

CSUSB
M.A. in English Composition
Comprehensive Examination
Preparation Guide
2007-2008

Contents

Introduction	3
The Basics	4
Checklist	5
Preparing for the Comprehensive Examination	6
Contact Information	7
Reading Lists and Sample Questions	8
On-Campus Components	
English 611, The Western Rhetorical Tradition	8
English 612, Contemporary Composition & Discourse Theory	10
English 650, Critical Approaches to Literature	12
Take-Home Components	
Composition	14
Literature	19
TESL (On-Campus and Take-Home Components)	22
Appendix: Study Questions (Composition Students)	32

Introduction

Starting in Fall Quarter, 2006, the M.A. in English Composition program at CSU San Bernardino began to offer a Comprehensive Examination as an alternative to the thesis. A comprehensive examination serves as a student's "culminating experience" in an M.A. program, equivalent for degree purposes to writing a thesis.

We have designed our examination to reflect the concerns of our program, and to allow students to demonstrate in a variety of ways the abilities specified in the California Education Code (Title 5), which governs CSU M.A. programs. Title 5 specifies the following about a comprehensive examination:

A comprehensive examination is an assessment of the student's ability to integrate the knowledge of the area, show critical and independent thinking, and demonstrate mastery of the subject matter. The results of the examination provide evidence of independent thinking, appropriate organization, critical analysis, and accuracy of documentation.

This booklet provides information about the examination for each of the three concentrations in the program, including reading lists and sample questions for each examination component. We are pleased to be able to offer students the alternative of a comprehensive examination, and we encourage you to carefully consider which culminating experience (examination or thesis) best meets your individual goals. The program's Graduate Coordinators can answer questions you may have after you have reviewed the material in this booklet.

The Basics

When You Take the Examination	No earlier than last quarter of program coursework and after completing ENG 695; you must declare your intention to take the examination at least one quarter in advance of enrolling in ENG 999 (Comprehensive Examination)
Continuous Enrollment	You must be enrolled in, at a minimum, ENG 999 (Comprehensive Examination) in the quarter in which you take the examination. For information about other Continuous Enrollment policies, consult the coordinator of your concentration,
Schedule	The examination will be offered Fall and Spring quarters.
Who will Read the Examination	A committee consisting of two English faculty and a Graduate Coordinator.
Coverage	The examination addresses the program core and concentration.
Structure of Examination	<p>The examination will consist of two parts:</p> <p>1. On-campus component (closed book):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Composition and Literature concentrators will choose two questions drawn from the materials of core courses (ENG 611, 612, and 650); ❑ TESL concentrators will choose one program core question (from ENG 611, 612 and 650) and take a TESL-concentration-focused mixed examination comprised of short-answer concept explanation questions, text analysis, and essay questions. <p>2. Take-home component (open book)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Students in each concentration will respond to an essay question focused on their concentration (3500-word maximum response).
Time-Frame of Examination	<p>On-campus component: For composition and literature students: 2.5 hours for each exam question. For TESL students: 2.5 hours for core question and 2.5 hours for mixed examination. There will be a one-hour break between questions (6 hours total). Will be offered on a Saturday.</p> <p>Take-home component: pick up examination question on Thursday, return response on Monday. The take-home component for the Composition and the Literature and TESL concentrations will be offered on a different set of dates.</p>
Grading	Pass/Fail; results will be announced approximately 2 weeks after the completion of the examination.

Repeat of Examination	The examination cannot be taken more than twice, and re-takes must be done within one calendar year. If you fail one component of the examination (on-campus or take-home) and pass one part, you only re-take the part you failed.
ENG 695 (Thesis Proposal and Comprehensive Examination Preparation)	Beginning in Winter 06, ENG 695 will encourage collaborative preparation for the examination; you may repeat ENG 695 even if you've already received a grade of CR. ENG 695 will continue to facilitate drafting of thesis proposals for those students undertaking the thesis.
Reading Lists/ Examination Preparation Materials Issued	For Fall Examination: released at the end of previous Fall Quarter/beginning of Winter Quarter For Spring Examination: released at the end of previous Spring Quarter
Changing from Thesis Option to Examination Option	Can be done up to one quarter prior to taking examination (e.g., by Spring 06 for the Fall 06 examination, by Winter 07 for the Spring 07 examination). You may need an additional 4-unit elective, since ENG 999 carries no units, in contrast to ENG 699A/B, the thesis courses. Consult the coordinator of your concentration to review your individual record and file appropriate forms.
Changing from Examination Option to Thesis Option	Cannot be done once you have attempted the examination; if you take the examination and fail, you cannot revert to the thesis option; if you fail the examination a second time, you will not receive your degree.
Thesis Option in New Program	Requires 3.7 GPA in degree-applicable courses or permission of the Graduate Coordinator for students admitted to the program beginning in Fall 06.



Checklist

Prior to the quarter in which you take the Comprehensive Examination, you may need to do some or all of the following, depending upon your academic record. Consult the coordinator of your concentration for more information about these requirements.

- 1. Earn a CR (credit) in ENG 695.
- 2. File a program plan with the coordinator of your concentration and consult the coordinator about the appropriate quarter to take the examination (no earlier than your last quarter of coursework). File a "Grad Check" with the Office of Records, Registration and Evaluation, listing the quarter in which you will take the examination as your expected date of graduation.

- 3. File a “Declaration of Intent Form” with the coordinator of your concentration at least one quarter in advance of taking the examination (by Spring 07 for the Fall 07 examination).
- 4. Enroll in ENG 999, Comprehensive Examination (0 units) for the quarter in which you intend to take the examination. Contact the coordinator of your concentration for a permit to enroll in this course.
- 5. Complete any outstanding incompletes.
- 6. File any petitions to discount an unsatisfactory grade or waive the 7-year expiration of courses (you must have a minimum GPA of 3.0 in degree-applicable courses to be eligible to receive the degree).



Preparing for the Comprehensive Examination

You’re already undertaking the first step in preparing for the Comprehensive Examination: carefully reading this booklet, and noting any questions you have. This booklet provides reading lists and sample questions for each component of the examination. Make sure you understand which components you will be required to complete, and if you have questions, make sure to contact the coordinator of your concentration.

In preparing for the examination, you should pursue interconnections among concepts both within and across the boundaries of your courses. Making such connections will be essential to answering your examination questions well, since those questions will draw broadly on ideas, concerns, and theories shared across classes. Remember that the examination is designed to allow you to demonstrate to the best of your ability what you *have* learned in the M.A. program, not to highlight what you *haven’t* learned.

