Summer 2022

Trans-Atlantic Composition: The History of British Academic Writing

Gareth George Rees-White

TRANS-ATLANTIC COMPOSITION:
THE HISTORY OF BRITISH ACADEMIC WRITING

by

Gareth George Rees-White

Bachelor of Arts
University of East Anglia, 2012

Master of Arts
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 2015

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

English

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2022

Accepted by:

Chris Holcomb, Major Professor

Byron Hawk, Committee Member

Kevin Brock, Committee Member

Paul Rogers, Committee Member

Tracey L. Weldon, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Dedication

To mum and dad: for supporting me through a lifetime of education and for encouraging me to study abroad, even if it ended up being for a *little* bit longer than one year.

To Jen: for moving across a continent for my degree, for being the most supportive human I could imagine, for being my best friend, and for just being you.

Acknowledgements

First, thank you to Chris and my extended committee: I could never have gotten to this point without your continued guidance.

Thank you, also, to my teaching mentors throughout the years: Brenda, Nicole, and Mike. You were each integral to the direction my career has taken, and I hope my classroom-self reflects the best of each of you.

It also seems rude not to thank Evie for always knowing when I needed to escape work and go on walks: they may have rarely been well-timed, but they were always needed.

Finally, I generally want to acknowledge the many—many—international students I've had the pleasure to meet over my years in higher education. Y'all rock and make the world a better place.

Abstract

I author a revisionary comparative history of British Academic Writing and American Composition studies. My core argument is that the Composition story has always, ultimately, been a Trans-Atlantic one. This project serves two key goals: 1) it offers a comprehensive history of UK writing education; while 2) simultaneously offering a revisionist US history that fights the claim that uniquely American exigencies led to a uniquely American education system that therefore has little to learn from *other* global Compositions. This project tracks the history of university level writing education in the UK from the 1200s to the modern day, and follows a series of historical Trans-Atlantic myths I dispel: the American exigencies of the 18th to early 20th centuries, the misconceptions surrounding both the 1966 Dartmouth Conference and its fallout, and the notion that contemporary British Composition is a non-existent field. The heart of this project lies in demonstrating how strong the education connections between the US and UK have always been, and, therefore, how important it is that they are allowed to continuously thrive: the world, as I say in my introduction, is becoming increasingly isolationist, and strong international ties have never been more important. This project is intended not as the final word on Trans-Atlanticism, but as a first entry in a series of increasingly internationalized historical projects: it is, ultimately, only by looking beyond our shores that we can remedy the problems at home.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

AAE..... African American English

ARU .....Anglia Ruskin University

BAAL .....British Association for Applied Linguistics

BALEAP..... British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes

CAW .....Center for Academic Writing

CCC..... College Composition and Communication

CCCC .....Conference on College Composition and Communication

CDAS ..... Centre for Development of Academic Skills

CEU.....Combined English Universities

CTR.....Current-Traditional Rhetoric

DHS..... Department of Homeland Security

EAP ..... English for Academic Purposes

EATAW..... European Association for Teaching Academic Writing

EEC .....European Economic Committee

ELPHE ..... English and Languages in Professions in Higher Education

ESP..... English for Specific Purposes

EU .....European Union

FYE .....First Year English

F2F .....Face to Face

GCSE.....General Certificate of Secondary Education

HEFCE .....Higher Education Funding Council for England

IEA ..... International Education Act

ISAWR ..... International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research

ISC .....International Steering Committee

JAW..... Journal of Academic Writing

LAC.....Language Across the Curriculum

LATE.....London Association for the Teaching of English

MLA .....Modern Language Association

NATE ..... National Association for the Teaching of English

NCTE .....National Council of Teachers of English

NDEA..... National Defense Education Act

SEVP ..... Student and Exchange Visitors Program

SRTOL .....Students Right to Their Own Language

UCL.....University College London

VW ..... Visual Writing

WAC ..... Writing Across the Curriculum

WDHE..... Writing Development in Higher Education

WID..... Writing in the Disciplines

WRAB ..... Writing Research Across Borders

Chapter One: Trans-Atlantic Composition

The world is currently on the brink of isolationism in a way that it hasn't been since the 1930s: at the center of this, as always seems to be the case, America. American Exceptionalism is nothing new, clearly: it is a conceit that has been part of this nation since its founding. Indeed, claims of American isolationism are also not new: all one has to do is look to the US refusing to join the League of Nations to see how long lasting this has been. And yet, at the turn of this new decade, the nation finds itself at a breaking point: to grow more insular and isolated from the rest of the world would essentially mean shutting out all global progress. Unlike other periods in America's isolationist history, however, it is being joined by countless other nations: this move towards isolationism was one that was heralded in with Brexit breaking the formerly iron-clad EU apart and is one that has only been furthered by the COVID-19 pandemic. Truly, in a period where closing borders has been seen by many as the only way to stay 'safe,' the need to remind ourselves how important international cooperation is could not be more important, especially as isolationism is being used as an excuse for a global rise of fascism.

International education in the United States acts as a simple case study here, as recent years have seen a continued erosion of networks that had been carefully built over multiple decades. I write this from a place of experience: as a British student who has studied within America for most of my higher education, I have found a wide shift over the past decade. When I initially entered the US as a study-abroad student, it was a mere 9 years after 9/11, when having any form of foreign identifiers—skin color, accent, cultural

markers—still painted you as a potential threat to American security, and every re-entry to the nation was treated with suspicion. Fast forward to my return to the States for a 2012 MA, and Obama had helped usher in a new era of foreign relations: those of us from abroad were to be celebrated for our decision to enter the nation and were encouraged to integrate ourselves into American education as much as possible. We, it seemed, were here to help bring our international experiences to the American academy and help build upon what already existed. And then Trump entered the scene, and the tone shifted back to one of suspicion, where paperwork was scrutinized for any potential slip up.[1] While this is specifically my personal experience, conversations with other international students suggests this has become increasingly common. In short, the election of Donald J. Trump allowed isolationists to say the quiet part out loud: only Americans have the right to American opportunities.

And yet, it does not have to be this way. I initially drafted this introduction in the shadow of the 2020 election, as the world watched to see if America was finally ready to return to the international stage it so dramatically chose to leave in 2016. Now, a little over a year into the Biden administration, signs imply this hope will come true as the US increasingly offers aid to nations both near and far. Indeed, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has united the West in a way that hasn't been seen in generations, furthering the sense that we are witnessing a reemergence of an internationalized global community. Even so, the past administration demonstrated how dangerously and quickly a nation can fall into isolationism, and there is no guarantee the 2024 election will not see a similar result: to return to Ukraine, there are certainly those who would rather see America focus more on

[1] As of 03/31/22 I have not, for full disclosure, traveled under the Biden administration, so hopefully these concerns are now increasingly a relic of the past.

home-grown issues. One goal of this project, then, is to demonstrate that nations are at their most successful when throwing aside isolationist ideals, and operating as part of a carefully built international network.

Over the course of this project, then, I focus on a singular piece of the isolationist story: the oft-retold tale that American composition studies are a field that only exists within America and could only have been built in response to American-unique exigencies. I argue, through the lens of a British-centric revisionary history, that those who hold onto this overly rehearsed myth are simply endorsing the continued isolationist nature of American education. In short, by mapping out the myriad ways in which the history of composition is, in fact, a Trans-Atlantic story, I argue that both British and American fields of study can grow. The goal here is two-fold: for America, I argue, breaking away from US-centric ideals allows for a new focus on teaching international-composition at the graduate level, which will in-turn usher in a more internationalized version of first-year English; for the UK, being able to demonstrate how vital my home has been in this story helps further argue for a sustained Composition studies being offered at the university level. This argument brings together a mix of archival sources and scholarship in its support: as this specific history has not fully been mapped out before, it would be impossible to 'just' work with existing scholarly works. But more on this below: first, a brief explanation of two global exigencies that have led to this point. My claim: while these events clearly impacted everyone indirectly, they each served to offer direct hits to the continued health of non-isolated internationalized education.

The Great British Break-Off: Brexit and the Fall of Shared European Education

On November 1, 1993, in Maastricht, Netherlands, the nations of the European Economic Committee (EEC) formed a European Union (EU): a Europe-centric answer, of sorts, to the United States (European Union, "Treaty"). These nations, whose member numbers have evolved repeatedly over the past twenty-nine years, share an economy, national security ideals, and educational goals. For our interests, it is the final shared interest which is primarily important: while students receiving an education in France cannot just transfer to a similar university in Estonia, say, due to differences in modeling, they *can* expect to receive a similar level of education from anywhere within the EU. Here, then, students from within the EU—and particularly from within the 22-nation Schengen Area—can access university education from any other member nation as if it were their own. Some exceptions aside, no matter where in the EU these students travel they will find a three-year model, wherein all coursework stems from a singular major, having finished general education during K-12 (to use the American term). Indeed, in this sense, it could be argued that the European undergraduate model is closer to the American Master's degree, although this is a debate for elsewhere. Current legislation aims to create the "European Education Area" by 2025, with the aim of making the above idea of a French student shifting to an Estonian institution a reality, providing "incentives for more than 5000 higher education institutions across Europe to…train the future generations in co-creating knowledge across borders, disciplines, and cultures" (European Commission 19). In other words, the proposed model seeks to make cross-border education the norm in Europe. That the UK is not mentioned anywhere in the 29-page document outlining this Education Area is a depressing reminder of the effects of Brexit, but I get ahead of myself.

Within the EU, the UK held a unique position: it was not included in the Schengen Area, due to a desire to maintain economic independence, but, as a key founding member of the EU, it held all other member rights. This, then, included an EU-centric focus on educational development and cross-Channel movement: in the 2018-19 academic year, for example, 7.4% of UK university students came from the EU, while 18% of faculty were non-British EU citizens (Universities UK, "Higher Education in Numbers"). That these numbers were up by 1.5% and 5.9% respectively from 2017-2018 academic year is a sign that this partnership was just growing, even before the European Education Area was conceived (Universities UK, "Higher Education in Facts and Figures, 2019"). Generally, and aside from medieval holdouts such as Oxbridge and St. Andrews, British universities have followed the same path as their continental counterparts since the EU was enshrined in law. That the largest collective growth of the British university system occurred in 1992, a year prior to the EU's forming, logically made this shared path easier to navigate: unlike Oxbridge and the such, the New Universities (to use their common name) were not adapting hundreds of years of past experience. Furthermore, British research journals—such as *English Education*—are typically closely linked to their continental brethren, with research directly shared back and forth across the English Channel, and IRB approval connecting institutions across the various EU nations. This was, for the two and a half decades, a fruitful relationship; it was an educational partnership unlike any previously seen, and it only showed signs of growing. That was, at least, until June 23, 2016, when Britain held a referendum.

We are now six years past the initial Brexit vote, and the only surety is a lack of European surety. While I cannot know, and will not speculate on, what the future holds for

the relationship between Britain and the rest of the EU, I do believe that the uncertainty that weighs heavily on my home's future is especially important from an educational perspective. As of writing, there are mixed signals on how Brexit will affect cross-national education. UK-based researchers, for example, "will be able to participate in…Horizon Europe"—a research partnership between EU nations running from 2021-2027—"in the same way as they could when the UK was still a member state" (Universities UK, "Horizon Europe"). For students, however, the future looks less bright: the "UK government decided not to seek participation in the…Erasmus+ programme" of international movement, instead launching the "Turing scheme" (Universities UK, "Student Mobility").[2] While it is too early to know the long-term results of this decision, the split from Erasmus almost guarantees that British students no longer have the same international opportunities as their EU counterparts: in 2017 alone, 16,561 UK students studied in Europe and 31,727 EU students studied in the UK via Erasmus (Reuben & Kovacevic). In comparison, in 2022-23, roughly 5840 UK students to study in Europe via Turing (Turing Scheme, "Proposed Destinations"); even taking the impact of COVID into account, this is a notable drop from the Erasmus era.[3] More problematically *all* students—British or otherwise—are now required to apply for visas to study internationally, unless they only plan to be out of their home country for 90 days or less (Universities UK, "Immigration Rules"). A Graduate Visa is proposed, but, at the time of writing, has not been realized. While the number of

[2] The Erasmus program offers European students a chance to study—or intern—in a different EU member country. Courses taken under the program are guaranteed to be recognized by the home university as part of degree progress, and students do not pay additional fees while studying abroad. The Turing scheme offers a similar method of studying abroad, but opens the options up for non-EU countries. Both programs offer funding to participants, and the UK argues that by focusing on Turing they can offer wider funds. However, unlike Erasmus, Turing does *not* guarantee international fees will be waived, potentially making for a considerably costlier experience (Reuben & Kovacevic).

[3] The number of British students studying in the EU was sourced by combining each individual EU member nation found on *Turning Scheme*'s funding document, so the exact figure could be slightly higher or lower.

international students studying in America—1,095,299 as of 2019 (IIE)—demonstrates that visa issues are not an all-encompassing bar to studying abroad, it is hard to not imagine that there will be an impact.

If the UK is to have prior research partnerships and freedom of educational movement cut off politically, then it is vital that a new partnership be forged. It is a naïve and arrogant nation that presumes it can meet 21st century educational goals without outside help—our resources are only as wide-reaching as those available within our borders, after all—and as such, I argue for a new reciprocal partnership. Indeed, it is clear from various sources authored by Universities UK—the primary body of British higher education—that a desire for this type of relationship is high. A well-reasoned academic relationship can only mutually enrich each member nation, thus helping both nations further achieve educational goals. This, too, can only help in reaching an increasingly globalized education market: much of a university's profit is derived from international students, and this profit extends to the wider nation. In the 2019-2020 academic year, for example, international students generated $38.7 billion dollars and helped support 415,996 jobs (Morgan); in South Carolina alone, international students added $199.2 million in this period. The reason for this is simple: international students can rarely accept in-state tuition, and then pay extra fees to both the university and government for their international status. The University of South Carolina, for example, breaks down international undergraduate costs at $33,951 per year, which includes a specific $400 international fee; in comparison, in-state tuition is set at a considerably lower $12,688 (Office of Undergraduate Admissions). If, therefore, a nation's universities are not competing at the highest international level, there is little to no reason for that market to choose those institutions, and the vast profit is lost. As such, I

look towards Britain's second oldest frenemy: America. With America, I believe, the UK could forge a deeper Trans-Atlantic education partnership than we have experienced before: here, then our two nations could leave their newly hardened isolationist states and re-enter the international world together. And then the world fell apart.

COVID-19: The Push Against International Education

As of writing (03/30/22), 6.13 million have died globally, with ~16% of that figure coming from the United States alone (JHU). I point to COVID-19 as a secondary breaking point for non-isolationist education models. As early as February 2020, articles—Elizabeth Redden's "Will Coronavirus Crisis Trigger an Enrollment Crisis?", for example—were emerging fearing that in-country restrictions within China would have a direct impact on the immediate number of international students working within the U.S. With Chinese students comprising ~1/3 of all international students—with 372,532 students in the 2019-2020 academic year alone (IIE)—this comprised a potentially devastating loss, even before any governmental action occurred.

The first official warning shots occurred in February 2020, when Chinese students who had returned home were not considered exempt from sweeping travel bans and, thus, could no longer return to their studies in America (*Suspension*). Shortly after—March 2020—students studying internationally, faced the opposite reaction as they were encouraged to return to their home countries. At this stage, the damage to international education—and the reciprocal nature of sharing students—was just temporary: in America in particular, students were initially encouraged to stay as long as they felt safe. Indeed, official guidance from the Student and Exchange Visitors Program (SEVP) was for universities to remove restrictions that required international students to take a majority of

face-to-face (F2F) classes, instead allowing "students on F and M visas to remain in the United States if their programs need to pivot to an online-only instruction platform during the pandemic" (Mitchell). It was not until July 2020, then, that things went from justifiably bad to actively targeting international students.

On July 6, 2020, a new ruling from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) prohibited "international students from returning to or remaining in the United States this fall if the colleges they attend adopt online-only instruction models amid the pandemic" (Whitford). In short, it was advised that all students who could only take online classes be deported, even if their university was *only* offering online options. While it was argued that this was for the safety of students, there was an underlying feeling for many that the ruling was "xenophobic and misguided" for forcing "international students to make a cruel decision between either leaving the country abruptly or scrambling to find a new program" (Southern qtd. in Whitford). In short, why help support someone who isn't a citizen? This bad faith argument inherently goes against any concept of building international connections. It took a grand total of nine days for the proclamation to be rescinded, after legal challenges were mounted from numerous institutions—MIT and Harvard among them—and, on July 15, the US returned to the initial guidance that international students be allowed to study online (Redden, "Government Rescinds").

What, then, do these moments of COVID precaution have to do with my tale of isolationism? Even after the July 6, 2020, ruling was no longer a concern, a new anti-international-student ruling argued that too many students outstay their visa end dates, and thus the entire visa system be overhauled. This overhaul is too needlessly (some would say intentionally) complex to detail here, but that is arguably the entire point: it is needlessly

complex. As Dr. Esther D. Brimmer of NAFSA pointedly states: “this proposal sends [a] message to…international students and exchange visitors, that their exceptional talent, work ethic, diverse perspectives, and economic contributions are not welcome in the United States” (Brimmer). A year later, to the day, and following “more than 32,000 comments” criticizing it, DHS “officially withdrew its proposed” overhaul “from consideration” (NAFSA, “Proposal”). The damage, however, may already be done.

Since the beginning of the Trump administration, the number of enrolled international students has steadily declined in the United States: while it is impossible to prove that there is a direct causal link—even if there were, this would wrongly downplay the rise of higher education in other nations—it is also hard to not see a correlation here, especially as the decline explicitly begun in the in the 2016-17 academic year, when a prior growth of 4.9% dropped to 0.80%. This decline becomes more pronounced with each year, reaching a 2.10% decrease in international students by 2018-2019 (Redden, “Number of Enrolled”). COVID has simply made this problem more pronounced, with first year international enrolment dropping by a staggering 43% in 2020-21 (Redden, “International Student Numbers Decline”).

As we move to the next phase of COVID—a ‘new normal’ melding with the global vaccination process—it is hard to know how much more international education will be impacted. It is my fear, however, that future politicians will see the dangerously effective anti-international policies of the Trump administration and create more long-lasting ways to force non-American students out of American education. If nothing else, then, COVID is a reminder of how fragile international alliances can be, and how easily isolationism can creep back in.

Isolation Based Education Policies

Thus far, international education has been able to weather the punches of Brexit, Trumpism, and COVID, although the increased drop in international students is a genuine cause for concern. On the proverbial home front, then, this push against international partnerships has seen an inverse move towards nationalism. Towards the end of the Trump administration, for example, America saw the creation of the "Patriotic Education Commission," which aimed to create a "pro-American curriculum" (Wise). To directly quote the former President, the prior American education system was a "twisted web of lies" akin to a "form of child abuse" (Trump qtd. in Wise). What exactly were these lies? Any American education that taught students the truth of the ills of slavery, for one, with the President explicitly labeling "critical race theory" (CRT) as a particularly "toxic" form of "propaganda" (Trump qtd. in Wise). While this was clearly a political move in the run-up to the election, that such a committee could even be conceived of is testament to the dangers of isolationist facing education policies. The continued push against CRT over the past year is indicative of how quickly these ideas have become ingrained.

Indeed, a reversal from liberal education ideals is not just limited to America: in an October 2020 meeting in the House of Commons, British MP Kemi Badenoch exclaimed that "we do not want to see teachers teaching their white pupils about white privilege and inherited racial guilt" (Wood). This push-back against anti-colonial education within the UK has been seen at the university level, with only 24 out of 128 universities committing to decolonizing their curriculum. Per a *Guardian* report, even among institutions that were willing to commit, "many…failed to grasp that" this commitment went "beyond adding black and non-western scholars to reading lists" (Batty). To bring things full circle, this

unwillingness to appropriately confront the past can itself be somewhat blamed for the success of Brexit, with key campaigner Boris Johnson actively engaging crowds with the rhetoric of deeply problematic British hero Winston Churchill (Thomas). This, then, is a depressingly pertinent example of what can happen when education is allowed to become overly nationalistic: Churchill is a hero to many,[4] and to suggest otherwise can lead to acts of violence, yet the only reason this is deemed to be so is because the education system has eschewed the truth.

All of the above highlights a dangerously simple point: it has never been more important to argue why America can only benefit from outside influences, and in turn how it can still be a source of great innovation, no matter what the prior administration argued. Yet, how do we even go about making such an argument, when so much implies otherwise? I argue that we begin by looking to a previously untold past, to demonstrate that things have never been as simple and isolationist as the canonical American myth would suggest. This argument could use any number of examples of how outside influences shaped the allegedly American-made forces of education, but I focus on the oft-told canonical history and evolution of American composition studies.

The Myth of American Composition[5]

The standard narrative goes as such: following early classes that utilized the work of Scottish rhetoricians, American Composition truly began with Harvard's English A. This course was designed to deal with the uniquely American issue of the rising middle classes

[4] I have a broader interest in history than many, and *I* had no idea of Churchill's deeply racist nature until deep into my teenage years: "Winnie" *was* the great British hero in my household.

[5] I intentionally eschew from using sources in this brief history, and therefore keep dates vague, to demonstrate how rote the re-telling can become: when we can list off historical 'facts' so easily, we are avoiding interacting with the nuances that make them important in the first place.

suddenly wanting access to education: they had grown wealthy off of the economic shifts created by the American Civil War, and were following the American Dream of self-improvement. An American issue faced by Americans, created by an American event, fueled by an American ideology, solved by an American institution.

