the community that experiences it, then that change of perspective should affect the structure of postrevolutionary textbooks and research publications" (ix). In Kuhn's model of "normal science," knowledge is made in the lab, reported in the journals, domesticated by the textbooks, and subsequently regarded as the "normal" platform for professional activity. Kuhn, then, would reject science textbooks as scholarship because they merely "expound the body of accepted theory, illustrate many or all of its successful applications, and compare these applications with exemplary observations and experiments" (10). Robert Connors goes further in his description of the traditional role assigned to textbooks:

In most developed intellectual disciplines, the function of texts has always been essentially conservative: textbooks, which change with glacial slowness, provide stability amid the shifting winds of theoretical argument. They serve as sources for the proven truths needed for students' basic training while advanced scholarship extends the theoretical envelope, usually in journal articles. (190)

In this traditional view, textbooks are regarded as non-rhetorical "window-panes" through which students passively receive theory developed elsewhere (cf. Miller 611-13). But Connors observes that textbooks on writing, unlike textbooks in science and many other disciplines, historically not only have served to transmit theory, but have formed and established theory as well (178). Connors sees, over the course of the last 50 years in composition, "a struggle for epistemological primacy between journals and textbooks," and he claims that "textbooks are changing because they have begun, for the first time, to lose the

battle" (191). Textbooks are losing their hegemony, he suggests, because of the increasing professionalization of composition. But we contend that even if composition were fully professionalized, textbooks must still participate in the production of knowledge in the field. This conclusion is based in part on the diversity of sites and methodologies that produce knowledge in composition.

In *The Making of Knowledge in Composition*, Stephen North finds each of the sites where new knowledge is made to be inadequate in one way or another. One senses his disappointment that he cannot find one adequate venue, methodology, or means of communicating discoveries. We would suggest that such a quest, though perhaps noble, is doomed. As North himself as well as many others have suggested, writing is extraordinarily complex and variable: writing does not conform to systematic theorems, proofs, laws, and formulas. Unlike science, composition cannot provide and transmit in textbooks anything like Ohm's Law or the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Recognizing this distinction, Mike Rose observes that

composition texts hold knowledge of a kind different from that found in history or literature or biology or astronomy texts. It is process knowledge for solving complex open-ended problems. This makes the composition text a rare kind of text, indeed. ("Speculations" 211)

Because it is bound up with creativity, cognition, language formation, personality, and social interaction, writing resists all efforts to reduce it to charts, models, or formulas. The study of writing and its production is thus not like science or most developed intellectual disciplines because it inevitably combines elements of the arts, sciences, and social sciences. Consequently, paradigms in composition are much less rigid and narrowly focused on past achievements than those of "normal science," for example (Kuhn 5, 10). Paradigms in composition (if the term "paradigm" is even appropriate) do not follow linear developments; rather, they grow from the sites and contexts where writing is studied and produced: conferences, classrooms, writing centers, work places, and conversations among professionals, to name a few. Each site where writing is studied and practiced has its own set of issues and methodological demands. As a result, it is often problematic to apply directly the knowledge gained at one site to writing that is composed at another site, as we will illustrate later. That is also why a single theory or methodology can never be wholly satisfactory to address the issues at every site where writing is studied.

Certainly one of the sites where knowledge about writing is created and tested is the classroom. We know intuitively that teaching students to write requires much more than teaching a canon of rules; it requires that we enable students to rehearse a variety of strategies and to try them out on real readers. The contemporary writing classroom thus requires that students become critically invested in their writing. The writing classroom is inevitably dynamic and seldom predictable: even when we mix the ingredients in exactly the same way, the results often surprise us. So, in a myriad of ways (often based on our

professional interests and specialties), we become students in our own classrooms.² And what we learn in the classroom as teachers is often at the center of our work as scholars. In short, we do not merely transmit or reproduce knowledge about writing in the contemporary classroom—we make knowledge about writing there as well.

With the growing awareness of the ways in which context influences writers and readers, we have come to see that the classroom is not a black box, protected from situational exigencies, but a complex work place with its own protocols and agendas. Composition textbooks inevitably orient the student and the teacher toward the problem of writing and toward one another. Textbooks create roles for them to fill and thus provide a theoretical framework for their accomplishments. This inherently theoretical nature of textbooks may be the reason Kathleen Welch observes that even when textbooks do not acknowledge their theoretical assumptions, they nevertheless enact an “unconscious theory” (269). In fact, a textbook that merely strings together inconsistent or outdated models of writing will not lack theory, but rather will endorse, and thus contribute, willy-nilly, a theory of writing that is similarly inconsistent and outdated. As the focus shifts from static, page-bound modes and models to the dynamic give-and-take of group writing, peer editing, and case method, the focus of the textbook must shift dramatically from what can be *taught* to what can be *learned*. The “rare kind of text” that Rose describes will be one which risks being richly and self-consciously theoretical.