Examination preparation need not take place in isolation. You are encouraged to collaborate with other students in preparing for the examination, both independently (e.g., in study groups) and through the mechanism of ENG 695. Talking about the ideas of the field with others is an excellent way to heighten understanding and to gain facility with the discourse of the field. Although you will do most of your examination preparation study and research independently or with peers, you may also consult faculty members for advice on preparation or to discuss specific questions about texts or concepts.

During both the on-campus and take-home components of the examination, however, responses *must* be completed independently. Examinees must not consult anyone (including other examinees) about the specific questions or responses to them. Such consultation will constitute a violation of the Student Discipline Code and will be subject to established sanctions.

In preparation for the examination, you may find that you already have some of the texts on the reading lists. Other readings can be obtained through the Pfau Library’s book and journal collections (print and/or electronic), the library databases, and interlibrary loan.

Students should also carefully read the "Examination Procedures Bulletin" (available on the M.A. website) for procedures applying to the on-campus and take-home components of the comprehensive examination.

Contact Information

Graduate Coordinators

Prof. Jacqueline Rhodes, Graduate Coordinator (Composition Concentration)
UH 301.22
jrhodes@csusb.edu
(909) 537-5026

Prof. Sunny Hyon, Associate Graduate Coordinator (TESL Concentration)
UH 301.05
shyon@csusb.edu
(909) 537-5465

Prof. David J. Carlson, Associate Graduate Coordinator (Literature Concentration)
UH 301.40
dajcarls@csusb.edu
(909) 537-7388

Department of English Main Office

Telephone: (909) 537-5824
FAX: (909) 537-7086

M.A. in English Composition Website

<http://english.csusb.edu/grad>

Reading Lists and Sample Questions

Reading lists and sample questions for each component of the examination follow. Please pay careful attention to the structure of the examination and which components you will be required to complete, depending upon your concentration.

On-Campus Components

The on-campus components of the comprehensive examination consist of questions on concepts and issues from:

- English 611: The Western Rhetorical Tradition
- English 612: Contemporary Composition & Discourse Theory
- English 650: Critical Approaches to Literature

Students with concentrations in Composition or Literature will be required to respond to questions in *two* of the above areas for their on-campus component. To give yourself the greatest flexibility and choice when faced with the three examination questions, however, we encourage you to prepare for all *three* areas. In addition, Composition concentration students will find that the ENG 612 materials provide a crucial foundation for their preparation for their take-home component, which will focus on composition topics.

Students with a concentration in TESL will be required to respond to one question chosen from the above areas and also complete a “mixed exam” on TESL topics. Because TESL students under the current curriculum take one course from the above list, we assume that TESL students will prepare for a question drawn from the course they took. The reading list and sample questions for the TESL mixed exam are provided later in this booklet.

English 611: The Western Rhetorical Tradition

The readings listed represent theorists, subjects, and approaches studied in English 611: The Western Rhetorical Tradition. While the particular historical or theoretical focus will differ from section to section, each English 611 course will have encompassed a range of rhetorical theories represented by the authors and works below.

Unless otherwise noted, these readings can be found in *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings From Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd edition, ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001).

- Plato, *The Phaedrus*;
- Gorgias, “Encomium on Helen”
- Isocrates, *Against the Sophists* and excerpt from *Antidosis*
- Aristotle, from *Rhetoric*
- Cicero, from *De Oratore*
- Quintilian, from *Institutes of Oratory*
- Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*
- Erasmus, from *Copia*
- Friederich Nietzsche, “On Truth and Lying In An Extra Moral Sense”
- Michael Bakhtin, from *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*

- Kenneth Burke, “Rhetoric Old and New,” from *Language as Symbolic Action and A Rhetoric of Motives* [On electronic reserve in Pfau library for English 611]
- Michel Foucault, from *The Archaeology of Knowledge*
- Hélène Cixous, “The Laugh of the Medusa”
- Henry Louis Gates, Jr. “The Signifying Monkey and the Language of Signifying”
- Stanley Fish, “Rhetoric”
- John Bender and David E. Wellbury, from *The Ends of Rhetoric*; “Rhetoricity: On the Modernist Return of Rhetoric” [On electronic reserve in Pfau library for English 611]
- Walter R. Fischer, “Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument” [On electronic reserve in Pfau library for English 611]
- Judith Butler, “Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire,” in *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (1990), pp. 1-25

Students are advised to familiarize themselves with historical trends in rhetoric, and should therefore read one of the following recent paperback overviews:

- Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.
- George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times*, second edition, Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2000.

Terms/Concepts

- The general, broad history of Western rhetoric (Classical Greek; Classical Roman; Medieval and Renaissance; 18th and 19th centuries; Modern/Postmodern Rhetoric).
- The five parts of the study of rhetoric defined, from Roland Barthes in *The Old Rhetoric: an aide-memoire* (1966):
 1. INVENTIO finding what to say
 2. DISPOSITIO ordering what is found
 3. ELOCUTIO adding the ornament of words, figures
 4. ACTIO performing the discourse like and actor; gestures, and diction
 5. MEMORIA committing to memory
- The differences between deliberative, judicial, and epideictic rhetoric:

Genre	Audience	End	Subject	Time	Reasoning	Topoi
Deliberative	Members of an assembly	To persuade/dissuade	Useful/harmful	Future	exempla	Possible/impossible
Judicial	Judges	To accuse/defend	Just/unjust	Past	enthymeme	Real/unreal
Epideictic	Spectators, public	To praise/blame	Beautiful/ugly	Present	Amplifying/comparison	More/less

- Challenges to “the Western rhetorical tradition,” particularly those made in the last several decades by feminist and postcolonial scholars (see, for example, Glenn’s *Rhetoric Retold* and Olson and Worsham’s *Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial*).

- Commonplaces or *topoi*
- Structure of classical oration (*exordium, narratio, divisio, confirmatio, refutatio, peroratio*)
- *Kairos*
- *Ethos, pathos, logos*
- Rhetoric as identification
- Rhetoric as persuasion
- Rhetorical triangle/situation
- Sophistic rhetoric

Sample Questions

- (1) While Aristotle set forth the definition and purpose of ancient rhetoric, he famously said “rhetoric is persuasion.” Agreeing with Aristotle, Kenneth Burke says, “The key term for the old rhetoric was persuasion and its stress was upon deliberate design.” Burke continues, “The key term for the ‘new’ rhetoric would be ‘identification,’ which can include a partially ‘unconscious’ factor in appeal.” Burke goes on to say, “‘Identification’ at its simplest is also a deliberate device, as when the politician seeks to identify with his audience... But identification can also be an end, as when people earnestly yearn to identify themselves with some group or other.” What are some consequences of this shift for the classical conception of *deliberative* rhetoric (that kind of discourse addressed to members of any kind of assembly, designed to persuade or dissuade them to decide upon some future action, e.g., pass legislation declaring a state of war, pass legislation making abortion illegal, pass legislation changing the tax code)?
- (2) In his *Antidosis*, Isocrates argues that the “objects of our toil, of our study, and of our every act” should be teaching rhetoric as a practical art, one that shows people how to use conjecture “to arrive generally at the best course.” Similarly, many centuries later, Molefi Kete Asante writes that discourse, “like African art of the highest order,” is “functional and is not made for art’s sake alone but for its practical value to people.” To what extent can or should the “art” of rhetoric be seen as practical?