As the American century progressed, English A needed to be adopted by other institutions, as more and more undesirable folks started to attend. Around this time, this introductory Composition class became the most commonly taken course in the nation, leading to writing instructors working overtime. The solution: apply the burgeoning American factory conveyor belt philosophy to teaching, and churn through as many students as possible with identikit education. This only increased after the GI Bill offered education to even more people; land of plenty, it seemingly was. To counter this influx of students, open admissions universities were heavily promoted, leading to debates of what does, or does not, constitute as 'basic writing.' Things were fine—supposedly—until the rise of that most anti-American enemy: The Soviet Union. The launch of Sputnik, in particular, brought a dangerously sharp light to how unexceptional American exceptionalism really was. To fight this, America responded in the American way: by pouring money into the issue.

In 1966, American compositionists met with their British counterparts in Dartmouth, NH. While they did adopt ideas from the British, this was done reluctantly, and then these ideas were quickly re-parceled into American iterations; this, most certainly, was the only time in the 20th century that foreign influence directly changed the direction of American Composition studies. Indeed, as more time was placed between Dartmouth and the present day, the story just becomes increasingly focused on those advents of

Composition that only occurred in America, such as the process, and eventually postprocess, movement, the more scientific approach to composition that came from the 70s, and WAC work. In short, outside of the brief interaction at Dartmouth and the early use of Scottish textbooks, the history of American composition *is* an American story.

The above 'timeline' is, of course, hyperbolically American: any well taught Composition history class will leave students with a considerably more nuanced understanding of the field. The problem, however, remains: no matter the level of nuance on display, to focus only on the American side of the story (paying lip-service at best to other international Compositions that directly contributed), is to re-enforce this version of events, intentionally or otherwise. As it is this singular story—in its many iterations, revisionary or otherwise—that is taught to the newest cohort of graduate students, it continues to be the story that shapes the composition classroom. As such, a new story—one that actively takes outside influence into account—is needed.

Historiography

According to Sharon Crowley, writers of histories can broadly be broken into two categories: essentialists and constructionists (Crowley, "Let Me Get This Straight" 8). The former argues that "history is a force that stands outside history" (9), and that individual actions—or even the great sweeps of national historical stories—are predetermined by tracks that human nature will ultimately always follow. This traditionalist view of history is arguably the historical equivalent of convergent evolution: just because an ichthyosaur and a dolphin look the same, does not mean they are inherently related; just because two nations seemingly share similar historical patterns, does not mean they are inherently going to have the same outcome. Despite this issue, however, this approach can be deeply

tempting: it *is* satisfying to look at Brexit and argue that it inevitably led to the rise of Trump, whose neo-capitalist mindset inevitably led to the disastrous handling of COVID, and which itself was inevitably used as an excuse to persecute non-Americans. By following this specific path through history, we can escape the frustration and guilt of any personal culpability in allowing it to happen. Yet, to continue with the current example, it is also infuriatingly blinkered: we *could* all have done more, and one event does *not* inevitably lead to the other; to say otherwise basically means we have no reason to try and change the future. Ultimately, there is no greater need for a history than to see how we can avoid past mistakes, so to say that those mistakes were pre-ordained to happen makes that history no more useful than basing present actions on any other fiction.

Constructionists, on the other hand, argue that as we mediate our existence through language—and as language is a construct with no inherent meaning—our paths through history are a human construct: we tell the story we want to tell by shaping how it is told (Crowley, "Let Me Get This Straight" 10). As such, constructionist theory can be both progressive and reactive. It could, of course, be argued that the constructionist approach can be used as a cheat code to avoid confronting the more troubling elements of the past: to return to the reckoning America—and the UK—is having with its history, the constructionist approach could be used to say "well let's reshape how that history is told, to show how folks weren't *really* negatively impacted by the actions of our ancestors."[6] According to Crowley, "constructionist historiography attempts to dislodge narratives that privilege the natural or the unchanging" ("Let Me Get This Straight" 16). Here, then, I

[6] This is, of course, a cynical read, I just believe that it's important to consider *how* the most well-intentioned concepts can be misused: to be clear, an essentialist historiography also allows for authors to excuse the past, perhaps even more so, as a mere step that was inevitable to 'get' to their current place of writing.

place myself in the constructionist camp: the history I will tell here is intended to break the cycle of inevitability that is currently taught as the canonical American composition story. I would argue, therefore, that to some extent all constructionist histories offer a form of revisionary outlook: the goal is to question the dominant hegemonic story and offer an alternative that offers a wider group of voices a chance to speak.

Yet, even here I recognize the danger of still falling into traditionalist patterns: it *is* difficult to break free of a "this happened, thus this happened" approach to history, and it could be argued that a revisionist history is largely saying "actually, instead this is what happened, leading to this." Perhaps this is one of the positives of revisionist histories, then: they help show how many different domino-style patterns played out, thus showing that there is no one definitive historical path. The danger here, of course, are folks just ignoring the retelling for the version they are more comfortable with: think, for example, of the masses who get upset at the idea that Christopher Columbus is not the patron saint of America that they want to paint him as. In other words, when writing a revisionist history, it can be important to demonstrate to potentially frustrated readers that you understand why they like their essentialist story, but why your retelling is productive for them to listen to. It may be a capital driven conceit—basically tricking an audience into going along for their own value—but sometimes it's the only way.

There are not, as of writing, any revisionary histories that focus on British writing education: indeed, there are relatively few texts that focus on *any* form of British writing education history.[7] The historical texts from my homeland generally follow the essentialist

[7] For example, both the Oxford University Press issued *History of Universities* series and the Cambridge University Press issued History *of Education Quarterly* take a wholistic, and international, look at education history, rather than a singular focus on the development of writing education.

route, where the authors (typically located within history departments, as opposed to education specialist areas) simply build upon what came before. As such, this is a clear gap in research that needs to be filled: there is a sense that writing education is a new field in the UK, which could not be further from the truth; as such, I will not so much be revising British history as actively writing it. As I cannot, for the most part, base my claims off existent British—or Trans-Atlantic—histories, we need, therefore, to turn towards America-specific revisionary histories to gain a sense of this genre, and thus better position my argument.

In "Let Me Get This Straight," for example, Crowley argues that she is "concerned about the pernicious effects" of the canon, as it "assumes that thousands of persons (who were mostly women) taught college-level writing during the first seventy years of the twentieth century without raising a whisker of resistance to the aridity of the dominant paradigm" (17). While Crowley offers this brief aside as an example of the type of work a constructionist history can achieve, it is a good example of the type of voices that have been silenced by the canonical history: the history of American Composition currently taught in stereotypical graduate classes essentially presents those early instructors as tools in the CTR machine who had no agency to change pedagogical practices, and who were ultimately saved by the canonical heroes, like Peter Elbow, who emerged in the 1960s. Crowley expands upon her revision of the CTR era in *Methodical Memory*, arguing that CTR was 'successful' in killing any concept of invention in writing instruction, and thus has never truly left the academy.

Robert Connors' *Composition-Rhetoric* argues that we should adopt his titular term to refer to composition studies, as composition became too related to rhetoric to ignore.

Indeed, he argues that the era typically written off as CTR can instead be re-thought as four distinct periods: Early American (1800-1865), Postwar (1865-1900), Consolidation (1885-1910), and Modern (1910-1960). By shifting the story away from 'just' CTR, Connors continues Crowley's work to open up the conversation for a wider selection of voices: it becomes a *lot* harder to simply write those first ~150 years off as non-important once they stop being lumped into a singular time period. Indeed, Connors goes as far as to argue that rhetoric, and by extension composition, evolved more in the CTR period than in the entire preceding 2500 years (23).

Gesa E. Kirsch et al.'s *Feminism and Composition* is not necessarily presented as a revisionary history, but does none-the-less offer an alternative to the canonical story. This collection of 36 essays written between 1971 and 2000 demonstrates that despite notions that the first feminist composition article not being published until 1988 (1), "classroom practice has always been a site for activism for feminists in composition studies" (xvi). I cannot help but wonder what an updated version of this collection that picks up Crowley's claim that female pedagogues of the 1800s should be included in the story would look like: published scholarship from these women does not exist, but if we expand what is considered to be published work—and include other primary materials such as teaching reports—an expanded work could be enlightening.

While positioned explicitly as a counter, not revisionary, history, Byron Hawk's *A Counter-History of Composition* argues that vitalism has been left out of the composition story, and "that transforming rhetoric and composition's image of vitalism from mysticism to complexity provides a basis for thinking about rhetoric and pedagogy that is more attuned to contemporary contexts" (6). In other words, rather than revising the dominant

narrative to make it more inclusive or accurate, Hawk offers an alternate narrative that asks "what if": here is a version of Composition that *could* have happened had events played out differently, allowing for an exploration of why that alternative is interesting. Hawk concludes by suggesting starting places for other counter-histories of composition, such as "acknowledging that writing history is fundamentally rhetorical and responds to rhetorical situations" (260), and "examining the change in meaning of key terms as they shift from various periods and categories" (262).

Similar to Kirsch, Ryan Skinnell's *Conceding Composition* is not, necessarily, sold as a revisionary history, but in the author's attempts to demonstrate the history of Composition studies within ASU, he reveals an untold version of the national story: here, Skinnell repositions composition from the subject that always lags behind, with no one in the grander academy particularly caring about it, to being the capstone without which the entire American university system collapses. While, Skinnell's book is a depressing take on Composition—in that it concludes with an essentialist feeling that because of the field's position as a capstone, it is destined to be stuck holding up the university system—it does demonstrate a different way of perceiving the place of writing studies.

Derek Mueller et al.'s *Cross-Border Networks in Writing Studies* repositions the composition story as one that has long been affected by America's northern neighbor, by "co-constructing knowledge about a North American (rather than simply American) concept of writing studies" (1). While Mueller et al.'s approach is markedly differently from my own—in that their focus lies on shedding light on cross-border writing networks, ala Actor Network Theory, that help break the dominating concept that composition is uniquely American—they offer a useful example of the various ways that this type of

project can proceed. Indeed, an early plan for this dissertation also followed network theory, trying to demonstrate how the American and British writing networks are a *lot* more similar than they initially appear; I shifted to my revisionary historical approach once I realized my "short" Trans-Atlantic history could fill an entire project, and would be more widely useful. I do, however, believe that a version of Mueller et al.'s project that compares contemporary American writing networks to their British counterparts—perhaps comparing a handful of representative universities from both nations—would be a valuable future work.

Each of these texts, while unique in their own right, ultimately follow a similar pattern: identify a voice or concept that has been silent (or silenced) in standard Composition histories, and highlight how the field can grow with its addition. Furthermore, these texts follow a similar source format: they ground the misconception they mean to dispel in potentially outdated academic writing, and then utilize primary material to forge ahead. I have personally seen first-hand how these texts directly influence the teaching of the field, as I cannot imagine being taught a version of Composition history that does *not* incorporate early female voices or new materialism (for just two examples). This is all, therefore, to say that my current revisionary history slots into a pattern that already exists, all the while filling a overlooked hole: outside of Mueller et al., none of the surveyed texts stray from 'the American story'.

It would be remiss to not also briefly touch upon the numerous texts offering revisionary rhetorical histories: the earliest stages of my argument (Oxbridge, the Medieval universities, and Scotland) can be read as purely rhetorical history, after all. Indeed, as Patricia Bizzell argues, "the rhetorical tradition is always being edited," in part through

"inclusions and exclusions in anthologies" (109). Bizzell states that there are two groups of revisionist scholars. First are those who put new focus on "texts and authors already known…but considered to be minor figures," such as the Sophists, Coleridge, and Derrida (Bizzell 112). Second are "rhetoricians [who] have not been able to assume that everyone who heard or read or studied or taught their rhetorical texts would be of the same race, gender, and social class as themselves" (Bizzell 113). In this second group, Bizzell places "people of color" and "women," listing out the likes of Frederick Douglas, Aspasia, and Virginia Woolf (113-4). Bizzell concludes that "we must hear from rhetoricians who have struggled with culturally complex venues in which they were marginalized, if we are to live and work and function as responsible citizens in the American multicultural democracy" (117). In other words, to revise the rhetorical—or, in my case, compositional—tradition is to help the academy best reflect the vast differences of the nation.

For specific examples of this work in action, Jeffrey Walker's *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* argues that the rhetorical canon begins with Hesiod instead of Plato (4), while Susan Jarrart's *Rethinking the Sophists* asks readers to, as the title implies, rethink the place of the historically maligned sophists in the rhetorical story. Meanwhile, Cheryl Glenn's *Rhetoric Retold* seeks to "chart women's inscriptions and contributions to rhetorical history and theory" (IX), reclaiming a diverse group of female voices from Sapho and Aspasia through to Anne Askew and Elizabeth I. Similarly, John Hampsey's *Paranoia & Contentment* seeks to place fringe voices from history—those who were written off as mentally troubled, for want of better expression—as lost voices from the rhetorical canon, in the process bringing in speakers as diverse as Hipatia, Joan of Arc, and William Blake.

Moving forward in rhetorical history, Wayne Rebhorn's *Emperor of Men's Minds* offers an alternative read of renaissance rhetoric, wherein the field was a *lot* more unified than traditional histories have implied. Finally, Paula McDowell's *The Invention of the Oral* repositions modern orality as a by-product of the print-culture of the 18th century, as opposed to its precursor, in the process adding previously lost voices to the history of performativity, such as the fishwives of Billingsgate Market. To be clear, there are far more revisions of rhetorical history than I include here, but the path is typically the same: suggest a group who has been left out of the story (the pre-Socratic rhetoricians, the sophists, women, literary figures, etc.), highlight a few members of that group that fit the argument, and then argue how that inclusion changes the entire field.

The blunt fact is that revisionary rhetorical histories are more common than their composition brethren simply because there is a longer rhetorical history to revise: indeed, one cannot directly compare a history dealing with multiple millennia of lost voices, to one that is (by American standards) barely in its third century. Either way, however, this has long been an accepted sub-genre of Composition studies.[8] Instead, then, it becomes more important to argue for why a specific revision 'matters': in short, if we accept that histories are infinite and constantly evolving, what makes any one stand out? One view returns to the idea of capital: if a revisionary history will draw a wider audience, it becomes 'worth' more. Another, less cynical take, suggests that the entire point of a revisionist history is to give voice to an audience who may have not even existed before, and thus it simply doesn't matter how wide ranging that is. I like to think my history appeals to both views: it

[8] Any desire to fight revisionary histories can be countered with a simple fact: even the canon is a story of the sheer amount of times Composition, as a field, revised how it would be thought of academically—from process to cognition to post-process, for example—that this already *is* a revisionary field before we begin revising further.

simultaneously brings in an entire nation as its audience, while also appealing to those non-Americans who already study Composition and feel left out.

A Revisionist Trans-Atlantic History

I argue, via a revisionary comparative history, that since the birth of America, the field of Composition has been intertwined with its British counterpart, and to better understand either field we should look towards a Trans-Atlantic Composition that is buoyed by the shared history of both nations. As such, there are three core goals to this project: first, and foremost, I am writing the previously unwritten history of British Academic Writing, in the process filling a notable hole in both the US and UK versions of our discipline. Part of the need for this type of history is to combat the claim that "general college composition courses largely do not exist outside of the United States," thus giving "U.S. composition studies" a reason to pay "little attention to insights that might emerge from cross-national comparisons" (Russel and Foster 3). As quickly becomes apparent, the histories of the US and UK are knotted together, with concepts originating on one side of the Atlantic rapidly bleeding into the other, so my focus on the British side of this story offers readers a chance to identify exactly when and where these moments of crossover occur. Secondly, I am arguing, via revisionist-history, that Trans-Atlanticism is the oft-ignored driving force behind the most important moments in American Composition's evolution: the belief that uniquely American exigencies led to a uniquely American education system is incorrect, and the British story is our best means to demonstrate this. To this end, I frame each chapter through a series of myths—or, as I use the term here, general misconceptions or overly simple assumptions—that I then dispel. Third and finally, then, I encourage other international compositionists to compose similar historical projects for their own home

nations: this work, as I discuss in my conclusion is intended not as the last word on Trans-Atlanticism, but the first in a series of Trans-National histories.

Chapter Two, "The Myth of American Exigence," traces British Composition from its origins in the Ancient Universities through to the run-up to the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966. With this nearly 800 year long history, then, I dispel the notion that American Composition evolved due to a set of specifically American exigencies, and instead was the result of hundreds of years of Trans-Atlantic influence. Indeed, I argue here that until the mid-1800s, there is no discernable American Composition, but rather a location-swapped iteration of its older British counterpart. Particularly notable in this early history is the role the Dissenting Academies and Scottish universities played. Even once America begins to face exigencies of its own—the rise of the middle class, the GI Bill, and the space race, to name three—I trace how the British system similarly evolved at similar times. This early history is also important for setting the stage for the rest of this project, where I shift from a vast multi-hundred year focus to a considerably narrower timeframe per chapter.

Chapter Three, "The Myth of Dartmouth," offers an expansive exploration of the Dartmouth Conference of 1966. First, I trace the Trans-Atlantic origins of the Conference in depth to demonstrate how much changed between the planning stages and the reality of the event. Next, I walk through the actual events of Dartmouth in similar depth, before finally investigating the immediate aftermath of the Conference. The goal of this chapter is therefore two-fold: I believe that Dartmouth is such a cornerstone to Trans-Atlantic conversations that it requires this level of attention to fully unpack; at the same time, however, this level of detail is needed to argue whether or not Dartmouth *should* be considered such a key piece of Composition's story.

Chapter Four, "The Myth of Post-Dartmouth Stagnation," moves beyond the Conference to ask what happened next from a Trans-Atlantic standpoint. Towards answering this question, then, the chapter presents a case study that begins at Dartmouth and continues long after: the relationship between American James Moffett and British James Britton. Theirs is a relationship that begins in America, heads across the Atlantic to London, and returns to America, and the results of which directly influenced the evolution of Composition in both nations for decades to come. Moffett and Britton, I argue, are the paradigmatic example of just how important Trans-Atlantic sharing is.

Across this Trans-Atlantic history, the direction of influence shifts notably: Chapter Two is directly concerned with British-to-American ideals, while Chapters Three and Four concern themselves with a more equal Trans-Atlanticism. With Chapter Five, "The Myth of Contemporary Trans-Atlantic Decline," this relationship fully reverses course. Here, then, I trace the final steps of the British story: buoyed by significant education reform that began in 1992, the UK found a renewed focus on writing education, and thus turned towards American Composition for inspiration. This final stage of this story, then, is one of highs and lows: just as British Composition is truly becoming a unified field, the exigencies described throughout this introduction put an end to everything. It is, however, my belief that the successes of the British 1990s and 2000s are indicative of just how strong Trans-Atlantic Composition programs can be.

I conclude with recommendations for how we move on from here, as I argue for a Trans-Atlantic course that can be taught to both the US and UK at the graduate level, albeit with adaptations for both nations, and provide a breakdown for how these classes would work in practice. In short, by changing how the next generation of teachers is taught, we

give them the chance to break past long held common places and move Composition studies towards a more internationally unified future. Here, then, I argue for a broader approach to American Composition history, one that fully acknowledges that this is *not* solely an American subject, and that actively includes other voices. Simultaneously, I argue that as the UK has been the site for Composition education for many centuries it is time for the field to have a greater footprint, and this can best be achieved by encouraging more students to interact with writing via new certifications for those who complete Trans-Atlantic Composition classes. These joint-national classes would by no means be the end of making Composition more internationally accessible, but instead act as a jumping off point for further projects. To this end, then, I conclude my dissertation with suggestions for future Trans-National research.

Before beginning, however, a brief consideration on international Composition: I am in no way claiming that the Trans-Atlantic story is the only revisionist history the field needs to listen to. Indeed, there is an argument to be made that it is a history that simply furthers the white European male-centric narrative that the American story was already telling. Yet, as this history is one that does *not* overly shake the American canon to its core, I argue that it is an important cornerstone to get in place, as it then opens the door for future conversations; there is, without question, a wealth of post-colonial Composition histories waiting to be written, especially when considering the British Empire's unwanted legacy on education. One overarching goal of this project, then, is to encourage further non-American histories of writing education to be written. As well as these additional histories, there are a wealth of counter-histories waiting to be written: what if, for example, Dartmouth had, as briefly considered, included delegates from all British colonies? While

my project is *not* conceived as a counter-history, I hope the moments of potential historical divergence I highlight throughout inspire others to write those hypothetical stories.

Chapter Two: The Myth of American Exigence

As mentioned in the previous chapter, one great myth at the center of the American Composition Canon—and, therefore, at the center of any Trans-Atlantic Composition discussion—is that the field evolved because of a very specific set of American-only exigencies, and thus 1:1 comparisons with education in writing in another country are essentially impossible; without having dealt with those same issues, the field could never have evolved in the same way. I argue, then, that the conceit of pre-1960s American exigencies is used as an excuse to not look into how other nations evolved or how those nations helped influence America. This focus on grand America-only exigencies only serves to promote isolationist leaning ideologies, so demonstrating that these aren't unique situations to America is vital to break free from this myth.

In this chapter, then, I walk through a comparative history of the British and American pre-Dartmouth days (i.e. the centuries in which Composition Studies wasn't codified under a singular name, as it is today) to argue that, not only are the American exigencies *not* inherently unique, but even when the UK faced different issues to America, it still evolved in a similar way. In short, I argue that expanding Composition history to be Trans-Atlantic, instead of America-centric, offers a chance to escape the narrow view that a solely exigence-based history will leave. This chapter first takes us from the Ancient Universities—the medieval institutions that still operate today—to the Dissenting Academies, the first location of education in, and about, the English language. From here, I move to the Scottish universities, whose textbooks would be directly adopted by early

American higher education. The driving argument of these first centuries, then, is that Antebellum American Composition is simply a location-swapped British Composition: there is, simply put, nothing uniquely American about it. In other words, from the beginning of American education this is a Trans-Atlantic story through and through. Due to this, then, many of the institutional hang-ups Composition has from these early years were themselves directly influenced by the issues of the UK. For the remainder of the chapter, I move through the first half of the 20th century, considering two landmark British government reports—*Newbolt* (1921) and *Robbins* (1963)—along with the question of how both nations responded to war with an increase in writing education. In short, even *if* we buy into the argument that US Composition only evolved as it did because of responding to exigencies that were unique to the United States, it was doing so with a foundation that is entirely British in nature.