For all the reasons cited above, however, some may quite properly suggest that textbooks contribute as much to pedagogy as to theory. And still others might persuasively argue that composition textbooks significantly influence the student’s practice of writing well beyond the classroom. It is little wonder, then, that academic administrators find problematic where to place textbooks in the conventional triad of research, teaching, and service. We believe this conundrum is the result of a failure to articulate sufficiently something we have always known: in composition, theory, practice, and pedagogy overlap, interpenetrate, and transform each other. When we teach writing, we create theory; when we communicate theory, we inform composition pedagogy; and when we enrich pedagogy, we affect the practice of writing for both our students and ourselves. A scholar who understands that relationship is up-to-date; a textbook which embodies that relationship is scholarly.

Indeed, such diverse scholar-authors as Edward P. J. Corbett, Frank D’Angelo, Linda Flower, Ken Macrorie, and W. Ross Winterowd manifestly demonstrate that such textbooks are possible. Moreover, some textbooks, like Young, Becker, and Pike’s *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*, show how textbooks can significantly extend the “theoretical envelope.” Other textbooks can (as we illustrate) provide a forum where theory can be tested or modified to accommodate practice and pedagogy in inventive ways that create new theory. Viewed in the light of these examples, textbooks should not be seen to compete with

journals for “epistemological primacy”; they should be regarded as merely one more voice in the dynamic conversation of the profession.

It seems to us that the increasing professionalization of composition ought to put a great deal more (not less) pressure on textbooks to be scholarly. For one thing, those whose professional investment is in composition will not be satisfied with textbooks that are unaware of important connections between theory, practice, and pedagogy. Consider one small example: recently, one of us reviewed a business communication textbook in which the authors were employing several heuristic strategies from general composition. Several reviewers pointed out that the importation did not satisfy all the needs of writers in an organizational setting. As the reviews and revisions circulated, the authors produced a fresh array of invention activities for solving business writing problems. What they produced surprised the reviewers—and probably the authors as well. Such dialogue among authors, reviewers, and publishers has in the past engendered new concepts; for conscientious publishers today, the textbook review and development process is often as rigorous and dynamic as that of many journals.

Textbooks and Accountability

Many worry, of course, that the textbook review process is sometimes too rigorous—that it rounds the edges where an author’s points are sharp and that it produces bland and repetitious books. Anyone who wished to document such a claim would not have to look far: an abundance of anecdotal evidence exists which suggests that pressures exerted by the publishing industry and merchandising practices tend to work against textbooks whose authors wish to present new ideas (see, for example, Blum; Perrin; Winterowd). Others fear that “instant” textbooks, created by publishers, bookstores, and copy centers, threaten to diffuse the process so that textbooks are the product of no one.

The logical development of custom publishing, the “feature-driven” textbook, is already evident in the speed with which fashionable topics are grafted onto new editions. The revision cycle (now down to about every other year) reinforces the perception that the content of the textbook is trivial—that revision is motivated not by scholarship, but by pressures from used book sales and the desire for a bigger market share. Such textbooks, following a programmed series of superficial updates, deepen our suspicion that new editions merely celebrate the new without touching on the variety of influences which would give meaning to that newness. By accepting textbooks as market commodities, we only encourage these publishing trends and foster the sophisticated, ineffective books Mike Rose describes (“Sophisticated” 66). Consider one mark of such books: prefaces that are sleek marketing devices rather than substantive statements by authors.

Many of us, of course, simply ignore prefaces; they are primarily used by sales reps to demonstrate the features of the book. Many publishers consider the preface to be their domain (rather than the author's) because they define it as a "marketing device." Consequently, prefaces are often bland and do not reveal the author's research or theoretical assumptions. Consider the following composite of several prefaces from well-known textbooks:

TITLE is a comprehensive and flexible textbook for the introductory writing course, although experienced writers will also find it useful. Rhetorical principles are explained, illustrated, and applied to a variety of assignments, which are based on the best contemporary theory and practice in the teaching of writing. Part One of TITLE covers standard methods of generating ideas and gathering information. New to this edition is the coverage of FEATURE, FEATURE, and FEATURE. Part Two helps students understand how they can produce effective writing for a wide range of situations. Part Three, "The Handbook," covers the essentials of grammar, usage, and mechanics.