English 612: Contemporary Composition and Discourse Theory

These ENG 612 examination preparation materials are organized into three sections: 1) concepts and issues central to composition and discourse studies; 2) some key texts in the field; and 3) questions for reflecting on interconnections among the concepts and texts.

Concepts/Issues

Students should be familiar with the concepts and issues from ENG 612. Each concept or issue might speak to others on the list, so students should work to find and articulate the interconnections among them.

- Academic discourse
- Antifoundational rhetoric/poststructural language theories
- Basic Writing
- Cognitive process theories of writing: possibilities and critiques
- Collaboration: its possibilities and problems within various theoretical frameworks

- The complicating presence of “others” in composition: concerns about social justice, race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation in the writing classroom
- Critical literacy/critical pedagogy
- Cultural studies and composition
- Current traditional rhetoric
- Discourses/discourse communities
- Expressivism/social expressivism
- Gender, language, and writing
- The historical development of composition (particularly as it arose in the late 1800s and as it has enjoyed renewed vigor since the 1960s to the present moment).
- The institutional situation of composition in the university
- The “process” movement and “post-process”
- The relationship between language, identity, community
- Social epistemic rhetoric/“the social turn”
- Social theories of genre
- Subjectivity, postmodernism, and the question of agency in writing studies

Readings

Students’ ENG 612 courses will have introduced them to the concerns and issues that the ENG 612 question will cover. To increase their comfort and fluency with the conversations that inhabit contemporary composition and discourse theory, they should read selectively from the following list as well as consult with faculty in the field.

Bawarshi, Anis. “The Genre Function.” *College English* 62.3 (January 2000): 335-360.

Bernard-Donals, Michael and Richard R. Glazer. *Rhetoric in an Antifoundational World: Language, Culture, and Pedagogy*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.

Brodkey, Linda. *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. *Students’ Right To Their Own Language*. Special Issue of *College Composition and Communication* 24 (1974).

Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1998.

Devitt, Amy J. “Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept.” *College Composition and Communication* 44 (1993): 573-586.

Gilyard, Keith. *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1999.

Harkin, Patricia, and John Schilb. eds. *Contending with Words: Composition and Rhetoric in a Postmodern Age*. New York: MLA. 1991.

Harris, Joseph. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1997.

Jarratt, Susan, and Lynn Worsham, eds. *Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1998.

LeFevre, Karen Burke. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

Reagan, Sally Barr, Thomas Fox, and David Bleich, eds. *Writing With: New Directions in Collaborative Teaching, Learning and Research*. Albany: SUNY P, 1994.

Schroeder, Christopher, Helen Fox, and Patricia Bizzell, eds. *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002.

Villanueva, Victor. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. 2nd ed. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2003.

Worsham, Lynn, Sidney I. Dobrin, and Gary A. Olson, eds. *The Kinneavy Papers: Theory and Study of Discourse*. New York: SUNY P, 2000.

Students may also want to browse the ongoing and recent conversations in composition theory as represented by the last two to three years of the journals *JAC* and *CCC*. This reading allows students to selectively update their knowledge in relation to the core concepts and issues listed above and to the study questions for composition included in the appendix of this booklet.

The following two resources may be helpful for students wishing to orient themselves within the history and terminology of the field:

“A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition“ Bedford Bibliography Online <<http://bedfordstmartins.com/bb/history.html>>.

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg, eds. *Keywords in Composition Studies*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann-Boynton/Cook, 1996.

Sample Question

Collaboration has long been a staple of composition teachers. However, as the scholarship shows, collaboration has been constructed in different ways and for different purposes in relation to (a) particular historical needs and (b) particular theories of language. In a thoughtful, well-crafted essay, discuss how and why our understandings of collaboration have changed since “the social turn” in composition. What are some of the problems and possibilities that compositionists have explored in relation to these new articulations of collaboration and its functions? Your answer should attend to both historical and theoretical concerns as they relate to our understandings of language, knowledge, and meaning making, our evolving sense of the subject matter of composition, and the various student populations we see in our classrooms.

English 650: Critical Approaches to Literature

The readings listed below represent a selection of authors, subjects, and approaches studied in English 650. Offerings of English 650 have included diverse readings introduced by instructors in their section of the course, but each section has encompassed a range of critical approaches to literature represented by the authors and essays listed.

- Paula Gunn Allen, “Kochinnenako in Academe: Three Approaches to Interpreting a Keres Indian Tale” [Vincent B. Leitch, et al., *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, Norton: New York, 2001]
- Gloria Anzaldúa, from *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new Mestiza*, Chapter 7, “La consciencia de la mestiza: Towards a New Consciousness” [Norton]
- Roland Barthes, “The Death of the Author,” and “From Work to Text” [Norton]
- Jean Baudrillard, “The Precession of Simulacra” (from *Simulacra and Simulation*) [Norton]
- Kenneth Burke, “Literature as Equipment for Living” [David Richter, *The Critical Tradition*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 1998]
- Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences” [Richter and Kaplan]
- Terry Eagleton, from *Marxism and Literary Criticism* [Charles Kaplan, William Davis Anderson, *Criticism: Major Statements*, fourth ed. Boston: Bedford/St.

Martins, 2000]

- Stanley Fish, “Interpreting the Variorum” [Norton]
- Michel Foucault, “The Carceral” (from *Discipline and Punish*) [Norton]
- Northrop Frye, “The Archetypes of Literature” [Norton]
- Stephen Greenblatt, “Shakespeare and the Exorcists” [Kaplan]
- Donna Haraway, “A Cyborg Manifesto” [Norton]
- Edward Said, From *Orientalism*, “Introduction” [Norton]
- Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, from *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, from Chapter 3, “History” [Can the Subaltern Speak?] [Norton]
- Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, from “Introduction” to *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosexual Desire*, and from “Introduction: Axiomatic” to *Epistemology of the Closet* [Norton]
- Elaine Showalter, “Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism” [Kaplan]

Questions

For the on-campus component of the examination in this area, you should expect to answer one of the following questions:

- 1) From the authors and readings on the reading list, select three essays by three different critics. Trace how these critics can be used as a lens by which to understand texts in relation to one of the following terms: race, or gender, or sexuality, or class.
- 2) From the authors and readings on the reading list, choose three different critics’ essays and discuss how each critic considers the links between and relative significance of text, author, and reader.