University Origins: UK Vs. US

First, however, a short breakdown of when the various major institutions were founded is useful to situate this argument historically. Based purely on the respective age of both nations, it would initially be fair, perhaps, to presume that UK higher education would have a larger historical footprint than that in the US. Yet, once the fact that Oxford, the first British university, was founded close to 700 years before the US was even a concept, is removed, there is relatively little British growth until the 20th century: "at the beginning of the eighteenth century, England had two universities…Scotland had four…Ireland had one, and Wales none" (Horner 33). In the US, on the other hand, the growth of higher education occurred rapidly, and, ultimately, the US is home to a larger number of historic institutions than the UK.

The following table breaks down the current top twenty institutions—private and otherwise—in both nations, ordered by the date they were founded to highlight the clear disparities.[9]

Table 2.1 Founding Dates of Top #20 Ranked Universities

US	Year Founded	UK	Year Founded
Harvard	1636	Oxford	~1096
Yale	1701	Cambridge	1209
Pennsylvania	1740	St. Andrews	1413
Princeton	1746	Glasgow	1451
Columbia	1754	Edinburgh	1582
Brown	1764	Durham	1832
Dartmouth	1769	UCL	1836
Duke	1838	LSE	1895
Notre Dame	1842	Leeds	1890
Northwestern	1851	Birmingham	1900
Washington	1853	Imperial College	1907
MIT	1861	Bristol	1909
Cornell	1865	Nottingham	1948
Vanderbilt	1873	Southampton	1952
John Hopkins	1876	Exeter	1955
Chicago	1890	Bath	1960
Stanford	1891	Lancaster	1964
CalTech	1891	Warwick	1965
Rice	1912	Loughborough	1966
UCLA	1919	Manchester	2004

What can be seen is that, despite British education operating for half a millennium before America, the American system grew in size comparatively quicker than the British. Here, then, five British institutions arise before any American, but then seven US

[9] University ranking data gathered from 2021 *The Complete University Guide* (UK) and *National University Rankings* (USA) charts. Conception dates for institutions are located on institution websites. Dates are based on when the institution was granted degree giving abilities, not when it was founded as a college. UCLA, for example, first operated as the California State Normal School from 1882 until 1919, when it became the southern branch of the UC system. I follow this decision simply to keep everything unified.

counterparts arise in the long gap between British expansion. Furthermore, prestigious American institutions are, for the most part, considerably older than their British counterparts: 18/20 US institutions predate the 1900s, as opposed to 9/20 UK equivalents. Indeed, the most modern American inclusion on this list—UCLA—was given university status eighty-five years before the most modern British institution, the University of Manchester. On the other hand, an argument *could* be made that this demonstrates that British institutions innovated more widely in the 20th century. The truth lies somewhere in between, and, to get there, we need to first walk through the history of these education monoliths.

The Four Stages of the British University

The British universities can be broadly grouped into four categories: the Ancient Universities (Medieval era), the Red-Brick Universities (early 1900), the Plate-Glass Universities (1960s), and the New Universities (post-1992). The following table breaks the top 20 institutions into their relevant categories:

Table 2.2 Top #20 British Universities by Group

Category	Institution
Ancient Universities	Oxford
	Cambridge
	St. Andrews
	Glasgow
	Edinburgh
First Public Universities	UCL
	Durham

Red Brick Universities	LSE
	Leeds
	Birmingham
	Imperial College
	Bristol
	Northampton
	Southampton
	Exeter
Plate Glass Universities	Bath
	Lancaster
	Warwick
	Loughborough
New Universities	Manchester

There are three outliers above, then. First, UCL (University College London) and Durham don't necessarily fit into any one category, as they were founded post-Ancient but pre-Red Brick University. In the various articles discussing these groupings, I have found no definitive naming convention for them, or their only surviving contemporary, the University of Wales. The other outlier, then, is the University of Manchester. While, purely by date, Manchester is categorized as one of the New Universities, it is the direct successor to Victoria University, an institution created at the same time as UCL and Durham, that faded from existence. These anomalies aside, the table demonstrates the extent to which elitism still rules the UK: each surviving Ancient University is included, along with each Red Brick. The New Universities, however, are only tangentially represented, demonstrating the problematic views the British hold against them; more on this in Chapter 5. For the next three subsections of this chapter, I walk through each stage of this

developmental story, as it is vital for understanding where Composition-adjacent education has gained a foothold in the UK.

The Ancient Universities: The Origin of British Education

It is no secret that, in the UK, higher education has existed for considerably longer than within many other modern nations. Indeed, Oxford prides itself as "the oldest university in the English-speaking world," having offered consistent instruction since 1096, if not earlier (Ox.ac, "Introduction"). Oxford also set an early precedent for international academic alliances, with the first known international student—Emo of Friesland—arriving in 1190 (Ox.ac, "Introduction"). That it took less than 100 years to get from English higher education being born to moving towards internalization is, perhaps, indicative of the simple benefits granted by promoting these relationships. Entire books have been written about the early history of Oxford, but the short version looks like this: the initial students, representing the elite of the nation, took over the area as their new domain, becoming embroiled in scandals that included multiple murders and houses being burned to the ground. In response, a series of anti-education riots tried to force the students out of the rapidly growing city. To assuage everyone, the University split its students into various residence halls to both separate the student body and to protect it from angry locals. These residence halls, in turn, quickly became semi-isolated colleges; to this day, many of these original colleges still operate, albeit under the semi-collected name of Oxford University.

Cambridge would follow Oxford around 150 years later. While an exact foundation date is cloudy, it is known that students first arrived in the small town in 1209—having fled from the riots of Oxford—and by 1231 these students had been offered royal protection, formally founding the university, even if it was not known by such a term until

later (Cam.ac, "Early Records"). As the university was initially organized by the students, they "arranged their...study after the pattern...which they would have known in Oxford" (Cam.ac, "Medieval"). Like Oxford, the students worked within semi-isolated colleges; again, like Oxford, these colleges eventually became collectively known as Cambridge University. So close is the historical relationship between these two ancient rival schools—leading to events like the Boat Race, that has been held annually since 1856 (Ox.ac, "The Boat Race")—that they are typically referred to as Oxbridge, the nomenclature used from here-on-out, as there is no holistic benefit from discussing them separately. While the origins of British education is interesting—and there are legitimately hilarious reports stemming from the sheer level of drunken debauchery occurring at both of these institutions—it is the specific program of study that is more important for the purposes of this work.

At both universities, all students began their studies with a "foundation course" in the arts of discourse: grammar, logic, and rhetoric.[10] Or, to put it a different way, first-year English (FYE) has arguably existed since at least 1096, albeit as first-year Latin. The comparison continues: "the teaching was conducted by masters who had themselves passed through the course and who had been approved or licensed by the whole body of their colleagues" to teach (Cam.ac, "The Medieval University"). So not only is the conceit of FYE arguably as old as English education, but so is the use of graduate students to teach the courses. Indeed, the way these courses were taught is even reminiscent of a basic form of FYE: "the teaching took the form of reading and explaining texts" and defending a

[10] Also known as the trivium.

thesis; yes, this thesis work was almost entirely oral, but the origins of Composition's researched argumentative paper is also there.

In "The Earliest Teaching of Rhetoric at Oxford," James Murphy explains that records of this earliest composition and rhetoric instruction are limited due to "a series of fires" which destroyed much of Cambridge's earliest archives (Murphy, "Earliest" 345). As such, the first hard evidence of what would, many hundreds of years later, ultimately evolve into Composition studies is found in a 1267 statute laying out requirements for Oxford graduates: students had to produce "testimony...that they had...attended lectures on...logic, grammar, and natural philosophy" (345). In this sense, then, education in discourse at Oxbridge pre-dates rhetoric, which does not appear on Oxford statutes until 1431, or Cambridge until 1506 (345-346). Again, it's important to point out that the subject most likely *was* taught earlier, but that these records have been lost to time. By 1431, however, all Oxford students were required to study "grammar, for the term of a year" and "rhetoric, for three terms" (346). Here, students were offered the choice of studying Aristotle, Cicero, Ovid, or Virgil. In a separate article, "Rhetoric in Fourteenth-Century Oxford," Murphy traces the history of instruction in letter writing, placing the first dictatem manual—written by Peter of Blois—at Oxford in 1181 (Murphy, "Rhetoric" 8). He does, however, stress that these early textbooks, of sorts, were not otherwise produced by Oxbridge until the 14th century; instead, students simply read texts brought over from the continent (8).[11] The above is not to imply that the arts of discourse, as taught in medieval-era Oxbridge, are in any sense a 1:1 match to the contemporary Composition system:

[11] As my focus does *not* lie in early forms of rhetorical education, I am not discussing the distinctions between ars dictaminins and other medieval forms of rhetoric. Instead, this overview of *how* rhetoric and early writing was taught at Oxbridge is intended to simply demonstrate how long there has been a tradition for this form of education within the UK.

instead, I simply mean to show that education in communication—both written and oral—*and* argumentation has been present in British education as long as the university system has. In this sense, then, I place these earliest classes as a progenitor, or proto-Composition.

Oxbridge were, themselves, influenced by the Medieval Grammar Schools, with the focus on Latinate study being adopted from the smaller religious institutions.[12] Whereas Oxbridge offered a full course of education to adult students, the Grammar Schools served a single purpose: to prepare their minor students to best serve the church as clergy. Furthermore, of the "seventy-seven" non-Oxbridge Medieval sites of education whose records remain, "none of them mention the teaching of rhetoric" (Murphy, "Rhetoric" 12). Similarly, of the "6,000 books identifiable in fourteenth-century catalogues, fewer than one percent belong to the arts of discourse" (12). In other words, for multiple centuries Oxbridge was the only locale in England where students could study this progenitor to Composition for purposes other than entering the church.[13]

By the eighteenth century, however, Oxbridge had "degenerated into a 'preserve for the idle and the rich'" (Barnard 24). They were expensive and elitist, both became known as the home of "traditional and increasingly decadent culturally elite," and classes offered so little reason to attend that they became known as "'wall lectures' because the lecturers had no other audiences than the walls" (Horner 37). While there were attempts made to overcome these issues—notably the Oxford University Act and the Cambridge Reforms of 1854 and 1856—the fact remains that Oxbridge "continued to be aristocratic and extremely conservative" (38). Indeed, English was not 'legally' allowed to be used on

[12] The oldest of these Grammar Schools is thought to be King's School, Canterbury which has operated since 597 (Kings-School, "History").
[13] A second set of Grammar Schools—most notably Eton and Winchester College—begin to emerge in the 1500's, with a focus not on prepping their students for the church, but for university studies at Oxbridge.

these campuses until the aforementioned Reforms were passed, and even after, it was exceedingly rare to be used for educational purposes. Furthermore, Oxbridge required Latin language competency—proven through strict entrance exams—until May 1960 (Forrest 44).[14] In other words, it took until a mere sixty years ago for Oxbridge to enter the modern world academically. In short, while these two institutions are notable for their longevity, in our story they are arguably more notable for inspiring other more forward-thinking institutions.

What, then, of the other UK nations? Prior to the foundation of the Scottish universities, some "Scottish students went to Oxford, but nearly four times as many went to the continent" (Horner 39). As such, Scotland would see four institutions created during the 15th and 16th century: the Universities of St. Andrews (1413), Glasgow (1451), Aberdeen (1495), and Edinburgh (1582).[15] To return to the *Complete University Guide* league table, these are still among the most sought-after institutions in the UK, with St. Andrew's ranking 3rd (only behind Oxbridge), Edinburgh 15th, Glasgow 19th, and Aberdeen 26th. While these institutions certainly began following the roadmap laid out by Oxbridge, they hold a more important place in the history of composition; as Horner explains, "they are often credited with being the real originators of English studies" (Horner 38). Horner continues, explaining that, in direct opposition to the strict and overly religious Oxbridge education, "the Scottish philosophy of education was...more democratic and contained few religious restrictions for admission of degrees" (39). In short, where

[14] Even at this late date, the decision was not without its controversy, with an immediate panic setting in that both the Classics and Latin would no longer therefore need to be required subjects in K-12 education; see Martin Forrest's "The Abolition of Compulsory Latin" for more. While I personally *did* take Latin classes, this was a rarity.

[15] Unlike England, which saw multiple additional institutions built in the 19th and early 20th centuries, this would be it for Scotland until the Andersonian Institution was offered Royal Charter in 1964, founding the University of Strathclyde (Strathclyde, "Governance").

Oxbridge would remain stuck in the past, Scotland moved towards the open future, and would become heavily influential in early America.

Following the formation of the four Scottish universities, the final remaining "ancient university," Trinity, was founded in Dublin in 1592. Trinity holds a strange place in this story, in that it *was* founded by British royal decree—like the other six institutions—and it *was* heavily influenced by the study program at Oxbridge (TCD.ac, "History"), leading to all students working through the aforementioned arts of discourse classes. In other words, for much of its existence, Trinity is, indeed, part of our conversation.[16] However, due to the Government of Ireland Act of 1920, its host country—the Republic of Ireland—is no longer part of the UK, and thus, Trinity has not explicitly followed the same British-led path as the other institutions. Indeed, the first major British government report into the place of English and Composition in education—the *Newbolt Report*, to be discussed below—was published the year after Ireland left the UK, and thus its findings do not ultimately impact the path of Trinity. The same can, therefore, be said for each following government report and the various overhauls of higher education they lead to, and as such, I will not be considering it further in this discussion; it is ultimately, now, no more a UK institution than Universidad Autonoma de Madrid or Freie Univerität Berlin (to use two other European examples).[17]

Wales, therefore, is the only nation in the UK to not have an ancient university, with its first degree conferring institution—Cardiff's University of Wales—not being

[16] Trinity was the educational home for Thomas Sheridan, whose lectures of elocution proved to be deeply influential to Scottish rhetoricians.

[17] While Trinity is the last built *and* still operational of the "Ancient Universities," it is wrong to say these institutions were limited to just seven locations. The University of Northampton, for example, was founded in 1261 before being almost immediately abolished in 1265 (BBC, "Northampton"). The reasons for the abolishment are debatable; however, this failed university did follow the same arts of discourse teachings as Oxbridge and the other Ancient cohort, and was briefly the institutional home of Geoffrey of Vinsauf.

founded until 1893 (Wales.ac, "History"). This says far more about English attitudes towards the Welsh than it does about a Welsh desire to access higher education. Indeed, that the three smaller non-degree giving colleges that this institution was founded from—University College's Wales, North Wales, and South Wales—were primarily used to prepare students for the entrance exams at University College London is a good example of attempts to maintain England's primacy in education (Wales.ac, "History").

The Dissenting Academies: The Origin of English-Language Education

Following the Uniformity Act of 1662, it became essentially impossible for individuals who were not practicing members of the Church of England to gain a place at Oxbridge. While the Scottish universities did not follow such a ruling, this was a hard blow for those wishing to study in England. To meet this need, then, the "dissenting academies" arose, modeled after the practices of "Swiss Calvinists" (Hansen 17). These academies "took students of university age...and dealt with the new university subjects" that Oxbridge had neglected. In doing so, they also provided locales of education in previously geographically isolated areas, such as the Midlands; attempts to open further academies were quickly stifled. Most importantly, however, they were the first known site of lecturing in the English language, an attribute more commonly offered to the Scottish universities. One such early lecturer, founder of Newington Green Academy, Charles Morton, would bring his pedagogical choices to the newly founded Harvard, where he continued to lecture in English (Colonial, "Compendium"). Morton, then, is the very first example of direct Trans-Atlanticism. These Academies would essentially cease to exist with the founding of the University of London. While the Academies remain the least discussed stage in breaking "the stifling dominance of" Oxbridge (Miller, "Where" 59-60), they are the forebears of

not only all UK public universities that have arisen since, but also all global education that teaches both in and about the English language, including America.

The first of the public universities, then, was the University of London, which was first argued for in 1825—via a letter to *The Times*—to "provide education for the 'middling rich,' 'the small, comfortable, able, trading fortunes'" (Campbell qtd. in Barnard 84). This institution, which opened in 1834, would be an "undenominational teaching institution" that avoided the religious gatekeeping of Oxbridge, while embracing "languages" in a way that had not been seen before, even in the Dissenting Academies (Barnard 84). H. C. Barnard argues that the instant success of the institution (which taught over 500 students in its first year) was, at least partially, due "to its provision of subjects which were not taught, or inefficiently taught" at Oxbridge "but for which there was a real and growing demand" (85). Among these subjects, then, were the first courses in "English literature and composition" (85), but, again, more on this below.

Red Bricks, Plate Glass, and New Universities: The First Government Intervention

Following the founding of the University of London, England saw a rapid growth in universities, known colloquially as the "Red Bricks."[18] As the name suggests, these institutions are easily identified by the red-brick architecture that dominated their first buildings. Here, then the promise of the Dissenting Academies became a reality, with regulated and extensive university campuses occupying multiple new cities, such as Birmingham (1900), Liverpool (1903), and Reading (1926). In total, there are nine Red Brick Universities; each of these new institutions—sometimes referred to as "civic universities" (Beloff 19)—had previously existed as "privately founded colleges before

[18] A term coined by Bruce Truscot in *Red Brick University*.

they received any government help" (19). Specifically, many of the Red Bricks began life as Dissenting Academies.

The next generation of British higher education, then, is defined by two interlinked factors: the government allowing a subset of what had been non-degree offering colleges the ability to operate as a university, and the government offering financial support. As these colleges had previously been helping teach students less elitist skills, they each entered their university phase with an appreciation for education in Composition. Through official bodies like the "University Grants Committee" (20), funding was made available for the first time, allowing the system to both rapidly grow and to accommodate a considerably more diverse student body; to phrase this differently, the universities no longer had to rely exclusively on rich students to keep them afloat. The above not only saw a major rise in students—"in 1914 the number was 24,000; in 1920 almost 50,000" (21)—but it also allowed the universities to move away from religious restrictions of Oxbridge. With government aid, however, also came government interference.

At the same time as the Red Bricks were gaining momentum, then, the first ever government reports in education began being published. While I cannot touch on each of these in this project, I do walk through the most important to Composition in their relevant chapters. For now, however, a general takeaway is that these reports increasingly point towards a university system that needs to impart a more practical skill set on the student body to better prepare them for the workforce. In almost each of these reports, then, a key element of this skill set is writing. Furthermore, with each generation of new students, governmental demand for further emphasis on writing education grows; in turn, this means

that each successive wave of university group is more intrinsically connected with providing education that had previously been considered remedial.

This connection is particularly clear with the final two stages of the system: the Plate Glass and New Universities.[19] Government reports demanded increasingly high student numbers, and as such, a rapid growth of the system was needed to house them.[20] The Plate Glass Universities, so called because of the modern building materials used in their construction, added 23 institutions to the British system, including my undergraduate home at East Anglia (1963): that, prior to this, there were only 22 universities demonstrates the systemic nature of this shift. In short, British education was now available for over twice as many students as it had at any other time in millennia long history. As many of these new institutions had previously operated as colleges of advanced technology, they were primed to offer the more practical skill set demanded of the government. Even so, government demands for stronger writing practices did not abate, and in 1992, the *Higher Education Act* created a further 38 institutions; this time around, these were former Polytechnic Colleges.

With each of these three phases—The Red Bricks through the New Universities—the type of college that was adapted for university purposes moves down a level of elitist hierarchy. In other words, the Dissenting Academies that became the Red Bricks were considered to be considerably more elitist than the Polytechnics that eventually became the New Universities. Simultaneously, however, because the less elitist colleges had been offering increasingly more skill-based education, once they became universities, they were

[19] The term "Plate Glass University" was, seemingly, coined by Michael Beloff in his 1968 book of the same name. No singular source seemingly named the "New Universities": instead they gained their name through the simple act of being new. British naming standards can be somewhat literal at times.
[20] 1963's *Robbins Report* asks for "200,000" new students "by the start of the new decade" (Beloff 22).

primed to offer stronger writing support than any degree offering institution that came before. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the success Coventry University—a New University founded in 1992—has had with graduate-level Composition programs.[21] All of the above to say, the further the British system moves from ancient elitism, the more effective and accessible its writing education becomes.

The question remains: why focus on the origins of these various arms of British education as a whole before moving onto the specific evolution of Composition? Even before the early days of English are discussed, it is vital to understand just how important the various moves to break from Oxbridge were for the development of both the earliest American campuses and certain cornerstones of modern Composition pedagogy. First, then, it is important to know that early American universities did *not*, for the most part, gain their pedagogy from Oxbridge, but instead adopted the ideals of the Dissenting Academies, along with the Scottish universities. To phrase this differently, I argue that this early British history *is* all part of the American Composition story: without Oxbridge collapsing into a retreat for wealthy Anglicans, the Dissenting Academies would never have been formed; had these not been formed, the ideals commonly associated with Scottish universities—namely a desire to teach in, and about, English—may have taken considerably longer to take hold, and without *this*, there is every chance that the first American institutions would instead have followed Oxbridge into Latinate exclusivity. In short, had British education not evolved in the way it did, there is a strong chance that America's wouldn't have either. Similarly, there have been numerous modern developments—aka post-1960—that evolved because of the British government adapting

[21] Much more on this in Chapter 5.

technical colleges into full-fledged universities, most notably writing across the curriculum (WAC) pedagogy. More on this second stand in later chapters: for now we turn our attention to the early British Composition classes that directly influenced nascent America.

