

writing, as it always has been, is a technology for thinking, and so it may be the case that we interiorize the technology of writing itself to shape the possibilities for meaning.

References

- Anson, Chris. 2010. "The Intradisciplinary Influence of Composition and WAC, 1967–1986." *WAC Journal* 21: 5–19.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. "Discourse in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination*, edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 259–422. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barton, David, and Mary Hamilton. 1998. *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203448885>.
- Brodkey, Linda. 1994. "Writing on the Bias." *College English* 56 (5): 527–47.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1966. "Definition of Man." In *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*, ed. Kenneth Burke, 3–24. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Flower, Linda, and John Hayes. 1980. "The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (1): 21–32.
- Gould, Stephen J. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hanson, F. Allan. 1993. *Testing Testing: Social Consequences of the Examined Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. 2012. *Words at Work and Play: Three Decades in Family and Community Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lunstedt, Andrea A. 1998. "Toward a Mestiza Rhetoric: Gloria Anzaldúa on Composition and Postcoloniality." *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 18 (1): 1–27.
- Meyer, Jan H. F., and Ray Land. 2006. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: An Introduction." In *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding*, edited by Jan H. F. Meyer and Ray Land, 3–18. London: Routledge.
- Ong, Walter. 1975. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." *PMLA* 90 (1): 9–21.
- Richards, I. A. 2001. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Russell, David R. 1995. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." In *Reconnecting Writing: Rethinking Writing Instruction*, edited by Joseph Petraglia, 51–77. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Russell, David R. 1997. "Rethinking Genre in School and Society: An Activity Theory Analysis." *Written Communication* 14 (4): 504–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088397014004004>.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1983. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Roy Harris. Chicago: Open Court.
- Shaler-Landau, Russ, ed. 2007. *Ethical Theory: An Anthology*. Malden: Blackwell.

CONCEPT 2

Writing Speaks to Situations through Recognizable Forms

2.0

WRITING SPEAKS TO SITUATIONS THROUGH RECOGNIZABLE FORMS

Charles Bazerman

A fundamental problem in communication precedes the choosing of any words or shaping of any message: identifying the situation we are in and the nature of the communication we wish to make. Are salespeople offering us a deal and do we want to accept? Are our acquaintances amusing each other with jokes and are we amused? Are our trusted advisors asking us to reconsider our behaviors and do we resist? The situation frames our understanding of the communicative action of others and gives us the urgency and motive to respond because somehow we sense our words will satisfy our needs in the situation or otherwise make the situation better for us. In face-to-face life, this problem is solved through our recognizing the geographic locale we are in, the people we are talking to, our relationship to them, the events unfolding before us, and our impulses to do something. Through long practical experience we learn to recognize spontaneously what appears to be going on around us and how it affects us. Our impulses to act communicatively emerge as doable actions in the situation, in forms recognizable to others—we accept the offer, we laugh at the joke, we agree to change. Conscious thought is warranted only if we have reason to believe things are not as they appear to be, if confusions arise within the situation, or if we want to suppress our first impulse and pursue a less obvious strategic path—laughing to appear congenial though we find the joke offensive. Writing, as well, addresses social situations and audiences organized in social groups and does so through recognizable forms associated with those situations and social groups. But with writing we have fewer here-and-now clues about what the situation is, who our audiences are, and how we want to respond. Written messages can circulate from one material and social situation to another, and in fact are usually intended to.

A newspaper report about events in one city is read in another, even in another country, and further events have evolved between writing and reading. A poem written for a small circle of friends is read centuries later in a literature classroom.

The technical concept of rhetorical situation brings together recognition of the specifics of the situation, the exigency the situation creates, and our perception that by communication we can make the situation better for ourselves (Bitzer 1968). Awareness of rhetorical situation is the beginning of reflection on how we perceive the situation, what more we can understand about it, how we can formulate our goals, and what strategies we may take in our utterances. It helps us put in focus what we can accomplish in a situation, how we can accomplish it, and what the stakes are. But this awareness also puts a reflective distance between our perception of the situation and our responses, which may disrupt spontaneous impulses and our sense of being in the moment. This disruption can thus can be troublesome and require a fundamental reorientation toward our experiences, which we may at first resist. Recognizing we are being accused of misdeeds may make us aware we need to answer but also aware that we must frame our words carefully so as to defend ourselves persuasively and so as not to lead to further trouble or accusations.