For the exam, you must write a well-developed and carefully argued exam essay. Your essay should introduce the critics you plan to discuss as well as the overall point you will make about the critic’s engagement with the question topic. The body paragraphs should cite specific examples from the critical essays that illustrate the points you make. Be sure to demonstrate your knowledge of the selected critics’ theoretical terms and define these as they relate to the terms included in the question. Throughout the essay be sure to synthesize the critics’ arguments, not just summarize them. Your essay should conclude with observations on the significance of the theorists’s essays within the broader history of literary theory.

Preparation

Be prepared to answer either question. For Question One, the exam committee will choose one term per quarter, but you should be able to address any of the listed terms. For Question Two, you must link and address all three terms.

To prepare, you should focus first on how critics define the terms of the question, such as “race,” “gender,” “author,” “text,” etc. Secondly, you should consider the connections between and among several critics’ definitions and usages of the terms. Finally, be prepared to discuss how the critics’ arguments fit into the broader history of literary theory.

In the months before taking the exam, you might prepare by choosing three theorists to compare and contrast regarding their treatment of each exam question's terms. In a 2.5-hour block of time, write an essay (without notes or books) based on your knowledge. Imagine specific examples from the theory you might use to illustrate your knowledge of the theory and its application to the question topic. You should know the theoretical texts well enough that you can quote phrases or terms coined by the theorists. For instance, Foucault claims that the "judges of normality are everywhere." You should be able to use such phrases and define and explain their importance to the topic. Your essay should conclude with observations on the significance of the theorists' essays within the broader history of literary theory. For example, how do the theorists you discussed respond to or problematize theories or concepts that came before them?

On-Campus Component: TESL Mixed Examination

See below, "Reading List and Sample Questions for TESL, On-Campus Mixed Exam and Take-Home Component," page 22.



Take-Home Components of the Comprehensive Examination

Students in each concentration will respond to an essay question focused on their concentration (3500-word maximum response, exclusive of references). Reading lists and sample questions for each take-home component of the examination follow.

Take-Home Component: Composition Concentration

The examination preparation materials for the Composition Concentration classes are designed similarly to those for the ENG 612 question. There is a list of issues and concepts for each class in the concentration that should help guide your studying. Given that students are not required to take every course in the concentration, those taking the examination are likewise not responsible for the content of every course in the list below. However, just as the thesis demands students go beyond the materials of their immediate classes, we do expect that students will do some additional work to flesh out their understandings of the politics and practices of literacy and writing instruction. A quick look at the sample questions below may illustrate how and why expanding your knowledge base is helpful.

Finally, students should expect to make use of their core ENG 612 knowledge in this second portion of the examination. Contemporary Composition and Discourse Theory provides an important foundation for all the other composition courses in the program. Readings from ENG 612 should certainly inform and supplement concentration-based readings.

English 530: Issues in Tutoring Writing

Concepts/Issues

- Collaboration/intellectual property/agency
- Composing processes
- Tutor roles
- Conflict theories
- Relationships with “otherness”/difference such as ESL, registers, levels of formality, or disciplinary conventions
- Online tutoring
- Citation practices
- WAC
- Usage conventions

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 530, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

Barnett, Robert W., and Jacob S Blumner. *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.

Bruce, Shanti, and Ben Rafoth, eds. *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2004.

Grimm, Nancy. *Good Intentions: Writing Center for Postmodern Times*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1999.

Haviland, Carol Peterson, Maria Notarangelo, Lene Whitley-Putz, and Thia Wolf, eds. *Weaving Knowledge Together: Writing Centers and Collaboration*. Emmitsburg, MD: IWCA, 1998.

Ryan, Leigh. *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors*, 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St.Martin’s, 2002.

The Writing Lab Newsletter

The Writing Center Journal

WCENTER (listserv)

English 626: TESL Methods and Materials for Reading and Writing

Composition concentration students who took ENG 626 (TESL Methods and Materials for Reading and Writing) should review their readings from this course and consult the list of texts under “Second Language Reading and Vocabulary,” “Second Language Writing,” and “Generation 1.5 Students” in the TESL preparation materials in this booklet.

English 655: Approaches to Teaching College Composition

Concepts/Issues

- Social expressivist pedagogies
- Cultural Studies pedagogies
- Critical literacy pedagogies
- Feminist pedagogies
- Academic discourse pedagogies

- Rhetorical pedagogies
- Language study/ genre pedagogies
- The relationship between identity, social memberships, and language use
- Student subjectivity and agency
- Student/teacher power and authority
- The relationship between reading and writing
- Scaffolding
- Approaches to (and issues in): (A) feedback and evaluation practices; (B) collaboration and peer group work; and (C) classroom dynamics

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 655, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

- Allison, Libby, Lizbeth Bryant, and Maureen Hourigan, *Grading in the Post-Process Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997.
- Harris, Joseph. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1997.
- Johnson, T.R. and Shirley Morahan, eds. *Teaching Composition: Background Readings*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002.
- McDonald, James C., *The Allyn and Bacon Sourcebook for College Writing Teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.
- Spear, Karen. "Controversy and Consensus in Freshman Writing: An Overview of the Field." *The Review of Higher Education*. 20.9 (1997): 319-344.
- Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick, eds. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

English 657: Sites of Praxis

ENG 657 incorporates the study of composition theory, research, and pedagogy as practiced in particular sites. In the recent past, this course has explored basic writing, ethnographic studies in literacy, writing across the curriculum, and writing program administration. In addition to concern with composition theory and pedagogy generally, all versions of this course share an investment in asking about the meanings of literacy in particular contexts. In all instances, 657 explores literacy as a socially and ideologically located concept with varying implications and consequences.

While students should not consider themselves fully responsible for the materials presented in those sections of 657 that they did not take, students may find it useful to delve into some new materials to round out their backgrounds in composition studies. Thus, while students are not responsible for every concept listed under sections they haven't taken, for those interested in exploring some of those materials as part of their preparation, the conceptual lists should help guide your reading of texts toward main ideas.

English 657: Sites of Praxis (Basic Writing)

Concepts/Issues

- History & Politics of Basic Writing

- Discursive constructions of “the basic writer”
- Ideologies of literacy and “standards” and the politics of access
- Multiple literacies and the place of “home discourses” in the classroom
- The “abolition debate”

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 657, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

Fox, Tom. *Defending Access: A Critique of Standards in Higher Education*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1999.

Gilyard, Keith. “African American in Process.” *Let’s Flip the Script: An African American Discourse on Language, Literature, and Learning*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1996.

Halesek, Kay, and Nels P. Highberg, eds. *Landmark Essays on Basic Writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2001.