The First English Classes: The Dissenting Academies and The University of London

Once more, the earliest recorded English language education occurred in the Dissenting Academies, where students were both taught in English and how to communicate effectively in the language. The aforementioned Charles Morton, for example, "encouraged the writing of English compositions" (Hansen 18). This act, however, was not limited to a singular instructor or Academy: at Sheriff Hales Academy "students were obligated to write compositions in English in the form of letters and speeches" as early as 1663, while students at Warrington academy were "trained up in a regular Course of English Composition" (19-20). Here, then, students would engage in a mixture of writing and oral reporting, covering argumentative topics such as the "Connection of Political Liberty and National Morals," "The advantages and disadvantages of an hereditary peerage," "The Origin of Slavery, and its favourable & unfavourable effects on the state of Society," and "Causes of the superiority of Europe in civilization to the other quarters of the globe" (Hansen 23). It is, of course, notable that each of these topics serves ideological enculturation: as well as gaining a course in writing, students were being offered a course in British superiority. That the language of the Empire was being used to pen these early Composition papers is not lost on me. Ideology aside, these were not just random papers: instead, "English composition and literature were being taught...to college-age students in a 'systematic and concerted way" (Miller qtd. Horner 38). Indeed, instructors at the Dissenting Academies stressed the need "to understand the rhetoric of political discourse"

and "write for diverse public audiences" (Miller, "Where" 60), two core goals of contemporary composition classes.

A glance at the earliest writing classes in America demonstrates how close they were to those offered at the Dissenting Academies: students at 17th century Harvard and William and Mary offered "oral and written discourses" that "displayed their grasp of civic and moral issues" (Crowley 49-50). Issues covered included "Is Civil Government absolutely necessary for Men?" in 1758, and "Is a Government despotic in which the People have no check on the Legislative power?" in 1770 (50). The only locale in British education where similar prompts appear prior to the 1750s were, indeed, the Academies; as such, it certainly appears that Trans-Atlantic imports like Morton brought their pedagogy over to America with them. This is not to say that the Dissenting Academies invented this pedagogy: it is, for a large part, a British perspective on ancient rhetorical practice. However, by offering this style of teaching in the language of the masses—rather than Latin—the Academies were the first modern institutions to provide such education in a way that didn't just favor the elite few. In other words, it is the marriage of this specific type of pedagogy with English-language speaking that make the Academies such a vital step to what would become American Composition.

A question remains: for such a clearly important part of the Composition story, why are these Academies less discussed? Thomas Miller cynically suggests that "contemporary students may be hesitant to accept a group of Presbyterian divines teaching in their homes as the first professors of English" (Miller, "Where" 65). While there may be nugget of truth here, the more practical answer is that these academies are a small blip in history: they had incredibly small staffs (sometimes as few as five individuals), they were often run out of

the instructor's home, and most importantly they did not last a particularly long time. Warrington, for example, operated from 1757-1786. However, it is vital that their legacy be known: without these first, albeit brief, attempts at teaching English *in* English, it is impossible to know when the field of Composition would have eventually started. Furthermore, these academies directly influenced the Scottish instructors who are more typically credited with founding this movement, and, as shown above, evolved into the first public universities in the UK.

Following the dissolution of the Dissenting Academies, the first known attempt to offer specialized English classes in England began in 1828 when Thomas Dale lectured on the subject at King's College, focusing on "rhetorical forms and genres" (Bacon 592). As with the Scottish universities, this was a class-inspired move: the students came "mainly from a different social class from those at Oxford and Cambridge and…although Greek and Latin were to be taught...perhaps something else was needed as well" (599). Dale was immediately beset by institutional issues, being forced to merge his course with history "to save money," and being "unhappy" with "the lack of importance which...the college authorities attached to the courses he taught" (603-5). In short, the first ever English class at an English university faced a similar fight for recognition as is faced in universities today. Dale would soon leave King's College and bring his English course to the University of London in 1850, where it was met more positively (Miller, "Where" 60).[22] While there was hope that "innovations at the London colleges would spread" to "Oxford and Cambridge" the very formation of these colleges made this unlikely: they were founded on the pledge that they "would be no threat to the old universities," and measures were taken

[22] A. J. Scott 'beat' Dale to the University of London by two years, offering the first recorded lecture on English in 1848, but records imply this was a one-off affair (Bacon 592).

to ensure they did *not* change the old way of life (600). In these early University of London English classes, students would be lectured on "English literature twice a week and English composition once a week" (604).[23] Proposals were made in 1886-7 to bring the English education Dale began to Oxbridge, but these were met with guarded concerns that it would create the end of the Classics (612). It would not, therefore, be until the rise of the Red Brick universities the following century that English further proliferated higher education in England.

The Next Wave: The Scottish Universities

It is difficult to pinpoint an exact date when education in and about English began in Scotland. As Miller explains, "professors were lecturing *in* English before they were lecturing *on* it" (Miller, "Where" 52; emphasis added). Indeed, during this time "English was even used to teach rhetoric, but English itself was not the subject of study" (52). As such, we have to go with a broad range of dates of when English entered Scottish higher education. The first known professor to "lecture on English literature, composition, and rhetoric," however, was John Stevenson of the University of Edinburgh, who taught from 1730 to 1777 (61). Here, then, Rhetoric and Composition classes at Scottish universities were, after the Dissenting Academies, the earliest locations in higher education where the vice-grip of Latin was released. Per Miller: "the adoption of English is the pivot point for the transition away from classicism," as "for the first time in over a millennium, the language of public life was being used and studied in college classrooms" (56).

[23] At King's, on the other hand, Dale's replacement—F.D. Maurice—believed that composition was "basically artificial" and encouraged students "to express thoughts and feelings they did not really have" (606).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, there was push-back from Oxbridge, with some seeing Stevenson and his ilk who were teaching in English as a direct attempt to usurp traditional pedagogical models. For example, Edward Copleston's *A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review* spends sixteen pages reverently defending Aristotle's place in education, entirely missing the point that just because we now teach in English doesn't mean we suddenly stop teaching ideas originating in other languages.[24] Indeed, while Stevenson "left no publications and few records of his teaching" (Miller, "Where" 61), a fair amount about his curriculum is known because of his students, and this very much included "Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Longinus" (61). From a Trans-Atlantic point of view, then, it is two of these students, Hugh Blair and John Witherspoon, that make Stevenson so notable. Blair, of course, would become well known for his popular lecture series on *Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, the published versions of which would become used as textbooks in America, and in the process define the early years of American Composition (Miller, "Formation: Survey" 267). Witherspoon, in the meantime, emigrated to the nascent America in "1768 to become President of Princeton" (Miller, "Where" 61), ensuring Stevenson's pedagogy was present in the US from the beginning. As it was through Stevenson that both men were introduced to "a full course in rhetoric, literature, and composition" (61), he therefore stands as one of the more important scholars for whom no primary sources exist.

At this juncture, it is worth pausing to consider the locale for these Scottish ventures into English education: before entering the university they were occurring in public lectures and private societies. Prior to "becoming Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres," for

[24] This, in a way, calls back to the Patriotic Education Committee, and the falsehood that modernizing education means entirely erasing the past.

example, Blair offered a popular series of public lectures "sponsored by the Select Society" (Miller, "Where" 62). Indeed, this was not new: prior to Blair, Adam Smith had also offered equally popular public lectures. It is the public nature of these lectures that is vital: these were *not* cloistered talks in Latin given to the elite few behind closed doors at Oxbridge, but instead were events that explicitly intended to speak to all listeners via the "language of public life" (Miller, "Formation: Rhetoric" 53). When, then, the likes of Blair were offered full time professorships based on the popularity of their lectures, it was only natural that their use of English would fully integrate into the Scottish universities.

Occurring concurrently with the rise of public English-language lectures, literary societies were becoming a key space for both students and faculty to converse—and debate—in their native tongue away from classroom Latin requirements. Even here, however, 'native' tongue may be more correct: in Scotland, English was ultimately the begrudging language of the elite, and its practice in these cloistered societies did little to challenge that. This said, these societies became an important space for spreading "the study of English among the Scottish public" (Miller, "Formation" 266). Particularly notable here was the "Society for Promoting the Reading and Speaking of English Language in Scotland," formed by Blair, Smith, and Lord Kames following a public lecture series by Thomas Sheridan (267). In short, by the time that a succession of chairs of English Language and Literature were founded across the Scottish institutions—Glasgow in 1861, Aberdeen in 1893, and St. Andrewes in 1897 (Newbolt 244)—these lectures and societies had long since normalized its study, and "communication skills, both spoken and written" were seen as "central to the entire educational endeavor" (Horner 45).

In Scotland, it was believed that it was the "duty of the universities to teach students" from non-urbanized areas "how to read, write, and speak a cultivated English" (Horner 41). The influence this would have on American education—in particular the work of Mina Shaughnessy, such as *Error and Expectation*—is perhaps obvious, but Horner pushes the point home: "what we would now call Basic English was an important part of writing instruction, especially in the Scottish universities" (44). Here, then, the Scottish universities introduce another two aspects of the Trans-Atlantic story: they were the first institutions to actively work on educating rural students in Composition, but in doing so also became the first institutions to force a prescriptivist version of English on their students. There is an irony that Oxbridge continued to only teach in Latin to maintain a sense of privilege (only those who were clever enough to speak the ancient language were worthy enough to be members of society), while the Scottish locations intentionally shifted to teaching in English for this same reason: to "enable Scots to speak as British gentlemen," and thus fit in with those same Latin speaking crowds (Miller, "Formation: Rhetoric" 54). The political motivation behind this shift need also be remembered: following the 1707 Act of Union that joined Scotland and England politically, a command of the English language was a base-line requirement for anyone who wanted to gain political power, and thus offering education in the language became of paramount importance for the Scottish universities. This, ultimately, is why the non-Latin language of education was English, not Scots or Gaelic. The tension between increased education in English offering greater numbers access to previously withheld opportunities while simultaneously reinforcing hegemonic ideals of the elite is one we see consistently throughout this story, so more on this below.

The move towards English-language education was met with an institutional desire to standardize English to avoid a rise in "numerous spellings, terms, and phrasings that are unfamiliar to standard English speakers" (60). In other words, English was standardized to ensure the Scottish who were benefiting from the shift from Latin could still be dismissed as speaking a lesser version of the language; a less cynical take here would say that this dismissal was less likely to occur with standardization. Furthermore, it again bears remembering that English is *not* the native tongue of Scotland, and as such this standardization served to reinforce England's place as the dominating nation: to gain access to higher education, the Scottish not only had to swap Scots or Gaelic for English, but they had to use a specifically predetermined iteration of the language. Notably, at the same time as the Scottish began pushing for prescriptivism, there were those in England who pushed for the opposite. Joseph Priestly, of the Dissenting Academies, for example, argued that "widespread literacy had" already "stabilized the language" (Miller, "Where" 57) and that teaching prescriptive grammar is less helpful than "'making the scholars compose dialogues'" meaning instructors "'should omit no opportunity' to assign compositions" (Priestly qtd. Miller, "Where" 57). Standardization would ultimately win out, becoming adopted throughout the UK as more institutions opened and remains a constant thread of British education.

While relatively little in the way of records of the earliest Scottish classes remain—as most "instruction was oral" (Horner 43), as were most responses to student writing (49)[25]—we have access to considerably stronger records in the 1800s. Perhaps most notable for our story are the lectures of Alexander Bain of the University of Aberdeen: in 1864, he

[25] Here Horner explains that this feedback was almost entirely "a matter of correction, not appraisal" (49), lest too much credit for modern pedagogical standards be given to these early classes.

taught, among other things, "the Principles of Rhetoric, applied to English composition" (Horner 331). Bain's 1866 textbook on the topic—*English Composition and Rhetoric*—is itself among the first specialized texts of its type, and thus serves as an important historical document from which modern FYE textbooks have grown. In other words, in a Scottish university in 1864, lies a clear example of a progenitor to the modern First-Year English course, and Bain can therefore be positioned as one of the fore-fathers of Composition.

Bain also provides a notable early example of a phenomenon seen throughout this Trans-Atlantic history: adapting an idea first floated on one side of the Atlantic and becoming the historic face for it.[26] Here, then, I refer to the notion that Bain is "generally credited with originating the 'modes of discourse'" (331). Yet, while it was Bain's textbook "that made the modal formula widely known," those terms were already "floating about in very general use during the period 1825-1870" (Connors, "Rise" 444). Indeed, the "first definitive use of terms similar to our modal terms was in 1827" when they appeared in a text called "*A Practical System of Rhetoric*" (445). The author, Samuel P. Newman, was an American "professor at Bowdoin College in Maine" (445).[27] Despite Newman's text being "the most widely-used rhetoric written in America between 1820 and 1860," its use of the modes of discourse "hung in suspension, waiting for a powerful voice to solidify and disseminate a formulation" (445). In other words, the system originated in the US—or at the least was codified there—and then moved over to the UK, was taken up by Bain, and then brought back to the US where it received "a burst of popularity" (447). As an interesting side note: Alfred Kitzhaber, the scholar whose dissertation Connors credits with

[26] The most notable version of this is the focus of Chapter 4 of this project: James Britton becoming inextricably linked with James Moffett's discourse categories.
[27] Alfred Kitzhaber, the scholar who Connors credits with pointing out the Trans-Atlantic similarities between Bain and Newman will go on to be a major Trans-Atlantic figure himself.

first positing the Trans-Atlantic similarities between Bain and Newman, would go on to be a major Trans-Atlantic figure himself as a lead creator of the Dartmouth Conference.

The First Composition Textbooks

Bain's textbook finding popularity in America is not an exception by any means: "textbooks originating in America were rare until the 1790s. The majority were imported from Britain; many were reprinted in America" (Michael 3). In other words, the first textbooks used for the first American writing classes mark some of the earliest Trans-Atlantic education. Even once America started printing original texts, during the 18th and 19th centuries, there was a "close relationship, sometimes supportive, sometimes crossgrained, between British and American textbook writers" (Michael 3). The most commonly noted example of this, then, are the "published lectures of Blair and Campbell," which "served as textbooks for almost a hundred years in the United States" (Horner 46). So frequently was Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* reprinted during this time, that there are "over a dozen" unique and different versions of the text, "and presumably yet other versions have disappeared without bibliographic trace," with the text itself being reprinted 283 times (Carr 77-8). Of these, 49 abridged texts were reprinted in the North East—where most universities were located at the time—between 1802 and 1830 (Carr 80). In comparison, Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* was reprinted 43 times in this period (Carr 78). These texts would dominate American composition education, until 1832, when Richard Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric* became the go-to text, quickly amassing "at least fifty-seven American versions" (84). Similarly, Lord Kames' *Elements of Criticism* "was printed in at least forty two versions after 1829" (84), quickly becoming a common text in American composition classrooms.

Even once American textbooks did begin to rise in popularity they were "little more than imitations" of their British counterparts (Berlin 31). It would not be until the tail end of the 1800s that "a rash of [American] textbooks appeared" and "although these most often displayed the use of ideas found in Blair, Campbell, and Whately, two distinctly new versions of the composing process prevailed," these being "new romanticism" and "current-traditional rhetoric" (Berlin 58). In the latter of these, then, textbooks championed "the most mechanical features of Campbell, Blair, and Whately, and made them the sole concern of the writing teacher" (Berlin 62).

In short, British textbooks dominated American universities from the birth of the nation up until the end of the Antebellum era. In the face of this British proliferation, it isn't as though American scholars weren't publishing; they simply weren't seeing the same level of success. For example, John Quincy Adams's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* were published in 1810, and then didn't "see another printing for 150 years" (Berlin 17). Indeed, it would not be until the 1855 publishing of George Payn Quackenbos' *Advanced Course in Composition and Rhetoric*—which experienced 30 printings in a roughly 30 year period—that a US-born scholar began to compete with the British (Carr 84). As such, it can be argued that it is only with the publishing of Quackenbos' text that American Composition begins to gain a national identity of its own, and, even here, it is one that is entrenched in the pedagogy of British scholars.[28] Indeed, it bears remembering that, at the time of Quackenbos breaking the British hold on the market, the vast majority of

[28] It is worth remembering that the German universities *also* had an important influence on early America: the actual inner-workings of the system bears more similarities with its Germanic equivalent. Indeed, the Scottish universities were themselves arguably influenced more by Germany than Oxbridge.

Americans were only a generation or two removed from literally being British themselves, so the early similarities between the systems is unsurprising.

The Trans-Atlantic Birth of Parallel Standardization

A notable shift in the late 19th century is the quick evolution of two different forms of standardization, one which grew in the US and was eventually adopted by the UK, and the other which grew in the UK and was adopted by the US. First, then, is the adoption of standard curriculums in Composition classes, most notably those courses that copy aspects of Harvard's English A. This, then, is the standardization that helps the universities shift from a gated elite system to one of mass education, and writing classes are at the forefront of this push. America beats the UK to standardized mass education by the best part of half a century, and when the UK begins to make moves in this direction, they are driven by paying attention to the US; see *Robbins Report*, below, for more. The second form of rapid standardization, then, is that which the US adopts from the UK: education in a standard form of English. While, therefore, these two ideas cannot be directly conflated, they certainly feed off each other: standardized education allowed for the teaching of far greater numbers of students, in the process allowing for the wider indoctrination of a standardized English.

Just as the University of London was, in part, founded to offer a place of education for the rapidly growing English middle-class who were not welcome at Oxbridge, post-Civil War American universities had to rapidly adapt to the same situation: they could no longer be "an educational space for aristocratic elites" but instead needed to provide "upward social mobility for a rising middle class, and the ability to write, and write effectively, was one of the skills that was needed to succeed" (Legg 83). Here, then, the

Harvard Reports were commissioned to "track and assess writing curriculum development," to ensure that these could handle the needs of the new student body. While the Reports were, arguably, issued with good intentions, the three men behind them—Charles Francis Adams, E. L. Godkin, and Josiah Quincy—had "no training or experience in the teaching of writing" (Berlin 61). This lack of training, in turn, ensured that they were struck by purely surface level concerns, and as the "most noticeable and trackable aspects of writing were grammar, mechanics, and…penmanship," these quickly became the focus of writing education reform (Legg 83).

So influential were these Reports for giving "support to the view" that "learning to write is learning matters of superficial correctness," that Berlin places them as the urtext of common misconceptions that have "haunted writing classes ever since" (Berlin 61). At Harvard, the response was to create the above-mentioned English A, the first required writing class in America, and potentially the world.[29] English A would rapidly be adopted as the basis for all Composition classes across the US, thus creating the standard syllabus. I would also argue, however, that the mechanics-based nature of English A also heralds the *other* form of standardization being brought across America: it, ultimately, teaches a very specific version of the English language, and students had little choice but to adapt or fail. Considering how vital English A was to shaping the next seventy or so years of Composition, I have to wonder how the field could have developed differently had Harvard hired a committee that was composed of experts of writing. In other words, would a definitive focus on higher level concerns at the turn of the 20th century have allowed the

[29] As of writing, the Writing Program at Harvard still mentions English A (in passing) on their site, explaining that since its founding in 1872 the "expository writing requirement has been the one academic experience required of every Harvard student" (Harvard.edu, "Writing").

field to gain a stronger foothold in the university as a whole, or was it always ultimately doomed to be seen as a site of remediation?

While English A was the first class of its kind, it was not the only call for bringing writing education to the masses. John Franklin Genung of Amherst College, for example, argued that "English composition should be required of all; that is, that no possibility should be opened for any student to gain his degree without some training in the practical use of his mother-tongue" (qtd. Brereton 101). Skinnell's *Conceding Composition* explains that "composition requirements were introduced in many places to provide evidence of coordination and standardization" (75). Indeed, when the first accreditation association was formed in 1885, "it encouraged…[all] schools to offer composition…modeled on Harvard's English A" (93). This marriage of first year composition to standardization created the working conditions of nightmares, as writing instructors were forced to instruct more students than any other subject, leading to stories like that of Barrett Wendell who, "at Harvard in 1892…read daily and fortnightly themes from 170 students [equating to]…over 24,000 papers each year" (Connors 191). This trend was found elsewhere: "Faculty at the University of Michigan in 1894...balked at a situation in which four teachers, and two graduate assistants were responsible for 1,198 students" (Berlin 60).

One way to avoid these classes taking up the valuable time of instructors who *clearly* had more important things to do was to ask their wives to teach them. Sarcasm aside, it was within the Composition class that female instructors first entered the American institution, an important moment that is in clear need of further exploration elsewhere.[30] As stated in the introductory chapter, published scholarship from these female pioneers is

[30] Indeed, a version of this history that explicitly tracks the role women played in the evolution of Composition in both the US and UK would be a valuable future project.

essentially non-existent—education was ultimately still male dominated—but their vital role in the early days of our field cannot be understated. No matter who taught the class, however, the sheer number of students being taught created a need to simplify just what constituted a passing paper, leading to the "handbookization" of composition, with learning becoming "ever more formalized and mechanical, ever more removed from the actual process of communication" (Connors 148); in short, the CTR that epitomizes 20th century American education was a direct effect of Composition's standardization. Yet despite this arguably negative note, there are positives to be found in this era: Berlin argues that it was a move towards "an education that prepared students for work in this life, not the rewards in the next" (59); in other words, the standardization of English classes was ultimately a move towards democratizing the classroom, creating a space where all students could access what had previously been held back for the elite few.