But what theory? What practice? What situations? How is it both "basic" and "advanced"? Are the new "features" compatible with the author's philosophy? What is the author's philosophy? What are the author's theoretical assumptions? What methodology lies behind the text? Where is the author's voice? What we find most distressing about this preface is precisely that we see it so often. The desire to make a textbook appeal to the widest possible market seduces publishers, editors, and even authors to construct prefaces that make textbooks appear as if they were assembled by an obscure machine.

Given the current ambivalence about the status of textbooks, it makes little difference, from the point of view of scholarship, whether a preface or any other part of a textbook succeeds or fails, since the project is exempt from scholarly attention. Many journals, in fact, now refuse to review textbooks, citing the overproduction of new textbooks and the increase in professional publications by scholarly presses. In this climate, a textbook's failure hardly endangers the scholarly reputation of the author, since "scholarship" is kept a safe distance away. However, if we consider composition textbooks as equal to other works as potential contributions to scholarship, we will raise the stakes for both authors and publishers. In that circumstance, as an example, authors would be obliged to accept full responsibility for prefaces by using them to declare their theoretical assumptions, describe the nature of their research, reveal a text's intellectual lineage, and explain how a text contributes to the discipline. Young, Becker, and Pike's preface stands as a good example (xi-xiv). But, historically, even the prefaces of less widely known textbooks have been used by their authors to make serious theoretical and substantive statements about their work. Consider one usefully limited and readily identifiable area: technical writing.

Alred, Reep, and Limaye's historical bibliography suggests that prefaces of technical writing textbooks in the early part of this century were often concise

treatises on their subjects as well as scrupulous explanations of the authors' methodologies. These early prefaces also reflect the conviction of their authors that textbooks can be sites where knowledge is produced and disseminated. In the preface to his 1911 textbook, for example, S. C. Earle complains that existing technical writing textbooks are largely "based on a study of literary exposition" and are therefore ill-suited to underpin technical writing as a field of study (vi). Earle's textbook articulates and embodies a view of technical writing as socially constructed; indeed, his textbook anticipates Jack Selzer's conclusions in "The Composing Processes of an Engineer," written 72 years later (Earle 1-3; Selzer 184-86).

In 1954, Gordon Mills and John Walter present in their textbook, *Technical Writing*, new forms of "technical discourse" for the engineer. Mills and Walter explain in their preface that these "special techniques of technical writing" are based on their study of hundreds of actual documents and numerous discussions with writers in 300 industrial and research organizations (viii). This research is the foundation for their textbook's departure from the traditional modes. Instead of Exposition, Description, Narration, and Argumentation, Mills and Walter proposed Definition, Description of a Mechanism, Description of a Process, Classification and Partition, and Interpretation. Their taxonomy served as a working platform for a generation of scholars who embraced it as well as for those who attempted to replace it. Although Mills and Walter presented some of their findings in a University of Texas research report, it was their textbook that broadcast their findings and established their influence.

In 1976, Mathes and Stevenson attempt to displace the current assumptions, telling readers of their preface that *Designing Technical Reports* "differs substantially from most technical writing texts, which usually begin with questions of report format, technical style, sentence structure, or mechanics . . ." (xvi). Like authors of scholarly articles and monographs, Mathes and Stevenson define a problem to be solved; they state in their preface that they "began with a paradox: practicing engineers need to write efficiently and effectively; yet despite that obvious need, the writing experiences of most engineering students in college do not prepare them to write as they must in industry and government" (vi). To fulfill that need, Mathes and Stevenson develop a map of the writer's audiences, called an "egocentric organization chart," that emphasizes not the forms of technical discourse but rather the relation between the writer and various readers in an organization (15). Although their design was presented at their University of Michigan Summer Institutes, it was their textbook that most fully articulated and broadcast this reader-directed philosophy.

More recently, Paul Anderson states in the preface of his 1987 textbook, *Technical Writing: A Reader-Centered Approach*, "While writing this book, one of my major goals has been to devise a framework that will help us as teachers to integrate our instruction in the standard forms of technical communication

with the rhetorical and process-oriented approach that many of us take" (vii). Anderson's project is to take key insights from cognitive psychology and apply these to process pedagogy in order to construct a theory of technical writing that is based as much on the mind of the reader as on the reader's organizational function. Those who saw the first edition quickly realized that the text represented a significant departure from both Mills and Walter's "forms of technical discourse" and Mathes and Stevenson's "egocentric" model. Of course, these earlier theories deeply inform Anderson's project. It is not surprising, then, that in his preface Anderson acknowledges his indebtedness to previous textbooks: among others, he acknowledges Mills and Walter's *Technical Writing*, Mathes and Stevenson's *Designing Technical Reports*, Linda Flower's *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing*, and Young, Becker, and Pike's *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* (vii). Anderson explains that these "textbooks have also taught me a great deal about what and how to teach" (vii). Anderson's preface not only suggests that textbooks on writing can be sites where knowledge is made, tested, and modified, but it also shows how prefaces should reveal the intellectual lineage of the books they introduce.