Horner, Bruce and Min-Zhan Lu. *Representing the Other: Basic Writers and the Teaching of Basic Writing*. Urbana: NCTE, 1999.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. “Basic Writing and Second language Writers: Toward an Inclusive Definition.” *Journal of Basic Writing*. 22.2 (2003): 106-28.

English 657: Sites of Praxis (Ethnographic Studies in Literacy)

Concepts/Issues

- Orality and (vs.) literacy
- “Great Divide” theories and their critiques
- “The Literacy Myth”
- “Literacy events”
- Social functions of literacy: its place in community identity and individual identity
- Ethnography: modern and postmodern views
- Ethical concerns in ethnographic research
- Critical ethnography
- Autoethnography
- Possible relationships between ethnography, literacy, and the teaching of writing

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 657, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy in American Lives*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Brown and Dobrin, eds. *Ethnography Unbound*. Albany: SUNY P, 2004.

Cushman, Ellen, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry Kroll, and Mike Rose, eds. *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2001.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, ed. *Into the Field: Sites of Composition Studies*. New York: MLA, 1993.

Prendergast, Catherine. *Literacy and Racial Justice: The Politics of Learning After Brown v. Board of Education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2003.

Street, Brian V. *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy Development, Ethnography, and Education*. New York: Longman, 1995.

English 657: Sites of Praxis (Writing Across the Curriculum)

Concepts/Issues

- Disciplinary genres, discourses, and conventions
- Theories and ethics of critical ethnography
- Politics of locating writing
- Writing as a mode of learning

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 657, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

- Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas N. Huckin. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum, 1995.
- Herrington, Anne, and Charles Moran. *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*. New York: MLA, 1992

English 657: Sites of Praxis (Writing Program Administration)

Concepts/Issues

- Politics of WPA work
- Theory and design of writing programs, including independent writing programs
- Placement, including directed self-placement
- Politics of tenure-line vs. contingent vs. teaching assistant faculty

Readings

In addition to their course readings for 657, students should familiarize themselves with the current conversations in *WPA: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* and the WPA-L archive (<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/wpa-l.html>).

English 658: Computers and Composition

Concepts/Issues

- Intersections of writing and technology (and the idea of writing *as* technology)
- Constructions of technological literacy
- History of teaching writing with computers (late 20th century to present)
- Implications of network/internet technologies for authorship and intellectual property
- The claim for and critique of “technology-as-democratizer”
- Problems of access to technology
- Most importantly, students should see that “technology and writing” does not just refer to internet/network technologies. Careful consideration of context is crucial.
- It is assumed that students who have taken ENG 658 will know such fundamental

terminology as hypertext, OWL, synchronous/asynchronous communication, URL, and so on.

Readings

In addition to their course readings for ENG 658, students should be familiar with the last four issues of (1) *Kairos: A Journal for Teachers of Writing in Webbed Environments* and (2) *Computers & Composition*. Additionally, students should do some extended reading in the following texts:

- Bolter, Jay David. *Writing Space: Computers, Hypertext, and the Remediation of Print*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2001.
- Gruber, Sibylle, ed. *Weaving a Virtual Web: Practical Approaches to New Information Technologies*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1999.
- Handa, Carolyn, ed. *Computers and Community: Teaching Composition in the Twenty-first Century*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook, 1990.
- Hawisher, Gail E, and Cynthia L. Selfe, eds. *Passions, Pedagogies, and Twenty-First Century Technologies*. Logan: Utah UP, 1999.
- Inman, James A., Cheryl Reed, and Peter Sands, eds. *Electronic Collaboration in the Humanities: Issues and Options*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2003.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality & Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Selfe, Cynthia L. *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-first Century: The Importance of Paying Attention*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999.
- Snyder, Ilana, ed. *Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1997.
- Takayoshi, Pamela and Brian Huot, eds. *Teaching Writing With Computers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.
- Taylor, Todd, and Irene Ward, eds. *Literacy Theory in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Columbia UP, 1998.

Sample Question—Composition Concentration

As the new writing program administrator at a community college, you have been asked to create a “new focus” or “updated face” for the writing program. Upon your arrival, you discover that the old program lacks coherence and the teachers, while dedicated, are largely teaching from untheorized pedagogies. Please write a comprehensive memo to your faculty that provides a theorized vision for the program. While you do not want to hinder the faculty’s curricular and pedagogical freedom, you do want to make sure their efforts are consistent with the knowledge of the field. Thus, you should design your memo to provide both a compositionist education in a nutshell and a rationale for the program. In your memo,

- (a) discuss the social and ideological terrain of literacy generally;
- (b) indicate some pedagogical orientations to the teaching of writing that would be sound in light of contemporary theory, explaining why these are useful ways of approaching the teaching of writing; and
- (c) offer the faculty an overview of some best practices for the classroom.



Take-Home Component: Literature Concentration

The Literature Concentration take-home component of the Comprehensive Examination will focus on two literary texts (“set texts”). One question on each set text will be distributed at the time of the examination; students will choose between these questions, and respond to one in their written essay (3500 words maximum, exclusive of references).

Students in the Literature Concentration are exposed to a range of literary texts and approaches, and engage in close study of and research on selected texts. The take-home component will assess your ability to research a literary text and achieve an understanding of the work that allows you to respond effectively to the question posed. Because the component assesses your skills in literary research and textual analysis, texts used in graduate literature seminars in the three years preceding the examination will be excluded as set texts.

Set Texts for the Fall 2007 Examination (Required Editions)

Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. Ed. Susan Framan. Norton Critical Eds. New York: Norton, 2004.

Twain, Mark. *Pudd'n'head Wilson and Those Extraordinary Twins*. 2nd ed. Ed. Sidney E. Berger. Norton Critical Eds. New York: Norton, 2004.

Preparation

Begin by reading the set texts and the accompanying critical materials in the Norton Critical Editions listed above. While the examination will require a response to one question and thus one text, we encourage you to be ready to answer *either* question by preparing *both* set texts.

Depending upon the set text and the question posed, the examination may require that you demonstrate some or all of the following:

- an ability to interpret the text and perform a close textual analysis;
- an ability to situate the work in the author’s canon or career;
- an awareness of the social and historical context of the work; and
- familiarity with the text’s critical history (for example, critical controversies or debates that have arisen in connection with the work)

To achieve this level of preparation, we recommend reading a range of critical works about the set texts, including some criticism focused on close textual analysis, drawing upon the research skills you have developed through your coursework, particularly Eng 609 (Perspectives on Research) and the literature seminars (Eng 601, 602, 603, 604, 651). Do not limit your reading only to recent criticism nor merely to the excerpted criticism in the required Norton Critical Edition; develop a sense of the critical response to the work over time and how that critical response corresponds to changes over time in critical approaches to literary works generally.