While the UK never saw a Harvard English A situation—wherein a singular class was used as inspiration for mass standardization—it also rapidly standardized writing instruction to meet the demands of the ever-increasing middle class. As explained above, in the late 1800s, there was a burst of university growth, in areas like Manchester, Birmingham, and Bristol, that had previously been isolated from higher education (Robbins 23). These institutions were strategically placed to allow educational access for the rising middle class; students were provided with a practical education, so instruction in "English composition became more common in response to evolving social, political, religious, and economic developments" (Murphy 173). As with the Scottish universities, the students at the new institutions did not speak standard English: they were from the north, and thus spoke with a vernacular deemed inappropriate for higher education. Herein, then, lies the

other form of standardization that dominates the turn of the century: "eradicating provincialisms became part of the education mission of [both] individuals and institutions" (180). To achieve this idealized form of the language, "teachers, elocutionists, grammarians, and lexicographers...set out to understand and standardize English, firm in the belief that change indicated deterioration" (176). This secondary form of standardization bleeds into every stage of British education; indeed, it is still a significant problem today.[31]

As the origins of standardized English predate America—it was, after-all, a key way in which Oxbridge scholars ensured their elitism over the Scottish—it was ingrained in the American system from the beginning. Think, say, of the still present discrimination against African American English (AAE) in academia: the origins begin back in Oxbridge. A payoff to this, however, is that attempts to break this standardization have also been present since the beginning. The Cherokee Nation Male Seminary, for example, "recognized that the English language is a living language and that a correct use of it can be learned only by practice in speaking and composition," and that "special attention will be given to the study of *content* of words and to the choice of words" (Legg 84; emphasis original). History shows us that the standardized academic English forced by the Harvard model would, ultimately, win, but it is still notable that attempts to break this were operating in the mid-1800s.

By the turn of the 20th century, then, both the UK and the US were standardizing Composition instruction to accommodate an increasingly large middle-class student body. This standardization, however, reveals a key ideological difference: in America, classes

[31] See Alex Baratta in Chapter 5 for more.

and tests were standardized in an attempt to prevent certain students from entering the system by ensuring their English was not acceptable; in Britain, there was desire to welcome all students, on the condition that they conform to a specific form of the language. Here, then, marks a crucial difference in the British and American stories, which is arguably the space where the two paths most abruptly diverge: whereas UK writing instruction evolved as part of general education reforms (i.e. all education was overhauled), in the US, Composition became the focus point for an increasingly standardized system.

Newbolt: The First Government Report

Prior to the 1910s, Oxbridge and the University of London were the only British universities to receive any political representation. As such, any government policy relating to higher education was aimed purely at the three institutions, essentially guaranteeing the elite status quo would not be challenged. This changed with the 1918 *Representation of the People Act*, which formed the Combined English Universities (CEU), a parliamentary constituency (Meisel 130). Combining the University of Durham with the Red Brick Universities, this group existed to ensure that higher education across all of the UK would receive a fair place in governmental discussion. The CEU would continue to operate as a constituency—and thus continue to influence policy—until the 1948 iteration of the *Representation of the People Act* removed it. That the very first government sponsored report into higher education—the 1921 *Newbolt Report*[32]—was published a mere three years later is, I would argue, indicative of what actually offering fair representation can achieve.

[32] In full: *The Teaching of English in England, Being the Report of the Departmental Committee Appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Inquire into the Position of English in the Educational System of England*.

While a large section of *Newbolt* is dedicated to pre-university education, it nonetheless offers a glimpse at early 20th century Composition in the UK. The general conceit of *Newbolt* was to work out just where education in English—in its various forms—should fit in the wider British school system. Here, then, *Newbolt* finds that "English is nearer than ever to becoming a universally known language" (200), a fact the committee credit to "the conditions created by" WWI. Here, then, English "will be the main source of culture of the millions of English-speaking men and women in the British Empire and the United States" and thus demands to be "recognized as a study that has a first claim on the support of every English University, old or new" (247). Indeed, "English is not merely an indispensable handmaid without whose assistance neither philosopher, nor chemist, nor classical scholar can do his work properly" but is "one of the greatest subjects to which a University can call its students" (200). Casual sexism aside, this claim is a sharp turn away from the previous century where English education was something of an afterthought that largely existed to ensure regional dialects could be stamped out in favor of a standardized norm. Even though the *Newbolt* authors never openly mention it, there is also a creeping sense of Empire-adjacent anxiety laden throughout, with repeated mentions to how important it is for everyone to know the language, or experience "the greatness of our literature" (201). In other words, if the university system can push the significance of the language, then maybe its global relevance won't wane.

What is, perhaps, most revelatory of *Newbolt* is how modern its claims feel. For example, the report suggests that, as early as 1921, British education was already making moves towards what will eventually become known as writing across the curriculum (itself

a British, not American, term[33]): "up to a certain point…every teacher is a teacher of Composition, in that he is helping to produce the habits of mind and the command of language which are required" for academic success (*Newbolt* 77). Indeed, "Composition cannot be regarded merely as a subject. It is the measure of all that has been truly learnt, and of the habits of mind which have been formed" (72). Furthermore, the central claim of *why* Composition matters is directly in line with what would become known—arguably incorrectly—as the British position at Dartmouth four decades later: "in teaching Composition" instructors "are concerned directly and immediately with the growth of the mind" (71-2). All of this to say, *Newbolt* offers evidence that writing pedagogy was evolving considerably earlier than some may think.

Newbolt also offers the first instance of British education authorities taking note of "the conditions in American Universities" (248). Here, then, the authors claim that "the academic English Staff will thus in a special sense be 'the teachers of the teachers' of the great English-speaking democracies" (247), and look across the Atlantic for inspiration, where "English departments are much larger than in" the UK (248). The authors are surprised by—and clearly find distaste in—the fact that "the tendency seems to be to multiply the assistant and junior posts and not the Professorships in the full sense" (248), as this undermines the stature of Composition within the larger university. To drive this home, they offer multiple US examples: at the University of Wisconsin, say, "the 53 teachers" of English include "two Professors, 6 associate Professors, 6 assistant Professors, 27 Instructors and 12 Assistants" (248). One can only imagine how the authors of *Newbolt* would react to 2022 English departments in the US. While the report, therefore, points

[33] See Chapter 4 for more.

towards the US with a sense of concern for the dilution of teaching credentials, it is a notable first step in our continuing story.

Newbolt also pauses to look at "an American experiment" being conducted in MIT, wherein Composition instruction is directly linked to students "professional pride and their objects in life" (161). These classes, aimed directly at Engineering students, aim to help students appreciate the multitude of ways that writing directly impacts their careers via classes like "Writing and Thinking" and "Engineering and Education" (161). Again, then, there is a sense of early WAC pedagogy at play here. Notably, the MIT instructor *Newbolt* pulls from—Frank Aydelotte—was himself a product of Transatlanticism: before making his move across the ocean he was "formerly a Rhodes scholar at the University of Oxford" (161). Aydelotte's success, then, is a further reminder of the importance of international education.

The Effect of War: Similar Outcomes, Different Times

Newbolt is just the first of many times in which national education policy shifts due to war. While, then, the US and UK respond to WWII in markedly different ways, it still serves as a vital exigence in the story of their parallel development. In short, as a direct result of war, both nations are faced with offering education to a far larger student body than the university system was intended for and thus must adjust accordingly. As education in writing is considered an increasingly important keystone of university education, both the US and UK are forced to begin overhauling Composition in ways that will define much of the 20th century and put them on the path to meeting at Dartmouth. The major difference, however, lies in the makeup of this new student body: for the US it is returning servicemen in the 1940s and for the UK it is wartime babies who have come of age in the 1960s.

Despite this difference, however, the fact remains that WWII changes everything for both countries.

With the signing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (more commonly known as the G.I. Bill) of 1944, the US university system saw its largest influx of students yet; indeed, it is the singular largest influx of entirely new students of any period, as 2,232,000 returning veterans suddenly had access to higher education (Olson 595).[34] To frame the statistics a little differently, "the class of 1949 was 70[%]...veterans" (595).[35] In short, the sheer number of students who suddenly had access to what was previously only for the middle-classes and up, meant that universities themselves suddenly doubled down on creating restrictive entry requirements, which often boiled down to "ok, but how well can you write" tests. In short, this sudden eruption of working-class students set Composition's diminished, yet omnipresent, role in the university in stone. This, more than any other time in US history, was the era of the theme essay and the handbook, offering the simplest way to assess the abilities of the impossibly large influx of students.

The UK never had an equivalent of the G.I. Bill. As such, returning soldiers who desired to access higher education could simply compete for "national 'state scholarships,'" of which there were only 200 initially available (Anderson). Even as government funding increased—most notably through initiatives of the University Grants

[34] This is *not* intended to glorify the Bill: among its greater failings (one that may, of course, have been a intentional design flaw) was its treatment, or lack thereof, of non-white students: "for black veterans likely to be limited to the South in their educational choices, the G.I. Bill had little effect on collegiate outcomes" (Turner and Bound 2). In short, the G.I. Bill *did* open up university to more students, but these were still explicitly mainly *white* students. Indeed, Turner and Bound argue that the Bill did more to set-back racial equality in higher education than other more directly racist legislation of the era. We are, of course, still seeing these effects today.

[35] The VA contests this number, instead placing 1947 as the peak year of G.I. Bill related university enrollment, when veterans made up 49% of college attendees (VA.gov, "History"). Either number is still staggeringly high, however.

Committee—the lack of national aid programs in the style of the GI Bill ensured the university system remained elite. In an attempt to "take practical steps to improve teaching" (Hardcastle qtd. Vee), a group of London-based English teachers gathered in 1947, forming the London Association for the Teaching of English (LATE). Among the founding members of LATE was James Britton, who would go on to be the defining British voice at Dartmouth two decades later; see Chapter 4 for more. LATE, in turn, would prove to be an influential voice in government policy, constantly pushing for both wider access to higher education and a greater focus on teaching writing to all age groups. A partial result of this influence can be found in the 1960 *Anderson Report*,[36] which called for the immediate abolishing of student fees in favor of national government support; between 1962 and 1998 "higher education in Britain was effectively free, as the state paid students' tuition fees" (Anderson). To make the most of this newly open system, the aforementioned Plate Glass Universities were founded: unlike any prior place of higher education in the UK, from conception these institutions were entirely dependent on government funding, and were intended to transform the British system into one of mass education.

LATE was founded to help support post-war students and instructors. Similarly, both *Anderson* and the Plate Glass initiative were responding to an explosion of war-generated students: "the very large numbers of boys and girls who were born just after the war" and who had now, in the 1960s, reached "the age of entry to higher education" (Robbins 257). So great were the numbers of baby boomers as to "make it certain that those qualified and wanting to enter higher education [would] far outnumber the places that…[would] be available for them" (257). In other words, the UK may have been multiple

[36] In full: *The Anderson Report: Grants to Students; Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland in June 1958.*

decades behind America, but ultimately it was still WWII that necessitated the shift from elite higher education to a system that was openly available for the masses.

The move towards free higher education correlates directly with another vital step in our Trans-Atlantic story. In 1963, in response to renewed calls for stronger English education, LATE expanded to the national level, and the non-profit education group the National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE) was founded. To this day, NATE remains the premier organization for Composition scholarship in the UK, publishing three different journals.[37] A mere six years after it was founded, NATE would join forces with the American NCTE and MLA to create the Dartmouth Conference, arguably the most well-known attempt at Trans-Atlanticism. All of this to say, Dartmouth was a direct result of the university reforms that dominated the British 1960s, as it was these reforms that created the conditions for NATE's inception.

Robbins and Project English: The Road to Dartmouth

Of the various post-*Anderson* government reports into the state of higher education, none was more influential than the 1963 *Robbins Report*.[38] At the heart of *Robbins* is an attempt to begin long-term development based on national needs, and at the heart of this is a need to more fully unify the British universities. Here, then, the report seeks to answer a "fundamental question": "whether a [codified] system of higher education…is desirable" for the UK (Robbins 5). In short, until *Robbins* was commissioned, "higher education [was] not…planned as a whole or developed within a framework consciously devised to promote harmonious evolution" and due to this, "there is no way of dealing conveniently with all

[37] See Chapter 5 for more.
[38] In full: *Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister Under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63.*

the problems common to higher education as a whole" (5). *Robbins* finds that "however well the country may have been served by the largely unco-ordinated activities and initiatives of the past…from now on these are not good enough" (5). Part of this newly conceived unified system, then, was to ensure that all students were gaining an equal level of education, which in part meant an increased focus on preparing pre-collegiate students for university level writing, as "too many entrants cannot express themselves clearly in English" (76).

The *Robbins Report* is also noteworthy for its efforts to develop British higher education based off of US models, to which an entire sub-section is dedicated. Here, the committee finds a system that stands "in sharp contrast" to their own (36), as "the provision of higher education greatly exceeds our own, after allowing for differences in population" (268). Indeed, *Robbins* appears to be impressed that "American courses…cover a much wider ground" than their British equivalents (41), noting that this means students can gain a more well-rounded education. Despite this admiration, as in only a "few American states has there been any sustained attempt to devise…a plan for the co-ordinated development…of higher education" (37), *Robbins* ultimately finds that the US offered little in the way of guidance. Where *Robbins* seems to find most inspiration, however, is in the US junior college system: while the committee reports that a direct adaptation cannot exist in the UK, it is a clear influence on their concluding suggestions (148). In short, they see the junior colleges as a space to teach those remedial subjects—writing included—that are too basic for the universities to concern themselves with, and as such argue that UK secondary schools need to offer a similar space to more fully prepare students for the rigors of university life. The question of how to remediate students—in writing education

specifically—while maintaining the British university model will recur throughout later government reports, culminating in the 1992 *Education Act*.[39]

While the UK was making its first tentative steps towards less elitist education, the US was grappling with issues of its own. For some time, the standardized American Composition machine had seemed to work; developing student identity and creativity may not have been a pedagogical focus, but at least students could seemingly meet basic writing needs. And then Sputnik happened. It is not hyperbolic to say that the launch of Sputnik in 1957 had a more direct impact on American education than any other preceding event in the 20th century, including the G.I. Bill. Prior to Sputnik's successful flight, it was believed that as long as a "child [was] the intellectual equal, or better still, the superior, of his or her Russian peer" then American dominance was safe (Parker 314). As such, the sudden (and literal) rise of Soviet science brought the limitations of American education into a harsh light; these failures were epitomized by a nation of college students whose writing skills were well below international standards. To counter this, the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) opened up funding for improved higher education, with a focus placed on science, technology, and language skills (both English and other). The added funding for non-veteran students, along with improved education led to another explosion in students: "in 1960 there were 3.6 million students in college, and by 1970 there were 7.5 million" (Senate.gov, "Sputnik").

In turn, in May 1961, the first US Senate debates on the inclusion of English in the NDEA were held (Reynolds 51). The core group in pushing for these debates was the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), so it truly cannot be understated how

[39] See Chapter 5 for more.

vital a role professional organizations have played in our story (see, again, LATE and NATE directly influencing British policy the same decade). While NCTE were not successful in 1961, they would try again, and in 1964 "Congress extended the NDEA to cover English" (Hook 197). Furthermore, in the wake of these debates the Congressionally funded Project English was created, chaired by Albert Kitzhaber. Kitzhaber, then, would be a key figure in the planning of Dartmouth, with the Conference acting as an international testing ground for Project English.

In 1966, a follow-up Act to the NDEA was planned, one which would have focused explicitly on bringing American education in line with international output. This International Education Act (IEA) failed to gain congressional support due to the financial drain of the Vietnam War. The guiding principles echo contemporary education goals however, promoting "strong American educational resources [as] a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries" (Read 407). The IEA would not, however, be the only attempt at internationalizing American—or British—education that year. In August, more than 50 scholars from both nations met on Dartmouth campus, the subject of the following chapter.

In short, however, the academics who met at Dartmouth in 1966 were bringing with them the weight of their nation's respective version of the 1960s: the Americans, led by Kitzhaber, needed to prove that Project English, their attempt for an internationally acceptable writing program could, indeed, be viable on the international level; the British, on the other hand, were divided between members of LATE, like Britton, who wanted to make the most of the newly expansive university system, and those who wished to maintain the elite status quo. That the 1960s reforms were themselves a direct response to the prior

centuries of exigencies, makes Dartmouth the seemingly inevitable end-point to this initial phase of our story.

The Modern Significance

The typical US Composition history class begins with a day or two dedicated to "Pre-Dartmouth" composition, mainly focusing on the "dark days" of CTR. Yet, as others before me (Susan Crowley, for one) have pointed out, by focusing our historic education on a canon that says "everything before [insert event here] isn't really part of this conversation," we create and support a binary that says that earlier teaching or events were less significant ("bad" even) than those that followed. Not only is this a deeply essentialist approach, it also entirely removes the vital work these earlier Compositionists were doing (the Cherokee Nation Seminary, for example). To use a different historical example, this is akin to beginning a History of America class with a brief overview of the Native Americans, before focusing entirely on European settlers: even if the intention isn't to imply that the more modern history is 'better,' by focusing the classes entire energies there, it's hard for students to not take this away. As such, to demonstrate how much was clearly going on pre-Dartmouth, we can move away from such a shuttered version of our story; in the American case, this would then allow women into the historical picture a *lot* sooner and demonstrate what a vital role they performed in Composition's early days. In other words, it would shift American Composition away from "old white men until the 1970s" to a considerably more diverse field from the outset.

The, perhaps, bigger element of breaking this myth, however, is that it would shift the importance of Dartmouth in the American story: Dartmouth stops being a space where the story begins, and instead is the space where one phase of the story *ends*. This, in turn,

allows historical Compositionists to focus on a wider array of past figures than those who turned up to a few weeks of discussion in 1966. Furthermore, it allows the actual focus of Dartmouth in Composition to shift: no longer is this a one-off event wherein international scholars helped shape the American story, but now it is a relatively common event of Trans-Atlantic idea-sharing. This also allows the field to escape lingering hang-ups on "what went wrong at Dartmouth." In other words, Dartmouth could simply be relegated to the status of any other relatively active conference. It could even be argued that demonstrating just how long Composition has been taught helps develop the field's place within the university: no longer is Composition a relatively new subject trying to prove its worth; instead, it is continuing a tradition started in Medieval England. Will this knowledge actually change Composition's place within the institution? Almost certainly not, but there is a psychological boon to knowing that the ideas we teach have been evolving as long as Western education, and thus the fear that we will be made obsolete has never come of fruition yet.

Similarly, by being able to actively demonstrate that Composition has, in different forms, always been a crucial part of British higher education, the first hurdle in making this a more sustained field is crossed. In short, studying writing has been a part of UK institutions since the Dissenting Academies first broke away from Oxbridge, and it has simply gone from strength to strength, albeit not in the same codified manner it has in America. To be able to demonstrate, then, that Composition *is* a valuable part of British academic history is an important first step in demonstrating *why* a greater focus on the field is needed. This is *not* a case of forcing internationalization on the academy but on using materials from British education's own roots to build a future. In other words, if anything,

Composition is an effective way to demonstrate how effective international education partnerships are to the British: American composition could, after all, never have grown without the initial British voices and ideals.

The Myth of Dartmouth

From its very conception, American Composition *is* British Composition; this is, in short, a Trans-Atlantic story from the beginning. This is not to say, once more, that there is a 1:1 comparison between our two nations: that stopped being the case as soon as the first US-specific textbooks began to be published and American Composition gained an identity of its own. Even so, there is no moment in our story that is not, to some degree, influenced by these early years. What, though, of the most visible modern event in Trans-Atlantic Composition? In my next chapter, I explore Dartmouth in great detail: its origins, what occurred during that month in 1966, and what its immediate fallout meant for further Trans-Atlantic Composition.

Chapter Three: The Myth of Dartmouth

When I first entered a Composition history classroom as a graduate student, I found a space that was almost entirely American in nature: my initial sense was that composition was an American subject that therefore only uses the work of Americans. It was somewhat ironic, therefore, that it was an American who broke this illusion. Here, then, I refer to discovering James Moffett's work surrounding the Dartmouth Conference and his continued Trans-Atlantic relationship with James Britton. In his belief in 'growth' and student-centered learning, Moffett seemed *so* British that it was only after reading a passing mention to his nationality in Joseph Harris's *A Teaching Subject* that I realized he wasn't. Intentionally or not, Moffett was positioned for me as something of a bridge between our two nations, and the earliest seeds of this project were planted. Dartmouth itself has long since been a point of considerate interest to me, as in so many texts it is positioned as *the* Trans-Atlantic moment. In many ways, then, the Conference acts as the fulcrum of this project: without what came before, it's difficult to argue for *why* Dartmouth is, indeed, important, and without the case study of Dartmouth, it's arguably impossible to argue for *why* current Trans-Atlanticism is viable.

In this chapter, then, I slow my sweeping multi-century history to look at Dartmouth—and its immediate fallout—in detail. First, I walk through the Trans-Atlantic organization of the conference using archival material to trace how a simple conversation between Alfred Kitzhaber (US) and Boris Ford (UK) in 1964 led to a watershed moment. Next, I walk through the various participants and the reading they were discussing,

attempting to discern *what* they were trying to achieve, so we can ask whether they did, indeed, achieve it. I then move into a survey of the immediate writings that exited the conference—the books by Herbert Muller and John Dixon, along with more personal articles—to determine whether it truly was a Trans-Atlantic moment, or if both sides just tolerated each other's existence for the four weeks and then went their separate ways. Following this, I then look at the immediate fallout of the Conference: the International Planning Committee and the Vancouver and York Conferences intended to replicate the successes of Dartmouth. A driving question throughout this chapter, then, will simply be why has Dartmouth attained the position in Composition history that it has, and is it worthy of staying there?