With writing, the need for understanding the rhetorical situation is even greater than in speaking because there are fewer material clues with which to locate ourselves spontaneously. To engage in a disciplinary discussion in chemistry, we not only need to know the chemistry, we need to know how each text is entering into a debate or accumulating past findings or projecting future plans (see 2.3, "Writing Is a Way of Enacting Disciplinary"). It is through genre that we recognize the kinds of messages a document may contain, the kind of situation it is part of and it might migrate to, the kinds of roles and relations of writers and readers, and the kinds of actions realized in the document (see 1.2, "Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences," and 2.2, "Genres Are Enacted by Writers and Readers"). Genre recognition provides a necessary clue for locating and making sense of any piece of paper or any digital display that comes before our eyes. Perhaps even more complexly, we may need to understand how documents move from among and between spaces, including from real spaces to enduring virtual spaces, which then may return to specific material spaces. So, teachers may collect records of students within a classroom for immediate classroom-management needs, but these records then may enter the school records for school-management purposes and then may be combined with school medical and other records to create a file on the

student, creating an enduring characterization of the student that may reappear in a court proceeding. Thus, to understand the full range of situations a document in a particular genre may be used in and the full set of meanings that might be attributed to it, we also need to understand the activity system it is part of (Russell 1997) (see 1.0, "Writing Is a Social and Rhetorical Activity," and 1.5, "Writing Mediates Activity").

Yet while writing may require more awareness of genres, the associated situations, and the activity systems those genres are part of, several factors limit conscious, reflective examination of genres and an understanding of their implications for the variability of writing. First, much learning of writing is in school, where stylized and repetitive classroom relations and situations, teacher authority, and student display of competence prevail. People often take school-based assumptions with them long after they leave school, associating writing with particular kinds of school assignments and finding their main motives to be avoiding correction and getting a good grade.

Later, after schooling, if they become deeply embedded in a set of writing practices associated with their profession or career, they may then assume, with little conscious attention to how complex and varied situations, exigencies, motives, and genres may be, that what they learn in that specific context are general rules and models for effective writing—with the result that they overgeneralize the practices they have learned. Further, they may think of the writing practices they develop through long professional experience to be part of their profession and may think of how they produce their texts as a matter of just doing good science, or being a good salesman, or knowing how to keep good records of what happens. Their writing knowledge, knowledge of situations, and sense of genres becomes deeply tacit and less accessible to conscious reflection. However, bringing such things to reflective attention through the concepts of rhetorical situation, genre, and activity systems is a necessary step to understanding their writing and making deeper choices.

2.1

WRITING REPRESENTS THE WORLD, EVENTS, IDEAS, AND FEELINGS

Charles Bazerman

It is no surprise to people that they can talk or write about things they see or do, what they feel, and what they think. But it is something of a surprise to realize that how each of these is represented in the writing

or speaking—in other words, in the communication—changes what is shared about each of them and thus what our common knowledge is. I may think if I write about a mountain that the mountain is there for all to see, so the words I use are not that important. But when I realize that all my readers are likely to know of the mountain, particularly on a sunny early spring afternoon after an overnight snow storm ending in sleet so the crust breaks through unpredictably beneath the feet, is through the words I write, I begin to take greater care in choosing my words. I want to represent facts, the world, or my imaginings as precisely and powerfully as I can. We may resist this idea because we think the world and the meaning of our ideas are more robust than the words we choose, or because grappling with words is hard and frustrating work, and we may feel that our words are always a reduction, always lose something. That is indeed so. But because words are such thin and frail communicators, writers must work hard to make them do the best they can do.

A further troublesome corollary is that what we can share with each other through writing is limited by our ability to represent the world through language and the ability of our readers to make sense of our representations in ways congruent to our intentions (see 1.2, “Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences,” and 1.3, “Writing Expresses and Shares Meanings to Be Reconstructed by the Reader”). Writers often have great ambitions about the effects and power of what they write and their ability to capture the truth of realities or conjure imagined realities, but they are constantly caught up short by what they can bring into shared reality through words. Recognizing the limitations of our representations can lead us to appropriate modesty and caution about what we and others write and about decisions and calculations made on the basis of the representations. Alfred Korzybski stated this concept vividly by noting “the map is not the territory” (Korzybski 1958, 58). Yet knowledge of this concept helps us work more effectively from our verbal maps in the way we view and contemplate the world represented.

Despite the limits of language, most of what we consider knowledge comes from the representation of the world and events in texts (see 1.1, “Writing Is a Knowledge-Making Activity”). Will Rogers famously said, “All I know is what I read in the newspapers.” The humor and humility in his statement are precisely in the recognition that most of our knowledge comes from the texts we read. If people don’t share those texts (or other texts derivative of the primary representation), they don’t share the knowledge. The recognition that different statements representing knowledge circulate in different groups does not mean all

representations are equal, but it focuses our attention on the procedures and criteria by which these representations enter a communicative network and are evaluated, held accountable, and established as credible. People may resist this recognition as it destabilizes the absoluteness of knowledge and seems to undermine certainty of truth, but recognition of this concept provides a path to a more detailed understanding of how things reach the status of truth within different communities and the criteria by which truth is held. Knowing this can help us write more carefully and effectively to represent the world, events, and ideas credibly within and across communities and to discuss the representations of others in relation to the social worlds the knowledge circulates within.

2.2

GENRES ARE ENACTED BY WRITERS AND READERS

Bill Hart-Davidson

One of the more counterintuitive ideas in writing studies has to do with the nature of a genre—not just how the term is defined but also about what genres are. Common-sense notions of *genre* hold that that the term describes a form of discourse recognizable as a common set of structural or thematic qualities. People may speak about detective novels as a genre distinct from romance novels, for instance. We can also recognize nonliterary forms as genres, such as the scientific article.