Sample Questions—Literature Concentration

(1) William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*

Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure* has long troubled readers and audiences:

Swinburne believed the play to be “in its very inmost essence a tragedy” and thus “no sleight of hand ... could give it even a tolerable show of coherence or consistency when clipped and docked of its proper and rightful end.” In her introduction to the play in *The Norton Shakespeare*, Katherine Eisaman Maus notes that while *Measure for Measure* is ostensibly a comedy, “its tone, themes, and methods of characterization ... veer close to tragedy. ... Many critics, therefore, classify *Measure for Measure* as a ‘problem’ comedy. The designation attests both to the difficult moral issues the play confronts and to the boldness with which it stretches—some would say shatters—the normal limits of comic form.”

Basing your response in a close reading of the text, consider the genre of *Measure for Measure*: in your view, why has the play characteristically drawn mixed responses? Does Shakespeare, in Maus’ terms, stretch the comic form or shatter it in this play? Are answers to the moral issues the play raises provided or, as some critics have argued, evaded? Your response should demonstrate your awareness of the historical and social context of the play and of theatrical practices in Shakespeare’s time.

(2) Charles Brockden Brown, *Wieland*

Critical debate surrounding Charles Brockden Brown’s novel *Wieland* has focused considerable attention on the text’s apparent “sloppiness.” (The book has an unresolved subplot, its first-person narrator contradicts herself and demonstrates a selective memory, and so on.) Some have argued that biographical factors (including the speed with which Brown wrote) as well as the nature of print culture in revolutionary America provide the best explanation for these textual “flaws.” Others suggest that the open-ended nature of Brown’s plot and the ambiguities surrounding its narrator are central to the novel’s engagement with the philosophical and political concerns of the American Enlightenment. Grounding your claims in a close reading of *Wieland*, stake out your own position in this debate. Your answer should address both the aesthetics of the novel and its historical context. Considering eighteenth-century aesthetic and philosophical discourses (such as gothicism, associationism, sensationalism, etc.) that may have influenced Brown would help in formulating a complete response to this question.

(1) N. Scott Momaday, *House Made of Dawn*

The publication of N. Scott Momaday’s novel *House Made of Dawn* in 1969 is widely considered to be the beginning of a “renaissance” of American Indian literature. Such a claim, of course, assumes that there is an indigenous artistic “tradition” that predates the 1960s, that this tradition was somehow lost or forgotten, and that Momaday’s book represents both its rediscovery and transformation. Discuss the ways that *House Made of Dawn* might be read as a revitalization of earlier forms of American Indian literature (oral or written), while also addressing the innovations Momaday seems to be making in his book. In your answer, you may also explore some of the theoretical implications of reading the novel in this way (in terms of the fields of Native American Studies or Post-Colonial Studies, for example).



Reading List and Sample Questions for TESL, On-Campus Mixed Exam and Take-Home Component

Readings

This list is designed to help guide your reading preparation for the TESL on-campus mixed exam and the take-home component of the Comprehensive Examination. The readings on the list were selected to reinforce, deepen and expand your understanding of material from your TESL Concentration coursework. The list is divided into three broad areas that reflect major themes in the TESL Concentration and on the examination: Language Structure and Use, Language Acquisition and Learning, and Second Language Pedagogy. Under each of these, sources have been further categorized under sub-headings related to topics in the TESL courses.

In preparation for the examination, you are expected to read the majority of the sources on the list, including at least substantial portions of most of the books. You should also review your course readings, handouts, and notes. In doing so, you will find that some of the sources on the list are ones that you have previously read and discussed in your coursework.

Language Structure and Use

Contrastive Rhetoric

- Ahmad, U. K. (1997). Research article introductions in Malay: Rhetoric in an emerging research community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 273-303). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Atkinson, D. (2004). Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: Why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(4), 277-289.
- Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 493-510.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research in pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kubota, R. (1997). A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 460-480.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7-27.
- Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English*, 47, 789-808.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3-22.

- Mohan, B. A., & Lo, W. A. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 515-534.
- Montaño-Harmon, M. R. (1991). Discourse features of written Mexican Spanish: Current research in contrastive rhetoric and its implications. *Hispania*, 74, 417-425.
- Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17, 241-265.

Discourse Analysis

- Gaik, F. (1992). Radio talk-show therapy and the pragmatics of possible worlds. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin, *Rethinking context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. Chapter 3 in *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: U. Penn Press.
- Gumperz, J. (2003). Contextualization conventions. In C. B. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. (2004). Interethnic communication. Chapter 3 in J. Kiesling & C.B. Paulston (Eds.), *Intercultural discourse and communication: The essential readings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Jaworksi, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language*, 57, 45-62.
- Smith, W. B. (2004). What can pragmatics tell us about developing writers? In J. Frodesen, & C. Holten (Eds.), *The power of context in language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle/Thomson.
- Swales, J.M. (2004). The research article revisited, Chapter 5 in J.M. Swales, *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Van de Kopple, W.J. (1998). Using the concepts of given information and new information in classes on the English language. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications* (pp. 79-92). Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency. Available on-line at:
http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pubs/BR/5111TOC_nof.htm

Pragmatics

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Chen, R. (2001). Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33,87-106.
- Grice, P. H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Leech, G. (1983). Chapter 6 of *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Morgan, J. (1978). Two types of convention in indirect speech acts. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 9: Pragmatics* (pp. 261-280). New York: Academic Press.
- Schroeder, P. (1983). Hidden depth: Dialogue and characterization in Chaucer and Malory. *PMLA*, May 1983, 374-387.
- Searle, J. (1965). What is speech act? In M. Black (Ed.), *Philosophy in America*. (pp. 221-239). Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). New York: Academic Press.
- Verschueren, J. (2002). Adaptability. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Handbook of pragmatics*. (pp. 1-24). Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. In G. Ward & L. Horn (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 607-632). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sociolinguistics

- Cheshire, J., & Trudgill, P. (Eds.) (1998). *The Sociolinguistics reader, Vol. 2: Gender and discourse*. London: Arnold.
- Coates, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Language and gender: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. London: Palgrave.
- Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Griefat, Y., & T. Katriel (1998). Life demands Musayara: Communication and culture among Arabs in Israel. In S. Ting-Toomey and F. Korzeny (Eds.), *Language, communication, and culture: Current directions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Jacobs, G. (1996). Lesbian and gay male language use: A critical review of the literature. *American Speech*, 71(1), 49-71.
- Maltz, D., & Borker, R. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Gumperz, (Ed), *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Philipsen, G. (1998). Speech and the communal function in four cultures. In S. Ting-Toomey and F. Korzeny (Eds.), *Language, communication, and culture: Current directions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1996). The ethnography of communication. In S.L. McKay & N.H. Hornberger (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 351-382). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). Athabaskan-English interethnic communication. In R. Scollon & S. Scollon, *Narrative, literacy, and interethnic communication*. New Jersey: Ablex.
- Talbot, M. (1998). *Language and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Syntax

- Berk, L. M. (1999). *English syntax: From word to discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (1998). *Explaining English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Language Acquisition and Learning

Second Language Acquisition

- Corder, P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-170.
- DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313-348). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(s1), 3-32.

- Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 505-537.
- Ellis, N. (1998). Emergentism, connectionism, and language learning. *Language Learning*, 48(4), 631-664.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hulstijn, J. (2003). Incidental and intentional learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 349-381). Oxford: Blackwell.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 113-128.
- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 52-79.
- Robinson, P. (2003). Attention and memory during SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 631-678). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Romaine, S. (2003). Variation. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 409-435). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2005). *Introducing second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 209-231.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331-350.

Second Language Pedagogy

Second Language Teaching—General

- Doughty, C. (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp. 256-310). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Second Language Reading and Vocabulary

- Aebbersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). The nature of reading abilities, ch. 1 in *Teaching and researching reading*. New York: Longman.
- Sokmen, A. J. (1997). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Second Language Writing

- Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 705-717. [see also responses to Benesch's article in *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(3) Fall 1994]
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing, ch. 6 in *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2004). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Frodesen, J., & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar and the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 407-430.
- Reid, J. (2001). Advanced EAP writing and curriculum design: What do we need to know? In T. Silva, & P.K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing*. (pp. 143-160). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
-

Generation 1.5 Students

- Goen, S., Porter, P., Swanson, D., & VanDommelen, D. (2002). Working with Generation 1.5 students and their teachers: ESL meets composition. *CATESOL Journal*, 14(1), 131-171.
- Harklau, L., Losey, K., & Siegal, M. (1999). (Eds.). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-education learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reid, J. M. (1998). "Eye" learners and "ear" learners: Identifying the language needs of international student and U.S. resident writers. In P. Byrd, & J.M. Reid, *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students* (pp. 3-17). New York: Heinle & Heinle.
-

Sample Questions—TESL

These sample questions are designed to introduce you to some styles of questions on the TESL portions of the examination and to facilitate your review of the program material.

The TESL on-campus mixed exam (2.5 hours) will contain short-answer concept explanation questions, as well as two essay questions requiring you to engage in text analysis (of written, spoken, and/or second language interlanguage texts) and/or discussion of second language learning and pedagogy. Sample questions related to these areas are included in these materials (for questions related to second language learning and pedagogy, see also the take-home sample question).

The TESL take-home component of the examination will be a multi-part question that will require you to draw on knowledge from different areas of the program. Your response to this portion should be written in the form of a paper (3500 words maximum, excluding the References page). The sample contained in these materials reflects one style of question for the take-home component; however, whether the take-home question focuses on text analysis, language learning, and/or language pedagogy may change from quarter to quarter.

On-Campus Component

The on-campus component for TESL students will consist of (1) a question related to one of the core courses (Eng 611, 612, 650) shared by the three concentrations; and (2) a “mixed” exam of concept explanations, text analysis, and essay responses related to TESL-specific courses. The following are sample questions for the TESL mixed exam. For sample questions for the core course portion of the on-site exam, students should consult the preparation materials earlier in this booklet.

Sample Question: Short Answer Concept Explanation

Select X number of the following concepts. For each one, write a paragraph defining the concept and explaining its significance to language research and/or teaching.

Interlanguage
 Implicature
 Generation 1.5
 etc.

Sample Question: Spoken Text Analysis

Examine the following example taken from natural conversation. In a well-organized, well-developed essay that draws on relevant theory and research, do one of the following:

- (1) Explain what kinds of features you see in terms of conversation analysis. You can discuss conditional relevance, turn-taking, adjacency pairs or other relevant features you observe; OR
- (2) Explain the conversation in terms of politeness theory, including what is done to mitigate face-threatening acts.

0 Ring
 1 Sheila: Hello?
 2 Ronny: 'lo Sheila,
 3 Sheila: Yea[:h]
 4 Ronny: [(t's) R]onny.
 5 Sheila: Hi Ronny.
 6 Ronny: Guess what.hh
 7 Sheila: What.
 8 Ronny: .hh My ca:r is sta::lled.
 9 (0.2)
 10 Ronny: ('n) I'm up here in the Glen?
 11 Sheila: Oh::.
 12 Ronny: hhh
 13 Ronny: A:nd.hh (0.2) I don' know if it's: possible, but

14 .hhh see I haveta open up the ba:nk.hh
 15 (0.3)
 16 Ronny: a:t uh (.) in Brentwood?hh=
 17 Sheila: =Yeah:- en I know you want- (.) en I whoa-
 18 (.) en I would, but- except I've gotta leave
 19 in about five min(h)utes.=
 20 Ronny: [Okay then I gotta call somebody else.right away.
 21 Sheila: [(hheh)
 22 (.)
 23 Ronny: Okay?=
 24 Sheila: =Okay [Ron]
 25 Ronny: [Thanks] a lot. =Bye-.
 26 Sheila: Bye..

Source: Mandelbaum, J. & Pomerantz, A. (1991). What drives social action? In K. Tracy (Ed.). *Understanding face-to-face interaction: Issues linking goals and discourse* (pp. 151-167). Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sample Question: Written Text Analysis

The following is an academic book review written by Thomas Scovel and published in the journal *TESOL Quarterly*. In a well-organized, well-developed essay that draws on relevant theory and research, analyze the discourse features of this text in terms of two of the following frameworks:

- Organizational moves
- Given and new information
- Spoken vs. written text features

Within your response, discuss how the discourse features you have analyzed help the text achieve its communicative purposes.

Understanding the Courses We Teach

John Murphy and Patricia Byrd (Eds.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001. Pp. ix +493

Much has been written and said about the need to relate theoretical principles of language teaching to the practical realities of actual ESL classrooms, and this introductory anthology, carefully compiled by Murphy and Byrd, accomplishes this difficult task remarkably well. The book is a fine choice as [a] text for a graduate seminar for prospective ESL teachers or as a useful reader for teachers who wish to update their knowledge.