When I refer to the "Myth of Dartmouth" in this chapter, I'm referring to the misconception that because Dartmouth didn't directly lead to a major overhaul of Composition, it was, therefore, a failure from a Trans-Atlantic point of view. In this chapter, then, I interrogate Dartmouth's specific place in our story via a mix of archival materials surrounding the planning of the Conference and the reports that immediately exited it. Here, then, we find a deep contradiction on how the Conference was contemporarily received: the archival materials paint a month-long discussion that led to Trans-Atlantic cooperation and offered promising plans for future evolution; the reports, on the other hand, imply an almost complete lack of communication between the British and American delegates and a Conference that was an utter failure. This is starkly seen in the vast difference between James Squire's press release that followed the Conference—that speaks warmly of the 11 points of agreement everyone came to (Squire, "Press Release" 2-3)—and Wayne O'Neil's deeply negative report that literally says Dartmouth

was a waste of taxpayer money and should be ignored (O'Neil 205). I argue that our contemporary position allows us to see the reality of Dartmouth as somewhere in-between these two binary views. As Sheridan Blau explains: "If the teaching of English in American schools underwent a transformation after the Dartmouth Seminar, the transforming event was not the...Seminar nor the subsequent publications about [it]...but the intellectual work that….began before the Seminar and eventuated immediately after Dartmouth" (Blau 87). In other words, Dartmouth simply occurred at the right time to seem like it was the nexus event. I, however, want to take things further: even if, to take Blau's read, this scholarship would have existed with or without Dartmouth, it would not necessarily have made the leap across the ocean. In other words, while the actual conversations at the conference may *not* have directly changed the path of Composition (I don't, for example, believe that anyone left Dartmouth with a satisfactory answer to the leading question of "what is English?"), there *were* vital Trans-Atlantic relationships forged at the conference that had no realistic way of forming elsewhere, and thus Dartmouth's vital place in our story is set.

The Origins of the Paradigmatic Trans-Atlantic Moment

Dartmouth—the "Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English," officially—was initially the brainchild of James Squire (representing NCTE) and Albert Kitzhaber (representing CCC) in America, and Boris Ford and Douglas Barnes (representing NATE,) in the UK. The Carnegie Corporation offered $150,000 in sponsorship, and NCTE President Albert Marckwardt was charged with directing proceedings (Vee, "Introduction"). The US was chosen to host the proceedings for a disappointingly bland reason: it was cheaper than the UK (Vee, "Introduction"). In short, as Squire explains in the Seminar's proposal: "a little more than half of the participants will come from the

United States and Canada; locating the seminar in the United States will mean a saving in transportation costs" (Squire, "Proposal" 7). Similarly, Dartmouth itself was chosen for its material resources, which included its library (Vee, "Introduction").[40] James Miller, somewhat sarcastically, further explains that Dartmouth was considered ideal because its rural location meant "conference members could not be lured from the discussions by tempting city night-life" (Miller 1). Indeed, "Dartmouth *was* protected, isolated, pastoral...in short, dull" (1; emphasis original).[41] The bulk of the conference was "held in Sanborn Hall, a centrally located building...and still the home of the English department" (Vee, "Introduction"). From the very beginning the official name was considered needlessly awkward, and, thus, the simpler choices of the Dartmouth Seminar or Dartmouth Conference became second hand; as such, throughout both this chapter and project, I use the terms Dartmouth, Seminar, and Conference interchangeably to refer to the event.

Annette Vee explains that Dartmouth "was not alone as a big, field-defining conference in the 1960s" pointing towards CCCC 1963, and "the 1966 structural linguistic conference at Johns Hopkins...where Derrida met Paul de Man, and where Barthes [and] Lacan were also present" (Vee, "Introduction"). Don Zacanella et al. argue that what sets Dartmouth apart from these conferences, however, "was the intensely English focused nature of the work done there. Dartmouth wasn't about changing society or changing

[40] Other suggested host locations included Middlebury College, Cornell University, UC Berkeley, and Stanford (Squire, "Proposal" 8). That Kitzhaber was former-Dartmouth faculty may have helped influence the final decision, although the proposal makes no mention of this.

[41] To combat the alleged dullness, there are a *lot* of references to drinking throughout accounts of Dartmouth. The *Agenda* explains that "the New Hampshire State Liquor Store will be able to take care of all...needs" (MLA, NCTE, NATE, *Anglo-American* 17), Miller explains that conversation "flowed abundantly with the...scotch" (Miller 1), while Paul Olson simply remembers that "there was an awful lot of drinking" (Vee and Olson, "Interview" 10:14).

education, it was about changing English" (Zacanella, Franzak and Sheahan 16). Indeed, in this sense, Dartmouth can be seen as something of a sequel to the 1958 Basic Issues Conference, which attempted to ask similar questions about English education, and which Kitzhaber directly references as an influence when selling Dartmouth to Peter Caws of the Carnegie Corporation (Kitzhaber, "Letter" 1).[42] Why, then, the major focus on Dartmouth if it was simply joining a lineage of conferences? Simply put it was the first *international* field-defining conference. Additionally, American education, as covered in the previous chapter, had its roots in England, and "here were educators from England presenting not the stuffy, Oxbridge version of the subject American teachers might well have expected them to promote, but something open, student-centered, even liberating" (Zacanella, Franzak and Sheahan 16). In other words, Dartmouth was the first time many—most, even—of those present had a chance to interact with both their Atlantic peers and their own educational history.

The first recorded mention of what would become Dartmouth occurs in a December 2nd, 1964 phone call between Kitzhaber and Caws, wherein the former is clearly trying to elicit interest from the latter. In the transcription of this call, Kitzhaber recollects "some recent conversations with Boris Ford of the University of Sussex," then head of NATE (Kitzhaber and Caws, "Record" 2). These conversations meant that "the more [Kitzhaber] thinks about it the more necessary he thinks it is for American representatives of the professional teaching of English to meet with their Canadian and British counterparts" (2). At the conceptual stage, Kitzhaber has a more inclusive idea in mind than the actual

[42] This would not even be the first field-defining conference to take place at Dartmouth itself: that honor goes to John McCarthy's 1956 "Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence," where the field of A.I. was formalized.

Conference, as he considers including "representatives from Africa and other parts of the Commonwealth" (2). Looking past the fact that these other nations would have only been included because of their colonial ties to the UK, a version of Dartmouth that included more diverse voices is a fascinating ideal to consider. As Kitzhaber explains, "the field is too important and the time too crucial to permit the profession the luxury of ignoring what is going on in other parts of the world" (2). How this greater representation would have changed Dartmouth is impossible to know, but the African and Asian nations could potentially have used this space to speak out against the ongoing tendency for English to override native-language education and the systemic class barriers this continues to create. On the other hand, a version of Dartmouth that encompassed the entire Commonwealth could have simply been used an excuse to further enforce the English First policies that were creating cultural genocides across the post-colonial world. Either way, the Conference would most likely now be remembered for deeply different reasons.

The following year, on May 19, Kitzhaber offered a more formal suggestion of the conference to Caws. Here, then, Kitzhaber explains that to both him and the British Ford, "a major contribution to the entire profession of English teaching, in both England and America...might be possible if someone could organize an extended conference of firstrate people in England and the United States" (Kitzhaber, "Letter" 1). Again, the version of the conference Kitzhaber dreams of is more expansive than the reality of Dartmouth, as he hopes it will run for "preferably six" weeks (1); however, the idea of a "detailed formal report" exiting the Conference would eventually be realized, albeit to mixed success. Kitzhaber proposes "that 25 or 30 people should be involved" with "at least a third of them from Great Britain where some extremely interesting work is being done in a number of

areas...work that is little known if at all to American teachers of English" (2). At this stage the idealized locale for the Seminar will be "in a part of the country where there is pleasant summer weather," such as UW Seattle or UC Berkeley (2).[43]

Four weeks later, on June 14, the newly elected head of NATE, Frank Whitehead, reached out to Caws to show "whole-hearted" British support for the "projected international conference" (Whitehead, "Letter" 1). Indeed, the NATE position is that "from such a conference there would result immense benefits for the teaching of English in both Great Britain and North America" (1). That November, Squire, Kitzhaber, and Caws met to discuss the benefits of bringing academics from both nations together, with Squire explaining that "while American schools could learn a great deal from English ones in the matter of basic literacy and the encouragement of reading at the elementary and secondary levels, the reverse influence would be useful in the thoroughness of the teaching of [English] at the college level" (Caws, "Record"). In short, the UK would provide K-12 guidance, and the US would provide higher education expertise; this can be seen in how many more K-12 instructors the UK sent than the US. Perhaps most notable in the back-and-forth that led to the direct birth of the Conference, then, is how American-centric it ultimately is: yes, it was a conversation with the British Ford that inspired Kitzhaber to begin organizing proceedings, but of all the accessible documents that relate directly to the planning of the Seminar, only one directly involves NATE, and this is more an affirmation of the work Squire and company were doing on their behalf in pursuing the Carnegie Grant. Now, it could be argued that as the Carnegie Corporation—the home of the archived Dartmouth material—is, ultimately, an American group, then they simply had more vested

[43] One has to imagine that Seattle had less gray summers in the early 1960s.

interest to conserve the American materials. Furthermore, there could be a veritable shedload of British Dartmouth planning materials hidden in an archive somewhere, but as of this writing they have no discernible online presence. Hypotheticals aside, then, the initial planning certainly feels deeply America-centric.

The initial November 1965 proposal for the Seminar—written by Squire on behalf of the planning committee—offers a glimpse into the idealistic origins, while also highlighting why the failures to meet the grand goals were frustrating to those present. The proposal's cover letter explains that "by meeting in an international body, the conferees would be released...from considering the often inhibiting problems of national custom and educational system, so that they might focus entirely on teaching" (Squire, "Letter 1965" 2). In the proposal itself, Squire explains that the Seminar "is indeed long overdue" (Squire, "Proposal" 7), as "little serious thought has been given to improvement [of English education] on the scale that is needed" (1). The UK is positioned as the nation in urgent need for the Trans-Atlantic meeting (3), but it is acknowledged that "communication between those in the two countries...has been so intermittent and uncertain that few Americans have even considered British experience in developing their new programs" (3). This will become something of a common occurrence in writings that surround Dartmouth: it is almost always the nation who the author does not belong to that was the problem or the reason some goal was not attained.

The differences between the nations and how these could become a hindrance in productive conversation, is also acknowledged, but Squire goes for the optimistic view that it can be "as potentially valuable for cooperative effort as our similarities" (4). The proposal offers five major issues to be tackled: "What is English" (13); "What is Continuity in

English Teaching" (15); "One Road or Many" (16); "Knowledge and Proficiency in English" (17); and "Standards and Attitudes" (19). That the paper the Seminar initially responded to is literally titled "What is English?", is indicative of where the focus would ultimately lie. Indeed, it's arguable that this is exactly why so many felt the Conference was a failure: the other four core issues were simply not tackled to the same extent. Indeed, there is an irony that it was one of the "minor concerns" that would lead to one of the more influential papers of the Conference: "what are the contributions of drama and experiences in dramatics of English instruction?" (21).[44] This would be a question James Moffett's manuscript *Drama: What is Happening* would directly answer, and the results of his findings would go on to become one of the biggest legacies of the Conference for both sides of the Atlantic; this will be a major focus of my next Chapter. Indeed, it's telling of the split between the intended direction of the Conference and the actualized resulting event that Moffett isn't one of the named proposed 39 presenters *or* their 35 alternative suggestions.

Who Was There and What Did They Read?

Directly comparing the idealized list of contemporaries to who *was* at Dartmouth is useful in and of itself. For a complete list of participants, see Appendix A, but of the 74 proposed presenters, 26 ended up being present at Dartmouth. Of the 41 proposed American participants (22 ideals, 20 alternates), 12 were present (9 ideals, 3 alternates). Of the 29 proposed British participants (16 ideals, 13 alternates), 14 were present (9 ideals, 5 alternates). Canada, however, is the nation that statistically suffers the most: none of the

[44] Other "minor concerns" include "What is the responsibility of teachers of English for promoting intelligent use of the mass media?" and "What use can be made of technological innovations in English instruction?" (Squire, "Proposal" 22). While these questions would pointedly *not* get answered in the Seminar, they are a fascinating glimpse at the shift towards multimodal English education and, arguably, the Digital Humanities.

three proposed presenters were present (1 ideal, 2 alternates).[45] Instead, the sole Canadian presenter at Dartmouth was Merron Chorny. That the hoped for Canadian inclusions included Northrup Frye is indicative of the heights the planning committee aimed for and, ultimately, failed to reach. This is *not* to say that those who were present aren't illustrious academics in their own rights, more that the proposal includes multiple 'names': those scholars who are widely known in fields outside of their own. These 'names', then, include linguist William Labov, critic Raymond Williams, and Walter Ong, none of whom were present as delegates.[46] Furthermore, the proposed list of delegates would have brought a considerably wider ranging area of specialties to Dartmouth than what ended up in reality: instead of the English faculty who were at Dartmouth, the proposed list includes linguistics, psychologists, and more, presenting a more varied cross-section of academia. This, then, raises the question as to how the outcomes of the Seminar would have looked if the idealized list of participants had been present: would the more varied voices have simply led to even less agreement, or would more concrete answers have been found? In total, to make up the numbers present at Dartmouth, 22 participants had to be added post-proposal, leaving us with an almost even split of 26 proposed and 22 added.

Along with the 48 participants, Dartmouth was also host to 21 consultants. Unlike the participants—who were required to spend the entire four-week period at the Conference—the consultants would drop in for short periods. The length of consultancy ranged from two days (Sybil Marshall, Walter Miner, etc.) up to a full week (Muriel Crosby), and consultants were brought in from a wide variety of academic positions. While

[45] The proposed Canadians: Northrup Frye, Wallace Lambert, and John McGechaen.
[46] Ong *would* make an appearance as a consultant from August 30th to September 2nd (MLA, NCTE and NATE, *Anglo-American* 5), while Frye was co-author of two pieces all participants were expected to read (13).

the consultants were largely American in nature—16, in total—there *were* also British and Canadian folks available, 2 and 3 respectively. Indeed, it is arguably notable that there were literally three times the number of Canadian consultants as there were Canadian participants. This said, I want to stress how non-existent Canada is in the various works that exit Dartmouth: in his post-Conference report, for example, Herbert Muller explains "I am including almost nothing about Canadian schools, since they were rarely mentioned in the discussions" (Muller 11). Notably, however, the immediate follow-up conference to Dartmouth would be held in Vancouver, BC, so the Canadians certainly had a vested interest in the conversation. As such, their lack of visibility at Dartmouth is, perhaps, indicative of the extent to which proving American or British supremacy overshadowed the Trans-Atlantic unity that was intended.

When interviewed about his experiences at Dartmouth, John Dixon summed up a major issue with the delegation: "there were no non-white reps" (Vee and Dixon, "Interview"). Furthermore, there were no non-English speakers, leading to a general consensus of monolingualism, which in turn meant there was no serious discussion of the neocolonial nature of forcing an English-based education on students (Vee, "Introduction"). Dixon explains that Jamaican-British Stuart Hall was supposed to be present but declined in order to focus on setting up the Center of Cultural Studies. Even if he had been, however, that would have still only been a single person of color amidst a sea of white men. As Vee attests, Hall was in no way "the only Black scholar of English at the time," with the likes of future NCTE president William A. Jenkins not even gaining an invite. In a similar interview, Paul Olson goes further than Dixon, and explains that "the only Black person...in the community was a woman who was a Black woman who was a

secretary" (Vee and Olson, "Interview" 08:31), and that "she was treated essentially as a servant" (09:07). Olson refers here to Nearlene Bertin, the transcriber of the various sessions (Vee, "Introduction"). To understand how little was seemingly thought of Bertin, we only need to look at the schedule for the Conference, where her name is spelled wrong: Nerlene Bertin (MLA, NCTE and NATE, *Anglo-American* 6). Olson points out how the hypocrisy of both this treatment *and* the lack of talk of non-white cultural topics: "the British people came to the meeting with 15-20 years of decolonization of the British Home nation...lessening their ties with...an empire made up largely of people of color. And we [in America] were in the midst of the Martin Luther King revolution. And yet we had almost no talk about culture" (02:26). Hampering any conversation here, "there were no anthropologists" (02:26) and as such "there was very little talk about...Native American culture or Hispanic culture, or any other cultures that...deserve to be...recognized in the schooling process" (02:26).

Along with the lack of people of color, there were only five women present as participants: Barbara Hardy, Barbara Strang, Connie Rosen, Miriam Wilt, and Bernice Christensen. When asked about this, Dixon singles out Louise Rosenblatt as a missed attendee, explaining "she was a stronger theoretician than many of the men, of course" (Vee and Dixon, "Interview"). None of the women present ever, so far as I can attest, published about their experiences at Dartmouth, but various accounts (Dixon and Olson's interviews, Miller's report, etc.) imply they were an important voice in the room, when the more misogynistic members actually allowed them to speak. The ratio of women to men gets a *little* better when the list of consultants is included, where they comprise ¼ of those invited to lead sessions. Here, then, we find Sybil Marshal representing the UK, Dorothy

Balfour representing Canada, and Muriel Crosby, Eldonna Evertts, and Dorothy Saunders representing the US. Notably there are also no non-white or non-native English speakers in the consultant list.[47]

Clearly, it's problematic to judge Dartmouth on those not present via contemporary standards; as Dixon and Olson both point out, there simply weren't as many people of color or women present in the academy in the 1960s. However, that there were women and people of color who could have been present and simply weren't invited is unquestionably problematic, and clearly limits the scope of what could be achieved. Instead, then, of positioning Dartmouth as the first step towards a progressive future as the organizers implied, the lack of diversity rather paints it as a last gasp of an outdated and elitist system attempting to prevent new voices from entering the conversation.

The papers read prior to the Conference show a more even split, even if their being based almost entirely on Dartmouth participants means that women and voices of color are entirely left out.[48] First, then, are the five Working Party Papers: "What is Continuity in English Teaching" (Whitehead) and "Knowledge and Proficiency in English" (Thompson) from the British, and "English: One Road or Many?" (Douglas), "What is English" (Kitzhaber), and "Standards and Attitudes" (Marckward) from the Americans. This group of papers were intended to drive opening debate, although Kitzhaber's work would ultimately overshadow everything else and become the most iconic question of the Seminar. Then there are the ten Study Group Papers, where an even 5/5 split is found, with the British offering the likes of Britton's "Response to Literature" and the American coalition offering "Through the Vanishing Point" from Parker, among others. In other

[47] See Appendix A for a full list.
[48] See Appendix B for a full list of conference papers.

words, then, even if the conference leaned a little towards America in terms of participants, the theory being read *was* intended to represent both sides of the Atlantic. *This* said, of the 15 suggested Additional Readings, only three come from Britain, suggesting the Trans-Atlantic sharing wasn't as deep as it initially appears.[49] The required readings cover a wide variety of theory of the era, and include work from scholars of all education levels and multiple sub-fields of English. The *Agenda* for the Conference enticingly states that "a few additional publications will be distributed at Dartmouth, if they are available" (MLA, NCTE and NATE, *Anglo-American* 13). There is not, however, a hard list of what these additional publications consisted of, so it is impossible to know what else was read. We know, for example, that the manuscript for Moffett's *Drama: What's Happening?* was certainly passed around as it is referenced by multiple delegates in their post-Conference reports, yet it receives no mention in the *Agenda*. It's enticing to consider just what else was read by participants, then, although the lack of presence of additional works in the reports implies they did not have much of an impact. With planning completed, Dartmouth would begin on August 20th 1966 and run until September 15.

The Trans-Atlantic Split Part I: The Unexpected Language Barrier

As soon as Dartmouth began, various reports demonstrate that "an unplanned national division" formed (Miller 5). Here, then, "the British and Americans were deeply divided by a common language" (2). The British, Miller reports, "spoke as with one voice in one accent—the accent that Americans have come to identify as cultured British" (6). Here, then, Miller refers to "restrained RP" (6) or received pronunciation; indeed, it is more

[49] Of the collected 30 readings, only two come from Canadian authors, and these are a) relegated to the additional readings; and b) are co-authored with an American, and thus placed in the American side of the list. In other words, Canada remains the least represented partner of the Conference.

accurate to refer to RP not as an accent, but as a dialect. The irony of the RP-unity Miller found is that it isn't a 'natural' dialect: it evolved from the forced tongue of the Royal Family to the perceived dialect of Oxbridge, and eventually the BBC.[50] In this sense, it is the British analog to the American Mid-Atlantic accent that defined 1940s celebrity culture and that we now mock when imitating older news reels; the difference is that Mid-Atlantic American has all but vanished, while RP continues to be the language of elitism. All of this to say, the accented unity that the Americans found in their British counterparts was an entirely fabricated unity. Here, then, is an unspoken truth that many of the British delegation brought to Dartmouth: even when they were arguing for a more open education, they were still representing the elite class of their nation, a class they had actively fought to become part of to the extent that they changed their way of speaking just to fit in, directly at odds with their Dartmouth stance that regional English should not be overrun with a standardized language. Miller notes that there was "some trace of Welsh or Scottish accent or of Cockney" (6) in the RP, demonstrating the often working-class roots the scholars had come from and tried to abolish. All of this to say, for Americans at Dartmouth there was a sense of snobbish elitism from their counterparts: "it is *our* language…and *our* literature. What is it, now, you want to know about it? What can we tell you that will help you along?" (6; emphasis original).

On the other side of this language barrier, then, were the Americans, speaking a vast variety of dialects from "the nasal twang of middle American" to "the soft slurring of American southern and many more" (Miller 6). Whereas the British put on a concerted front to sound "elegant," the Americans sounded "frequently harsh and coarse" and "spoke

[50] See Peter Trudgehill's 1972 "Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich" for more.

with a multitude of voices in accents that seemed to leave them peculiarly defenseless and vulnerable" (6). In short, national stereotypes led to a feeling like the conference was "an international confrontation" (6). It is interesting to consider if this sense of clinging to linguistic stereotypes—the British RP and the vast American diversity—would have been present had this first Trans-Atlantic meeting occurred in a later era when international communication had become considerably more commonplace.