Raising our expectations of prefaces will not by itself make textbooks any more scholarly. But a substantive preface would help us judge if a book fulfills and embodies the promises of its preface—and thus ensure that a textbook's theory is no longer "unconscious." Substantive prefaces would also help journal reviewers to assess which texts are worth reviewing. Similarly, tenure and promotion committees would be better able to evaluate the seriousness of a book's contribution. For all of us, such prefaces would make the text-selection process richer by revealing if a book is compatible with our own approach to writing—whether that is egocentric, reader-centered, current-traditional, process-based, socially-constructed, or "none of the above."

Conclusion

Are textbooks contributions to scholarship? Given the history of textbooks and the way knowledge is produced in composition, it seems wrongheaded to unquestioningly accept a common view that they *cannot* be scholarly contributions. At the same time, we would not claim that all textbooks fully participate in the process we describe earlier. But one thing is certain: if we accept the view that textbooks are merely commercial ventures and not a scholar's proper work, we will participate in a self-fulfilling prophecy that warps the textbook process and makes it unlikely that another *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* will ever be produced. On the other hand, if we raise the stakes for textbook publishing, we will foster textbooks that can serve as sites where theory, practice, and pedagogy will transform—and reform—one another. And we will foster textbooks that represent the best of our scholarly labor.

Notes

1. This essay was developed from a speech delivered by Gerald J. Alred at the Midwest Conference of the Association for Business Communication, April 5, 1991. We wish to thank Diana Reep, whose thoughtful response pushed us in new directions, and many other colleagues for their helpful comments and suggestions.

2. As graduate programs in composition and rhetoric mature, many of us will have the option of not teaching writing to undergraduates. We hope very few choose that option. As one of our colleagues whose specialty is basic writing told us, she regularly teaches in the undergraduate program precisely because she learns from those students as well as from her colleagues.

Works Cited

- Alred, Gerald J., Diana C. Reep, and Mohan R. Limaye. *Business and Technical Writing: An Annotated Bibliography of Books, 1880-1980*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1981.
- Anderson, Paul V. *Technical Writing: A Reader-Centered Approach*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1987.
- Beakley, George C. "Publishing a Textbook?" *Engineering Education* 78 (Feb. 1988): 299-302.
- Blum, Debra E. "Authors, Publishers Seek to Raise Quality and Status of the College Textbook, Long an Academic Stepchild." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 31 July, 1991: A11-A12.
- Cable, Carol. Cartoon. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 15 August 1990: B7.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. *Scholarship in Composition: Guidelines for Faculty, Deans, and Department Chairs*. Urbana: NCTE, n.d.
- Connors, Robert J. "Textbooks and the Evolution of the Discipline." *College Composition and Communication* 37 (May 1986): 178-94.
- Earle, Samuel C. *Theory and Practice of Technical Writing*. New York: Macmillan, 1911.
- Flower, Linda. *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing*. New York: Harcourt, 1981.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.
- Mathes, J. C., and Dwight W. Stevenson. *Designing Technical Reports: Writing for Audiences in Organizations*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1976.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "A Humanistic Rationale for Technical Writing." *College English* 40 (Feb. 1979): 610-17.
- Mills, Gordon H., and John A. Walter. *Technical Writing*. 1954. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1970.
- North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth: Boynton, 1987.
- Perrin, Robert. "Textbook Writers and Textbook Publishers: One Writer's View of the Teaching Canon." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 7.1 (Spring/Summer 1988): 67-74.
- Rose, Mike. "Sophisticated, Ineffective Books—The Dismantling of Process in Composition Texts." *College Composition and Communication* 32 (Feb. 1981): 65-74.
- . "Speculations on Process Knowledge and the Textbook's Static Page." *College Composition and Communication* 34.2 (May 1983): 208-13.
- Selzer, Jack. "The Composing Processes of an Engineer." *College Composition and Communication* 34 (May 1983): 178-87.
- Stewart, Donald C. "Composition Textbooks and the Assault on Tradition." *College Composition and Communication* 29 (May 1978): 171-76.
- Welch, Kathleen E. "Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production: The Place of Theory in Writing Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication* 38 (Oct. 1987): 269-82.
- Winterowd, W. Ross. "Composition Textbooks: Publisher-Author Relationships." *College Composition and Communication* 40 (May 1989): 139-51.
- Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike. *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*. New York: Harcourt, 1970.