Understanding the Courses We Teach begins with five introductory chapters in which the editors take turns defending the need for local classroom perspectives, arguing for a postmethodological perspective on teaching, listing some popular principles of language learning and teaching, and outlining the format and framework of their anthology. This introduction is followed by 19 chapters written by a combination of 28 TESOL professionals, balanced between full-time classroom practitioners and well-known experts in the field who also have active teaching experience. Although the chapters vary enormously among the language skills, student populations, and curricular goals they deal with, each author (or pair of authors) addresses nine pedagogical questions about their class (e.g., What are the objectives for the course? What roles do the students play?). By focusing each chapter on these common points, the editors ensure a degree of continuity among

the disparate topics addressed, but they also help the reader keep in mind that teaching ESL, even when it adheres to specific but abstract principles, is a highly contextualized and particularized activity.

Because the book covers such a diversity of topics and settings, different readers will find certain chapters especially relevant. Here I highlight a few in order to show the range of classroom activities covered. Brian Morgan discusses ways in which he has helped his Canadian immigrant class learn both English and citizenship by relying, in part, on his students' knowledge of their native language and culture. Tim Murphey describes a complicated but creative way of helping his Japanese university conversation students videotape and evaluate their oral English. May Shih discusses approaches and activities teachers of ESL composition classes can use to help their students edit their writing more vigilantly and accurately. William Acton explains an unusual system for teaching his Japanese students English prosody by literally choreographing their body movements in his speaking class. And as a final illustration of the range of activities covered, Carol Numrich reviews several theme-based projects her academic ESL class has pursued, including one that takes them to an Indian gambling casino for an integrated skills study of the gaming industry in the United States.

The limitations of this fresh and wide-ranging anthology are few: The EFL contexts are restricted to East Asia (Japan and Hong Kong), and a chapter or two applying the promising new insights from corpus linguistics and the teaching vocabulary would have been helpful. But, all in all, Murphy and Byrd's text lives up to its title and will help all teachers better understand the courses they teach.

Thomas Scovel
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, California, United States

Source: Scovel, T. (2002). Review of *Understanding the courses we teach*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 635-636.

Sample Question: Interlanguage Analysis

Consider the following transcript of excerpts of an interview between "HP" a native English speaker and "N," a native speaker of Teochew, (a dialect of Chinese). N is a waitress in Singapore who first learned English in a Singaporean primary school. In a well-organized, well-developed essay, identify 2-3 prominent error patterns in N's interlanguage for English, supporting your analysis with examples from the interview transcript. For example, you could describe recurring morphological, syntactic and/or phonological errors in N's utterances. For each pattern, discuss possible sources of the error, drawing on relevant theory and research in second language acquisition.

- HP What school did you go to?
 N Around my parent staying, Perryman Secondary School. There's number of schools there. There's also got churches there.
 HP Mmm.
 N Catholic churches there.
 HP Are you a Catholic?
 N I am Methodist.
 HP Tell me about your school.
 N Is small. Geylang Methodist School is called.
 HP Ahem
 N From Primary One to Secondary. Then I transfer myself to Tomlin (?) School. Is government school.
 HP Were your lessons in English or in Chinese?

- N We speak English.
 HP Are there many schools where you speak only Chinese?
 N Chinese? Ya, is. My place there I got one, Kong Kong Yang School.
 HP Did you learn Chinese at school?
 N Ya-only as subject.
 HP Did they teach any Malay at your school?
 N Ah Malay-ya a few.
 HP A few?
 N Number ah. Depends ah. Some of them they take Malay as one dialect' and some they take two dialect', that means the Chinese and the Malay. They take two types.
 HP Oh I see. What about your own dialect? Are you Hokkien?
 N No I am a Teochew

...

- HP Tell me a bit more about your school. When you went to Primary School did you get religious instruction?
 N Ya, we have. When I am schooling in Primary Two to Six we studying mostly from bibles. Actually from Primary One we don't do that lah. We jus'- we get lesson about scripture. So we studying we sing songs-sometime we learn gospel.

...

- HP Tell me a bit more about your parents. Do they come from China?
 N My mum's parent they come from China. My other grandmother is a Baba Teochew-you know baba?
 HP She was born in Singapore.
 N Ya, Singapore. My grandmother she speak Teochew an' she speak Malay, Baba Malay. Sometimes she wear sarong.
 HP What do you speak to your grandmother?
 N I speak Teochew. To my paren' I speak Teochew an' Hokkien and sometime English.
 HP And with your sisters?
 N We speak mostly English.
 HP And do both your parents understand English?
 N Ya. My father know to speak but my mother do not.

Source: Gass, S., Sorace, A., & Selinker, L. (1999) (2nd ed.). Problem 5.2: Oral interview, in *Second language learning data analysis* (pp. 80-81). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



Sample Question—TESL Take-Home Component

You have just been offered an ESL teaching job at a school site (You imagine the context: high school, community college, intensive ESL center overseas, etc.). The program coordinator has asked you to begin the design of a new semester-long ESL class to be offered at your school site in the coming academic year.

In a well-organized, well-developed paper, do the following:

1. Explain the context of the teaching site and the target student population.
2. Identify approaches to second language acquisition (SLA) that will inform the design of the new class.
3. Explain how the concepts of “input” and “interaction” have been viewed in the SLA research you have cited above, and how your course planning will take findings from SLA on input and interaction into consideration.
4. Describe in detail one activity or assignment that you would include in this course, and discuss how it reflects the approaches to input, interaction and SLA that you describe above.

Appendix: Study Questions (Composition Students)

The following are suggested study questions for reflecting on interconnections among concepts and texts for the ENG 612 question and the Composition Concentration take-home component. Students would be well-served to consider the reading they do in relation to the aforementioned concepts and issues and in relation to these three questions:

How has this concept been constructed within the terms of composition studies, what criticisms has it been met with, and what revisions to it have various scholars and researchers offered?

This question should suggest the importance of historicizing composition studies. Collaboration, for example, has long been a staple of composition teachers. However, as the scholarship shows, collaboration has been constructed in different ways and for different purposes in relation to a) particular historical needs, and b) particular theories of language. Students preparing for the test should be able to trace the trajectory of collaboration's development as history and theory came together to critique and revise older notions of collaboration and create new rationales and ways of using it.

What does this text, this theory, or this construction of concept X suggest about the relationship between form, content, context, and meaning in writing and language use?

Take, again, the example of collaboration and consider: How does Kenneth Bruffee's discussion of the rationale and purposes of collaboration in "Collaboration and the Conversation of Mankind" construct the relationship between form, context, and meaning in language?

Within any particular theoretical movement, how do various theorists, scholars, and researchers contribute to/change the conversation?

In many ways, this might be seen as another version of the first question, although question one is intended to point to the trajectory of composition across time and movements, while question three focuses on how members of the comp community have treated concepts within a particular historical moment and in reference to complementary or competing theories. For instance, Richard Trimbur and Greg Meyers both offer critiques of Bruffee's agenda in "Collaboration and the Conversation of Mankind." In what ways do their critiques overlap or complement each other? How are they different? What are the implications of these differences?