It didn't help that "both the British and Americans had radically mistaken notions of each other's basic views of education" (Miller 7). Here, then, miscommunication about reform ideals threatened to derail proceedings from the beginning. What's odd about this confusion, however, is how logically preventable it was. After all, the delegates were selected specifically to present the idealized version of their nations reform agenda, with the US mainly sending PhD-holding college instructors, and the UK a swathe of K-12 educators and researchers (Vee, "Introduction"), and therefore those present *should* have known from the reading list what they were getting ready to expect once vocal discussion began. Indeed, from reading the various reports on the Seminar, I get a sense that both sides went in projecting an idealized version of their national interests, and thus were unprepared for the stark reality to immediately take over: it is a lot easier to present a sunshine and roses version of a situation in a piece of distanced and considered writing than it is when asked to actively defend it. Perhaps the clearest example of this was Kitzhaber's reaction to Project English being torn apart by the British; more on this below.

It didn't help, perhaps, that "the British and the Americans brought with them distinctly outdated images of each other. The British, in the euphoria of their new-found democratic principles of education, expected the Americans to be progressive and

approving. The Americans, in the euphoria of their recently-discovered intellectual traditionalism, expected the British to be classical and sympathetic" (Miller 10). As such, there was surprise that "the British seemed to be the progressives, while Americans talked like classicists" (7). Miller explains that part of the reason the early conversations were unproductive was because "the British and Americans were not debating with each other so much as with their own pasts" (10). Here, then, lies the tension at the heart of Dartmouth: delegates were simultaneously a) promoting national interest; while b) coming to terms with their deeply rooted national issues, and the two were often at odds with each other. There is, perhaps, no easier site to identify this than in Kitzhaber's opening paper "What is English" and Britton's response.

What, Indeed, Is English?

How Kitzhaber and Britton answered the question not only suggested the supposed agreed upon ideological stance of each nation, but also set the stage for the entire Conference. Kitzhaber explains that "the English course should be restricted to 'the study of language, literature, and composition, written and oral'" (Kitzhaber, "What" 14). Here, then, he is aligning the stance of Project English with the wider American delegation at the Conference. This would, perhaps, be a poor decision, as any critiques of his paper were *then* taken as direct critiques of Project English, whether they were intended this way or not. So heated did the discussion become that Kitzhaber reportedly threatened to leave.[51] Here, then, Kitzhaber argues that the reasons for any confusion in English education can at least in-part be placed on "the influence of educational theorists, to which English has been peculiarly susceptible" (7) for making people think "all children should be exposed to it"

[51] See Miller, Olson, and Dixon's reports on the conference for different takes on this story.

(4-5). There is, of course, a great irony in a theorist using his scholarship to complain about theorizing, but such is academic life. To help right the wrongs of English, Kitzhaber argues for placing rhetoric at the "center of at least the English curriculum, where it would make possible a spiral structuring of the course of study" (15). Throughout, his argument is preoccupied in defining English's place within the university, not in asking how the subject can be developed; per Harris, "one can view the American position at Dartmouth…as an attempt to justify the study of English to other university experts" (Harris, "Growth" 635).

Reading Kitzhaber today there is a deeply uncomfortable sense of elitism on display that on more than one occasion shifts into full blown sexism: "Although it is obvious that not every child will become a banker or a physician or a government official—or the *wife* of one of these—and therefore need to speak the prestige dialect, one cannot be absolutely certain that he won't" (Kitzhaber, "What" 2; emphasis added). Later he asks: "does the low-ability student actually do enough writing after his schooling has ended to warrant the heavy emphasis placed on it throughout his school life?" (22). In other words, "low-ability" students and women have, per the Kitzhaber read, no real need for continued English education, and thus efforts should be reoriented to mainly help those more desirable students. In short, then, Kitzhaber's opening statement flew directly in the face of the allegedly student-focused British approach, and may have even frustrated some of his less elitist-leaning fellow Americans.

The UK delegates—no matter their personal leanings—were "likely to be unsympathetic to Kitzhaber's paper"; where Kitzhaber grounded his pedagogy "in traditions of teaching rhetoric…progressive English teaching in the UK was characterised by…a break with rhetoric and philology" (Hardcastle qtd. Vee). Furthermore, whereas

Kitzhaber was looking towards an elitist college-focused English, the UK was "focused on centering students and life in language" (Vee, "Introduction"). It was from this viewpoint, then, that Britton responded.

Britton suggests—"strongly"—that asking the question "What is English?" is unproductive, and, instead, delegates should be asking "what ought English teachers to be doing?" (Britton, "Response 6). By pushing for this move, Britton attempts to shift the Conference from a theory-heavy discussion of a field towards a pedagogical conversation of growth. This could be perceived as a small shift, but in terms of the goals of the conference, it is vast: in short, this shift moves the proverbial ball from Kitzhaber's American Project English focus—the focus that arguably started the entire Conference being organized—towards a more British stance on classroom reform. Britton was successful, and the entire focus of the Conference would change for the next four weeks. To phrase this differently, Kitzhaber was most concerned with defining English "as an *academic discipline*" while Britton "looked instead at English as a *teaching subject*," and it was the Britton stance that carried the day (Harris, "After" 634; emphasis original). As Harris explains, "if the American hero was the scholar, the British hero was the teacher" (634).

As well as generally fighting Kitzhaber's stance, Britton uses his response to posit that English is the subject that connects all other subjects: it is through writing and communication that we connect with the world, and therefore English is of vital importance. Britton would go on to make further WAC adjacent arguments throughout his post-Conference work, a key focus of the next chapter. To get to this point at Dartmouth, however, Britton offers an almost comedically British extended metaphor about making

jam tarts: here, every other subject is rolled out of the proverbial dough, and English is what is left when everything else is gone (Britton, "Response" 12). In other words, English is everything that other subjects aren't: it isn't 'just' poetry and literature as some mistakenly think; it is all communication. English is not simply a discipline as Kitzhaber would have it, but instead, we need to ask "what is the function of the mother tongue in learning?" (6). This is a good place to again remember that there is an uncomfortable neo-colonial nature to Dartmouth: by focusing heavily on English—instead, say, of "Composition" or "Communication"—Britton and Kitzhaber constantly remind their reader that it is *the* mother tongue, and thus the superior language. In other words, there is never a space given for the possibility of these conversations being transplanted to other languages. While this issue has its roots far beyond Dartmouth, the opening papers of the Conference do little to problematize it, again highlighting the frustrating limitations on display.[52] Placement of English as a subject aside, Britton also uses his response to express the importance of process in writing: "whenever a student writes successfully he shapes the experience and he also gets a bit better at doing so next time" (9).

In his conclusion, Britton lays out four guiding principles most will recognize as being central to Composition today: "we learn language by using it" (12), "we learn to live by using language (12), "in English lessons the area of operations is that of personal experience" (13), and "insofar as study of language aids the practice anywhere in the curriculum, not simply in the area of English concerns, that also is the responsibility of the English teacher" (13). Here, then, Britton lays out the seeds of growth, process, and WAC. Not bad for an in-conference response paper. Per Harris, Britton "proved that one can do

[52] See John Timbur's 2008 "The Dartmouth Conference and the Geohistory of the Native Speaker" for more.

serious work in English not only by studying literature or criticism"—as Muller argued—"but also by looking closely at the talk and writing of students" (Harris, "Growth" 21). In short, Britton introduced American compositionists to what are now considered modern cornerstones of US Composition, in the process providing arguably the most crucial in-Conference Trans-Atlantic offering.

The Immediate Fallout of Dartmouth

In a letter sent to Squire during the conference—on September 7—Caws states that "on the whole I thought it looked as if things were going pretty well" (Caws, "Letter" 1). Despite this quiet praise, however, Caws did express a growing concern that "the habits of academic types being what they are, the whole thing may look in retrospect like an exercise in theory rather than in strategy, whereas the latter is what is most needed" (1). Here, then, Caws foreshadows much of the criticism of the Conference: that the stated goal of forging "an assessment of the joint resources of the two countries and their optimum deployment for reform" (1) had been overlooked in favor of theorizing for theory's sake, leading to vague and untenable results.

In his reply to Caws, sent on September 23 shortly after the Conference had ended, Squire approaches Dartmouth with excitement, and paints a version of the Seminar that was a great success: "for most of us, Dartmouth provided an experience unlike anything we have had before" (Squire, "Letter 1966" 1). Squire is careful to not suggest any direct outcomes, explaining that "the ultimate effect will not be apparent for some time to come" as "each participant...will surely sift the wheat from the chaff" and "find some convictions strengthened and others radically shifted" (1). Even at this stage, however, Squire singles out that "British and American scholars alike questioned the conception of presenting to

young people an inert, established 'content'" (2). Squire also foreshadows the presence of the growth movement at Dartmouth, explaining that "the pupil's own intellectual and emotional involvement in the uses of language and his active exploration of human experience in both literature and life seemed to provide the central themes for much of the discussion" (2). Squire also explains that "with only two exceptions, Seminar members adopted a strong stand against the undesirable impact of present examination systems on curriculum and teaching in English" (3). Frustratingly, Squire doesn't single out who these two exceptions were, so it's impossible to know which side of the Atlantic they came from *or* what their stance was.

On September 26, Squire issued a press-release to acclaim the successes of the Conference, wherein he breaks Dartmouth down to 11 key points of agreement. These points include understanding and accepting:

- "the centrality of pupils' exploring, extending, and shaping experiences in the English classroom" (Squire, "Press Release" 2);
- "the importance of directing more attention to speaking and listening experiences for all pupils at all levels" (2);
- "the need to negate the limiting…impact of examination patterns…which are at best superficial and often misleading" (3);
- "the importance of teaching of English at all levels informing themselves about scholarship and research" (3); and
- "the importance of educating the public on what is meant by good English and what is meant by good English teaching" (3).

We only need to look at the last of these points to see the origins of failure: even without reading the wildly conflicting reports on the Conference, we can know that the public has *not* been educated on what "good English teaching" means, considering how little knowledge many seem to have about what Compositionists even do some sixty years later; indeed, that English departments continue to operate in a strange liminal space of being deemed vitally important and yet not important enough to receive adequate funding is itself indicative that the lofty ideals of the Seminar failed.

In his report on the Conference, Marckwardt directly echoes Squire's list (Marckwardt, "Dartmouth" 104-5). Miller also reports on the list of 11 points. He, however, explains that "this closing manifesto is remarkably silent on some of the major issues debated at the seminar; on the issues it does venture to touch, it leaps to a level of generality and ambiguity" (Miller 19). Olson is even more critical of Squire's press release, however, explaining that "I don't think that has much to do with what the conference said" (Vee and Olson, "Interview" 1:09:01). When pushed, Olson says that while "I'm not saying that he's lying...I'm just saying...that was what he took away" (1:09:13). Here, then, Olson sheds light on the selective nature of Squire's report: "we didn't have a discussion where we said, Well, what do we agree on? What are the nine things we agree on" (1:09:32)? In a sign of just how frustrated by the report he was, Olson directly contacted Squire to "refuse to endorse" his press-release, and while Squire's response has been lost to history, Olson remembers that "he wasn't pleased with that" (1:09:32).[53] In short, this is the perfect

[53] When pressed to demonstrate any success at Dartmouth, Olson explains: "we spent a month and we could have gotten a lot more done, we should have gone a lot further. Maybe, maybe what we did was enough to get us off dead center and to start us in new directions. That, that, I think, that may be it" (Vee and Olson, "Interview" 1:06:07).

example of the biggest issue of Dartmouth: no one who was there seemed to directly corroborate the findings of anyone else.

To collect the findings of the Conference, two book-length reports were to be written—and shall be discussed below—with the seeming hope that these would showcase a Trans-Atlantic unity in what was said. However, "there was no agreement that" other participants "would *not* write about the conference. It is possible…that the sponsors wish there had been…because some of the reports…seem more exposé than personal account" (Miller 3; emphasis original). In other words, the various non-sponsored reports demonstrate a highly different Dartmouth to the sponsored ones. Miller, for example, suggests that "in effect there were forty-one conferences; the one which was planned, and in essence, realized by no one; and the others unplanned, spontaneous, created by individual participants out of their singular experiences and unique perspectives" (Miller 2). In spite of this, however, Miller (slightly sarcastically) reports that both delegations "seemed genuinely concerned for inhumanity and waste of talent in the educational systems" (11), and that "neither the British nor the Americans advocated a return to the worst practices of the past" (18). Indeed, Miller's personal take away from Dartmouth is that "the ideal conception of English teaching...must somehow combine the creativity stressed by the British together with the discipline represented by the Americans" (Miller 21). Marckwardt is more positive, and simply argues that "it must be recognized that the very fact that the conference was held is significant in itself" (Marckwardt, "Dartmouth" 102). In his short report, Marckwardt states that "there was evident a preference for power rather than knowledge, for experience rather than information, for engagement rather than criticism" along with "a strong sense of language as the medium of engagement with

reality, as a means of experience as well as expressing" (106). In his preface to the *Response to Literature* monograph, Squire echoes this sense of unity: "The differences which seemed to divide participants were far less significant than the degree of unanimity achieved in attacking many common educational problems" (Squire, *Response* 1).

Of the immediate responses, none are bleaker than Wayne O'Neil's. In a report for the *Harvard Review*, O'Neil does not go lightly: "The Dartmouth Seminar could have aimed high, it could have tried to offer a blueprint for education in the Anglo-American countries. Instead it narrowed itself to talk about nothing. In so proceeding it misconceived what it is that needs doing and along the way wasted a good deal of public (Carnegie) money. Its 'findings' should be ignored" (O'Neil 275). Aside from these un-official reports, however, there are, as mentioned, the two official takes on Dartmouth: John Dixon's *Growth Through English* and Herbert Muller's *Uses of English*.

Dixon and Muller

In his post-conference letter to Caws, Squire clearly shows favoritism towards the British account of the Conference: "we are fortunate...that John Dixon will prepare [a] report" because "his personal sense of excitement, as well as his sensitivity to the ideas of others" meant "his should be a splendid volume" (Squire, "Letter 1966" 1). Muller, on the other hand can simply "be counted on for a report that is readable and sound" (1). This, then, generally foreshadows how the two reports would be received: Dixon's with excitement and passion and Muller's with the resignation of a generally readable piece of writing.

These two texts have highly different audiences: Dixon was writing directly to fellow academics, while Muller was writing towards the general public.[54] It is, perhaps,

[54] I truly don't know who this general public audience was conceived to consist of. In an entertaining, but somewhat bitter, review of the two projects, Jack Sublette wonders if Muller was aiming for "those who

indicative of how wildly different the audiences are that, per Google Scholar, Muller's text has been cited 257 times, while Dixon's has been cited 1098 times.[55] In other words, Muller may have aimed for the wider audience, but it was Dixon who gained greater academic traction, and thus proved to be the bigger influence.

So different are the two texts that Miller jokingly states "it is difficult to believe that Dixon and Muller are reporting on the same conference, and their books might be offered in evidence that individuals create their own reality by imposing a vision from within on the muddlement everywhere without" (Miller 3). Muller argues that English is the "least clearly defined subject in the curriculum" (Muller 4) but should help the learner develop "knowledge and power in the English language" (350). Dixon disagrees, positing English as a fluid subject, which has historically been approached from three perspectives: skills, cultural heritage, and personal growth, with the Seminar "finally focus[ing]…attention on [growth]" (Dixon 1). For this framing, Zancalla et al. state that "Dixon's work [is]….considered to be the document that best captures the spirit and substance of Dartmouth" (Zancalla, Franzak and Sheahan 14). Vee slightly complicates this take and instead says that Dixon's work "is based on Squire's summary and is often taken as a summary of the findings" (Vee, "Introduction"). Considering how contentious Squire's summary proved to be for many, then, to base an entire text on it is guaranteed to offer a skewed version of Dartmouth. Dixon, to his credit, does not try to hide this clear bias: "it has been my aim to draw from the discussions and reports at Dartmouth such ideas as are directly relevant to my own work…and to that of teachers I know" (Dixon xi).

simply want something to do while sitting in an air terminal, while waiting in a laundromat, or while filling the hours between 5 p.m. Friday and 7a.m. Monday" (Sublette 348).

[55] Citation count accurate as of 3/31/22.

Indeed, it is from Dixon that we get perhaps the most succinct take on Conference findings: "language is learnt in operation, not by dummy runs" (13). In other words, while it is problematic that Dixon so closely mirrors Squire's report—and thus "undervalue[s] the dissenting views that tended to become submerged in the excitement of our agreement" (xi)—it is still a useful extended summation of Dartmouth, albeit one that heavily favors the British side of the delegation.

Dixon and Muller are arguably most ideologically opposed on the topic of teacher training: Muller is horrified, believing Dartmouth makes "exorbitant demands in its recommendations for in-service training and…education of English teachers" (Muller 166). The heart of Muller's fears: there were too few teachers to expect them to "keep abreast of new developments" in the field (354). Dixon, unsurprisingly, disagrees, arguing that to not place more demands on teacher training is to deprive potential and "limit the experience of" pupils (Dixon 107). Dixon argues that teacher experience can be helped by three levels of continuing education: in the school, the local community, and external study (109). In short, in the American purview, poor classroom experiences are student caused; for the British, on the other hand, it is the teacher who is at fault.

Another clear difference between the two reports is how they frame student-centered learning. For Dixon, "Dartmouth proposed a new interest in the learner, his development, and the processes of using language to learn" (Dixon 112). While Muller doesn't say otherwise, he clearly dislikes this move: "While appreciating the concern of the British for the tender minds of youngsters, I felt there was some need of asserting the rights of teachers too, or even their duty to 'intervene' now and then when their mature judgment of a child's needs differed from his" (Muller 50). Indeed, it is notable that Muller

specifically calls out the British delegation for this move: whereas Dixon seems to play up Trans-Atlantic unity, Muller brings up the national differences at all opportunities, seeming to relish in the confusion caused by "differences in vocabulary" (11). This move is arguably purposeful: as Muller is aiming his text at a non-scholarly audience, his attempts to position the British as the outsiders who have brought strange ideas to America creates a constant sense of othering. In other words, Muller sets up a scenario wherein any failing of Dartmouth can be put down to outside influencers who had no idea how America worked. Indeed, there is something of a pattern in post-Dartmouth reports: the British delegation largely approach the Conference with a sense of "well we didn't sort everything out, but here is what we *did* achieve" while the American delegation have a considerably more isolationist stance. This is not, of course, universal for either nation, but the trend *is* notable. There are, therefore, two different takeaways here: either the British were overly keen to push their version of pedagogy, as their reports have it carrying the day, *or* the American's were frustrated that they seemingly had less influence on the UK. This is of course deeply reductive and can lead us down the road towards national stereotypes (the UK as empirical pusher of ideology, the US as insular holder of ideas), but the difference in tone between the two major reports is distinctive.

A final word from both reports, one that foreshadows the future of Composition in different ways. Muller explains that "Teachers in other subjects will have to cooperate if students are to learn to read, write, and speak better, and to assume that the ability to do so is not something exercised only in English classrooms to satisfy the eccentrics in charge of them" (Muller 185-6). Slight unwilling tone aside, here Muller clearly discusses WAC, borrowing from Britton's response to Kitzhaber. Dixon, on the other hand foreshadows the

student's right to language movement: "notions of 'correctness' and sensitivity to 'correct' speech forms have a class bias" (Dixon 18). While the problematic irony of someone speaking a manufactured RP lecturing on not being biased against different classes cannot be ignored, this *is* an important step forward, and one that echoes the work of the Dissenting Academies centuries earlier.

The Dartmouth Seminar Papers

As well as Dixon and Muller's reports, six "monographs presenting papers, summaries of discussion, and related materials" were set to be published with the goal of fully covering Dartmouth's findings (Olson, "Myth" Foreword). This series, known as the *Dartmouth Seminar Papers* is oddly missing in many responses to the Conference, and thus sits in a strange space in comparison to Dixon and Muller's books. Here, then, are two collections edited by British delegates—*Creativity in English* (Summerfield) and *Drama in the English Classroom* (Barnes)—along with four proposed American collections: *The Uses of Myth* (Olson), *Sequence in Continuity* (Eastman), *Language and Language Learning* (Marckwardt), and *Response to Literature* (Squire). Of these, all were published except for Eastman's collection: I have found no reference as to why this never materialized. The seeming intention of these monographs is to re-publish the paper that specific study group responded to and then offer a summation of their findings. The issue, as Geoffrey Summerfield points out in the "prefatory note" to his collection, is that it is "impossible to summarise or even accurately recapture the tones, nuances, exchanges, differences, perplexities, and pleasures of four weeks' conversation" (Summerfield vii). In other words, the actual goal of the *Papers* is slightly questionable: to again draw from Summerfield, these are still "*personal* statement[s], which make no claims to represent the views of the

group" (vii; emphasis original). Elsewhere, Barnes introduces his collection by saying that "quotations from papers written at the Seminar have been embedded" but "their authors are not…to be held responsible for the interpretations put upon them" (Barnes, Preface). Furthermore, Barnes apologizes "for what [the monogram] failed to express" (Barnes, Preface). In other words, if NCTE and MLA hoped that publishing the monograms would put an end to the "rather harsh criticism" (vii) of Dartmouth and demonstrate that *something* concrete had resulted, then they failed. The biggest cause for this, then, is that there was seemingly no set guideline for how the *Seminar Papers* should proceed: each takes a wildly different approach to their particular topic, with some (Olson's, for example) offering an extended personal take, and others (Squire and Marckwardt) instead including feedback from most members of their respective groups. In many ways, the *Seminar Papers* read like more focused versions of Dixon and Muller's text: a personal reflection on how *that* editor felt their sessions went, rather than an objective report on what was spoken about.

While the sheer variety of approaches certainly makes reading the five monographs a less repetitive experience, it also adds to the notion that nothing at Dartmouth was as cohesive as some (Squire, in particular) want to suggest. Indeed, I'd argue that it is the *Papers* edited by the Conference organizers that are the most useful today, as they really do show both the variety of voices along with a sense of where those voices were cohesively agreeing.