In writing studies, though, the stabilization of formal elements by which we recognize genres is seen as the visible effects of human *action*, routinized to the point of habit in specific cultural conditions. The textual structures are akin to the fossil record left behind, evidence that writers have employed familiar discursive moves in accordance with reader expectations, institutional norms, market forces, and other social influences.

The idea that genres are enacted is associated most strongly, perhaps, with Carolyn Miller’s argument in a 1984 article in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* titled “Genres as Social Action.” Miller’s (1984) argument was influenced by Mikhail Bakhtin (1986), and has been developed over the last thirty years by a number of scholars studying writing in organizational settings such as David Russell (1991), Charles Bazerman (1988), and Catherine Schryer (1993), among many others.

This view holds that genres are habitual responses to recurring socially bounded situations. Regularities of textual form most lay people experience as the structural characteristics of genres emerge from these repeated instances of action and are reinforced by institutional power

structures. Genres are constructions of groups, over time, usually with the implicit or explicit sanction of organizational or institutional power.

This view of genre has several interesting implications most newcomers to the idea find challenging and fascinating. One is that no single text is a genre; it can only be an instance of that genre as it enters into contexts (activity systems) where it might be taken up as such an instance. Readers and users of texts have as much to do with a text becoming an instance of a genre as writers do (see 1.2, "Writing Addresses, Invokes, and/or Creates Audiences,"). And because creating a genre is not something an individual writer does, but rather is the result of a series of socially mediated actions that accumulate over time, genres are only *relatively* stable. Generic forms are open to hybridization and change over time. This is why Schryer refers to the textual features of genres as "stable for now" forms, acknowledging that they can evolve.

JoAnne Yates (1993) offers a fascinating historical account of this sort of genre hybridization in the context of the rise of American industrialization. In this account, we learn that standard features of genres, such as the header block of a business memo appearing in the upper left corner, become stable in use situations. When documents were stored in vertical stacks rather than in file cabinets, the memo block allowed for easy search and retrieval. This convention remains today even in email though we no longer need to flip through hard copies to find a message. As we might expect, the convention is less stable due to changes in the use context; users can choose to hide or minimize headers, for instance, in many email programs.

2.3

WRITING IS A WAY OF ENACTING DISCIPLINARITY

Neal Lerner

The central claim of this threshold concept is that disciplines shape—and in turn are shaped by—the writing that members of those disciplines do. In sum, the relationship between disciplinary knowledge making and the ways writing and other communicative practices create and communicate that knowledge are at the heart of what defines particular disciplines.

As an example of the relationship between writing and disciplinarity, consider the use of citations. On the most visible level, citation practices vary by discipline—and often within subdisciplines. Whether the practice is an author-last-name parenthetical system, author-last-name-plus-date

parenthetical citation, footnotes, or numbered references, disciplinary distinctions are clearly marked, and readers in those disciplines have clear expectations for what type of citation formats they will encounter. Different formats also convey different disciplinary values. For example, formats that include the date in a parenthetical citation (e.g., APA) convey to readers that timeliness is important to that discipline; in contrast, formats that only include authors' last names (e.g., MLA) convey the value that references are timeless in certain ways.

Citation practices also enact disciplinarity on more subtle levels (see, e.g., Bazerman 1987; Connors 1999; Hyland 1999; Swales 1990). The mechanics used to introduce previously published work—for example, a parenthetical reference or footnote versus an attributive phrase—convey distinct disciplinary values. Citations tell us something about the discipline's values and practices while also recreating them by enacting them.

On a larger discourse level, any disciplinary genre speaks to the processes by which members of a discipline shape, make distinct, and value its forms and practices of knowledge creation and communication, and these processes, in turn, are shaped by the histories of those genres (see 2.0, "Writing Speaks to Situations through Recognizable Forms"). For example, the experimental report in science has evolved over several hundred years into the IMRD format—introduction, methods, results, discussion—an organizational scheme meant to mimic the scientific research process, particularly as that process has become more codified (Bazerman 1988). In contrast, while a short story also has specific features meant to function in specific ways for a specific disciplinary audience, readers would be hard pressed to confuse a short story with an experimental report. Many distinct disciplinary genres—e.g., legal briefs, SOAP notes, mathematical proofs—reflect the values those disciplines assign to particular kinds of evidence, particular forms of argument, and particular expectations for the transaction between readers and writers in particular rhetorical situations (see 2.0, "Writing Speaks to Situations through Recognizable Forms").

Of course, disciplinary boundaries can sometimes be quite fluid rather than fixed and stable. Such fluidity offers further evidence that disciplinary knowledge making is a social process and subject to changing norms, practices, and technologies (Thaiss and Zawacki 2006; also see 1.9 "Writing Is a Technology through Which Writers Create and Recreate Meaning"). Ultimately, writers and readers come to writing in their disciplines with histories, intentions, and expectations, all shaping the disciplines themselves and, in turn, shaping the writing that members of those disciplines do.