Where the *Seminar Papers* are most interesting, however, isn't in offering a report on Conference findings, but when they offer a direct insight into how the Conference worked in practice. In his preface, for example, Marckwardt explains that there were two

groups dealing "directly with language problems" and "midway through the…Seminar…the two groups joined forces," having felt "that the two topics had so much in common that to try and treat them separately would result in waste and duplication of effort" (Marckwardt, *Language*, Preface). As most responses to the Conference are understandably more concerned with the theory being discussed—rather than how those discussions looked—these little glimpses are genuinely fascinating and help humanize the various study groups.

The Rise and Fall of the International Steering Committee

Of the more immediate Trans-Atlantic results of Dartmouth, none is perhaps more simultaneously exciting and frustrating than the International Steering Committee (ISC). Chaired initially by Merron Chorny—Canada's single participant at Dartmouth—the ISC was created partially to work out how to best spend the $10,000 allotted to post-Dartmouth international activity from the original Carnegie grant. The ISC initially consisted of representatives of NCTE, MLA, and NATE, and eventually "expanded to include a representative of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English [CCTE]" (Chorney, "Letter" 1), itself created by ISC work, and the "Australian Association of Teachers of English" (Hogan, "Final Report" 2). In a 1972 letter to Carnegie Corporation Executive Chairman E. Alden Dunham, Chorney explains that "the work of the" ISC has been "an extension of" the outcomes of Dartmouth: "it has worked for the dissemination, refinement and realization of the ideas and recommendations that emerged from Dartmouth and has sought to continue and extend the valuable international dialogue" (Chorney, "Letter" 1). Here, then, the ISC was deeply involved with promoting both Dixon and Muller's reports, along with providing "teachers with more detail on some of the Dartmouth concerns" (1). The

ISC also provided a grant to NATE "to cover part of the cost of a university and secondary school...conference to discuss Dartmouth," which Chorney explains was successful enough to be repeated the next year (2).

The biggest success of the ISC, however, were two "international conferences on the teaching of English, one held in Vancouver, Canada, in 1967 and the other in York, England in 1971" (Chorney, "Letter" 2). The Canadian conference involved "nearly 20 participants of Dartmouth" and "brought together over 600 teachers and scholars, principally from the USA, UK, and Canada" (2). York, then, was "planned specifically as a follow-up to Dartmouth, as an invitational meeting to consider the outcomes of 1966 as they had matured and as they might be applied in education today" and "brought together 500 participants, 200 each from the USA and UK and 100 from Canada" (2). While these two conferences were certainly considerably larger than Dartmouth from a participant perspective, they were also considerably shorter, each lasting a week. More on these below.

Other efforts of the ISC include the establishment of "informal contacts with...Australia and New Zealand to discuss mutual concerns" and the promotion of the "exchange of research reports, materials and resource personnel among the USA, UK and Canada" (Chorney, "Letter" 2). Furthermore, beginning in 1967, with the aid of the ISC, NCTE sponsored "summer Study Tours" of the UK, "participated in annually by over 100 American teachers" (2). Between 1966 and 1972, the ISC met six times—typically planned around conferences in the US, UK, and Canada—and "the insights thus gained and the contacts thus made have accelerated the international exchange and have provided perspectives for re-examining and enriching English teaching in each of the three countries" (3). Chorley ends his letter by explaining that, without the ISC, "the outcomes

of the Dartmouth Seminar would not have received the attention that they deserved" and that "our international borrowings in English might have been more faddish and less responsible" (3). Indeed, Chorley concludes, "without it, I am certain that English teaching in each of the countries concerned would have been the poorer" (3). While reading Chorley's letter is certainly a rousing experience, it is hard not to have a haunting sense that it is a biased promotion of the Committee's successes that obfuscates its failings. This, then, is because it quite literally is: the letter was, ultimately, sent to assuage the Carnegie Corporation of any concerns that their grant investment had been a worthwhile one.[56] As such, one needs to take all of the successes reported with a grain of salt: it is, simply put, suspicious to read of nothing but endless success, especially when the ISC led programs don't even constitute a footnote in most contemporary reads of Dartmouth and its fallout.

It would not take long for the hopeful outlook of Chorley to be replaced by the realities of maintaining the ISC's success. In his final report for NCTE in 1977—just five short years later—Richard Hogan bluntly outlines the continued failures. First, he explains that the nature of the organizations that maintained the ISC meant that it increasingly became focused on "English in schools, teacher preparation and inservice education, and post-secondary education, but not formal university teaching or scholarship" (Hogan, "Final Report" 2). Due to this shift, MLA increasingly diminished its commitment. The first true failure of ISC, however, was its attempt to help offset the costs "of manufacturing copies of one of six pamphlets growing out of the Dartmouth conference" for the UK: the "plan was to test the marketability of these U.S.-based materials among the members of NATE" who themselves could not cover the cost (2). The ISC chose Barnes's *Drama in*

[56] In a follow-up to Chorley's letter, Dunham exclaims the ISC "made $10,000 go further than any similar sum in my experience" (Dunham qtd. Chorley, "Letter" 4).

the English Classroom as their trial run, most likely because it was one of the two British authored papers, and thus was perceived to have more interest in the UK. As Hogan explains, "frankly it didn't work" as "the topic was not nearly so novel in England" and plans for further Trans-Atlantic publishing were scrapped. The more notable failure, however, was "a still-born proposal to hold a third International Conference on the Teaching of English" (3). This follow-up to Vancouver and York was intended to be held, once more, in Canada in 1975. The American, Canadian, and Australian delegates all gave "assurance of support," but "the economy in England was at so low an ebb that NATE" could only "scrape together funds for one delegate" (3). As the Canada Council was "reluctant to have its funds used to support travel and subsistence for non-Canadians" the "plan was held over for another year" (3). In 1976, however, "support for the U.K. delegation remained a problem" (3). As to hold "such a conference without U.K. participation seemed unthinkable" the plans were soon abandoned (3). By this time, "the reserves of the ISC had shrunk to such a low ebb that no one touched them" meaning delegates only met when luck allowed (3). Hogan ends on the bluntly depressing note that "the future of the ISC is unknown to me" (3). For all intents, the ISC was finished.

The short life of the ISC is not the only immediate failure of Dartmouth. Vee, for example, argues that the actual impact of the Conference on "curriculum was very diffused, and ran aground on…counter curricular efforts, such as the retrenchment of testing in the UK and later in the US" (Vee, "Introduction"). In the UK specifically, the sweep of progressivism heralded by the Conference was quickly overshadowed by the publishing of the *Black Papers on Education*. I will discuss these in depth in my next chapter, but for now it is notable that "Dartmouth played its part" in "arousing such big guns and

formidable forces to do-or-die battle" (Miller 4). In other words, the very act of bringing together educators from across the Atlantic to solve issues in English caused those who did *not* want to see a more progressive education move forward to organize. This is not to say, perhaps, that the failed promises of Dartmouth are to blame for the stagnating 1970s, but it certainly didn't help.

Vancouver and York

In a reflection on York, Britton states "looking back now, it is difficult to see the York International Conference as 'an event'" (Britton, "York" 3). The lack of archival materials of York and Vancouver certainly imply as much: especially in comparison with Dartmouth, there is notably little. Outside of the references in IPC documents and articles specifically about Dartmouth, I can find almost no trace of Vancouver at all. In their Forward to the 1975 edition of *Growth Through English*, for example, Britton and Squire notably leave Vancouver out of their brief breakdown of "cross-Atlantic dialogue on the aims and methods of English teaching initiated at Dartmouth," despite mentioning "York (1971)" and the ill-fated "Banff (1975)" (Squire and Britton in Dixon, *Growth* xviii). Indeed, in the new concluding chapter of this edition, Dixon explicitly refers to York as "the second international seminar" (Dixon, *Growth* 111), despite the fact that Vancouver *did* (allegedly) happen four years prior.

As well as offering a shorter timeframe—"an intensive week's work" (Stratta et al., 2)—the scope of York was also more limited that Dartmouth, focusing almost entirely on K-12 education: there are scant mentions of college education, and every reference to university simply mentions where each participant gained their credentials. To avoid the conflicts of Dartmouth, "in our planning, we have had close consultation and advice from

our Canadian and American co-chairman" and as such "feel confident that the issues raised will be as relevant to our colleagues in North America" (Stratta at al, 4). Indeed, in what *could* be a subtle dig at the language barrier of Dartmouth, Strata et al. explain that "although most of the terminology used…applies to the British situation, we trust that colleagues from North America will not have too much difficulty in translating it" (Stratta et al., 5). Indeed, what is perhaps most surprising about York is how deeply UK-centric it is: every single session chair was British, and all advance reading materials were from British authors (Britton and Dixon included).

This go around, then, the six groups focused on the following: "English in the School" (chaired by Leslie Stratta), "English in Operation" (chaired by Harold Rosen), "The Teachers Concern With Language and Learning" (chaired by Winifred Fawcus), "English for the Young Adult" (chaired by John Dixon), "The Place of Drama in the Teaching and Learning of English" (chaired by Norman Stephenson), and "English and Curriculum Change" (chaired by Emrys Evans). It is, therefore, surprising that the ISC sees York as a direct follow-up to Dartmouth considering the six focus areas are almost entirely different to those of Dartmouth. Indeed, the original 1966 Conference receives barely any mention in the planning documents: it is named just six times in 88 pages, and four of these references are simply to introduce Dixon's *Growth Through English* (three times on 80, and on 87); Vancouver does not receive a single mention. Indeed, it is only in the materials for the Evans led "English and Curriculum Change" that the participants are encouraged to directly interrogate the goals of Dartmouth: "it would seem a priority task to arrive at an adequate notion of what 'growth' means, and then to ask ourselves 'growth towards what?'" (Evans et al., 80). Furthermore, "what are the implications of 'child-centredness'

for classroom strategy…[and] how does a person become the sort of teacher that the Dartmouth Seminar approved of?" (80).

The biggest takeaway from York, from what the scant materials suggest, "was to recognize that teachers…must not be left to fight their battles alone" (Squire and Britton in Dixon, *Growth* xiii). Specifically, the various academic bodies like NCTE and NATE are called upon to lend their "active support" (xiv). This could, perhaps, be part of the reason why NATE and LATE were called upon for the deeply influential parliamentary *Bullock Report* of 1975. I discuss *Bullock* in detail in Chapter 4, but this *is* an important turning point—if York is truly where it occurred—for progressive scholars gaining institutional support for their attempts to change education policy.

The Trans-Atlantic Split Part II: Ideology Over Language

As explained above, it has been commonplace to separate those present into British and American groups. Those present such as Miller—see above—certainly support this view. Indeed, as troubling as binary splits are, it's a logical one on the surface: the delegates *do* essentially split evenly into two groups, so it makes sense that those in each group would enter Dartmouth with roughly similar positions. Yet, as Harris points out, the core "British camp" consisted of Dixon, Britton, and Moffett (Harris, "Growth" 17); in other words, a third of the most patently British seminar members was American. Here, then, the 'British' camp become defined not by nationality but by progressive ideology, with a group of scholars who all supported a more open view of the classroom that breaks away from historic elitism. Indeed, Harris further explains that not even all the British present supported the stereotypically "British" concepts championed by the Jameses and Dixon, with "scholars associated with Cambridge attack[ing] what they saw as a devaluing of

literature by the London growth theorists" (13). This Cambridge group became known at the Conference as Leavisites—the "devotees of F.R. Leavis," editor of the literary criticism magazine *Scrutiny* (Vee, "Introduction")—and while it's debatable how much influence Leavis actually had on proceedings, his acolytes certainly made an impression. The growth theorists—mostly associated with LATE—were themselves heavily influenced by "Lev Vygotsky and Jean Paget" (Hardcastle qtd. Vee).[57] As such, within the supposedly unified British cohort there lies the contemporary split between literary scholars (Whitehead, Barnes, Ford, Lewis, Holbrook) and rhetoricians (Dixon, Britton, British-by-association Moffett). Furthermore, even if the British mostly spoke a manufactured RP, "there were class differences among them—namely, those who taught in the schools and those [who] were products of them" (Vee, "Introduction"). In short, there was pointedly not a singular unified British front.

A similar split in national unity is found in the American delegation. Olson explains that John Hurt Fisher and James Squire—who he perceived as the core organizers of the Conference—both naturally fell on opposite sides of the Atlantic split. Here, then, "John was very upset that the American emphasis on academic rigor…was not being terribly well respected" while "Squire was more comfortable with the British side" (Vee and Olson, "Interview" 14:06). Aside from this, most of the American delegation did not know each other: even those associated with Project English "did not know each other personally" as "the study centers were scattered across the country" (Vee, "Introduction"). Whereas most of the British delegation, at the very least, taught in similar environments, the American delegates came from "West Coast high schools, mid-America land grant universities, and

[57] As I discuss in my next chapter, Vygotsky was a particularly large influence on Britton's post-Dartmouth work.

elite private universities on the East Coast" (Vee, "Introduction"). In other words, there was no singular shared "American" ideology present at Dartmouth.

In short, there are two different ways to view the Dartmouth split. The first follows the contemporary reports of those who were present, and identifies a clear split across national lines and points to this for why little immediately productive material left the Conference. The second, however, looks past the physical split and highlights the shared pedagogy that linked various scholars from both sides of the ocean, and thus places the split purely on ideology. The first option allows for a continued isolationist stance, as it implies that superficial national differences like word choice make it impossible for international cooperation; the second, however, breaks this needless "but they are aren't from the same country" binary, and allows for a more holistic version of Composition as a field.[58] This is, perhaps, the heart of my entire project: prescribing to entirely separate Composition into sub-fields dictated by nationality allows isolationist scholars to ignore the vast similarities that often outweigh surface level national differences. At Dartmouth this ideological split falls between those focused on "the scope and sequence of the body of knowledge thought to define the subject of English that teachers were responsible for teaching" and those championing "questions of child language and development" who advocated for a "experiential, inquiry-oriented 'growth' model" (Blau 85). Dixon frames this split as one between "blind enthusiast in the classroom and academic rationalists in the study" (Dixon qtd. Vee). I would take things a step further and simply say that the 'split'

[58] A non-ideology based Trans-Atlantic bridge can be found in Harold Rosen (UK) and Wayne Booth (US) who had served together in WWII, and re-found each other at the Conference. From here a lifelong Trans-Atlantic friendship was rekindled (Vee, "Introduction").

was between those practicing more progressive pedagogy and those who wished to maintain a conservative status quo.

The Legacy of Dartmouth; Or, Why Does This Matter Today?

Even if it had been an utter failure never to be revisited, Dartmouth would still be an important chapter of a Trans-Atlantic history: on an entirely surface level, it is unquestionably the first great modern experiment in mixing scholars from both nations (and Canada). Indeed, a lot of the issues that the delegates reported should *not* come as a surprise today. Take, for example, the language and accent barrier that seemingly came as a shock for many present and thus made conversation harder to parse: I've been going to conferences in America for the best part of a decade, and *still* the first time I open my mouth people get confused about my accent before just accepting it as part of internationalized education. As such, even if the follow-up conferences at Vancouver and York hadn't occurred, Dartmouth would still be notable for being the first in what would eventually become a long line of international education conferences. Yet, I argue there are two core reasons that it's incorrect to look at the Conference as a Trans-Atlantic failure.

One key importance of Dartmouth today is that it offers an easily accessible case study to prove how non-existent the Atlantic gap is once pedagogy and ideology are focused on instead of accent or historical exigencies. In other words, as I've argued above, the ideological gap that makes certain pedagogies seem incompatible cannot simply be defined by basic geography, like those opposed to Trans-Atlantic sharing would argue: I will discuss this for much of my next chapter, but if this were the case, Moffett could never have influenced Britton—and then Britton America—to the extent he did. This, then, is the second vital importance of Dartmouth for our Trans-Atlantic history: it was at Dartmouth

where Moffett's work became widely distributed, it was at Dartmouth where Britton read the manuscript that he admits openly influenced his landmark study, and it was at Dartmouth where this deeply important Trans-Atlantic relationship began. In other words, whether or not Dartmouth achieved a single one of its initial goals—and whether or not James Squire was in any way representing the truth in his much maligned 11 points of agreement—I argue that the sheer vitality of Moffett and Britton's co-influence on both sides of the Atlantic is enough to make the conference a success, albeit with historical hindsight on its side. In other words, to see the fruits of the Conference we just need to be able to play the long game: for a singular example, that WAC is a thriving part of our field today and is entirely built off of Trans-Atlantic sharing that began at Dartmouth.

The Myth of Post-Dartmouth Stagnation

In my next chapter, then, I focus on what I argue is the paradigmatic example of Trans-Atlanticism in action: the relationship between the two Jameses. In short, Moffett's ideas were shared and deepened at Dartmouth, they then headed across to the UK via the work of Britton, and they then eventually headed back across to the US in their new form. Britton, as explained above, would be a crucial voice in developing Composition on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1970s and 80s, yet, without the Moffett-derived influence, I posit this would have gone in a notably different direction. This relationship, then, acts as a strong contrast to the stagnating attempts to maintain a conservative status quo that otherwise dictates the period following Dartmouth, most notably in the deeply influential *Black Papers on Education*.

Chapter Four: The Myth of Post-Dartmouth Stagnation

As outlined in the previous chapter, the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966 is often placed as *the* grand moment of Trans-Atlantic composition: it is where the British and American forces met enmasse—for an entire month, no less—for the first time. In short, Dartmouth is where Trans-Atlanticism moved from a mainly theoretical relationship—textbooks and ideas moving from the UK to America throughout the 1800s, for example—and became a physical one. While Dartmouth was not a standalone event, it is, perhaps, easy to frame it as the such given that it becomes the starting point for multiple Composition histories (think, say, of Harris's *A Teaching Subject*). This, however, not only ignores events like the Vancouver and York conferences that immediately followed in 1967 and 1971 and brought together considerably *more* academics from both nations, but also plays into a flawed logic that says "if the entire world wasn't changed by an event, the event therefore didn't matter." In other words, to judge Trans-Atlanticism purely off whether Dartmouth was a success or not is, I would argue, a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure.

Leaving aside questions of whether or not Dartmouth was successful in itself, we now move to the question of what happened next. Towards answering this question, this chapter presents a case study that began at Dartmouth and continued long after: the relationship between American James Moffett and British James Britton. Espousing a connection between Moffett and Britton is nothing new: see articles by Durst, Koshnick, Blau, or Burgess, for example. These prior discussions, however, rarely focus on the Trans-Atlantic nature of their relationship. I argue, however, that while Moffett and Britton *were*

two of the most important voices of the 1960s and 70s, they never would have reached this stage *without* Trans-Atlanticism. In short, the ideas Moffett presented at Dartmouth, and then expanded upon in his writings, would be directly taken up by Britton to fill in the missing pieces of his own research. Britton's Moffett-derived ideas, then, would directly influence Britain (via the Bullock Report) and America (via WAC and discourse categories). In other words, this relationship begins in America at Dartmouth, heads across the Atlantic to London, and returns to America. I position Moffett and Britton as vessels through which a more holistic Trans-Atlantic composition can be explored. If nothing else, they are, I argue, *the* paradigmatic example of just how important the Trans-Atlantic sharing of ideas is.

As well as Britton and Moffett, however, there is also the negative side to the post-Dartmouth era to consider: just as it seems as though the UK and US are about to fully embrace a Trans-Atlantic partnership wherein they look outside for inspiration, the nations take a turn back towards isolationism. It is here, then, that I begin this chapter, as this conservatism is an important context for the more progressive work that exits the Conference. Specifically, I begin with the British *Black Papers on Education*, which I position as a direct response to Dartmouth progressivism. In a way, the 1970s act as a mirror for today's educational issues—as outlined in my introductory chapter—in that it feels as though the proverbial ball was dropped at *just* the wrong time. Indeed, Burgess et al. place Moffett, and by extension Britton, as a "failed [attempt at] progressivism" that would be "set aside" for more conservative education policies (Burgess et al. 265). While it is true that conservatism *did* reign supreme for some time,[59] it was the work of Moffett

[59] Think of the Thatcher/Reagan years.

and Britton during this period that ultimately birthed today's more progressive policies—they just took time to be realized. As such, with this chapter, I position Moffett and Britton as proof of how important Trans-Atlantic sharing is, especially in moments of isolationist conservatism: in short, I argue, they prove why this type of relationship is vital to foster once more.

The Black Papers

The immediate pushback to Dartmouth, in the UK at least, can be seen in the *Black Papers on Education*. Published in *Critical Quarterly*[60] beginning in 1969, these "anti-progressive education papers…may have been more influential to…education policy in the UK than Dartmouth" (Squire and Britton, xiv). In short, this series of papers were written as a direct response to Government White Papers that the authors saw to be dangerously progressive: think, for example, of the *Robbins Report* I discussed in detail in my second chapter. Today, the *Black Papers* read as a deeply xenophobic, misogynistic, and outright racist commentary on education and feel like the last gasp of an aging generation of colonists who have just lost their Empire (to use a contemporary example, they read like conservative responses to the *1619 Project*). In the opening "Letter to Members of Parliament" in the first *Paper*, for example, C.B. Cox and A.E. Dyson write that "anarchy is becoming fashionable" and "the teacher is no longer regarded as the exponent of the great achievements of past civilisation" (Cox and Dyson, "Comment" 2).[61] Indeed, "at a recent demonstration in a new university, students objected to being taught History, Literature or Science, and asked to be taught LIFE" (2; emphasis original). Even worse, "there is a

[60] Known as *Critical Survey* at the time of the first *Black Paper* being published.
[61] All quoted articles are from the first two of these *Papers*, subtitled *A Fight for Education* and *The Crisis in Education* respectively. While there would be three follow-up papers, none would have the same visceral impact as the first two.

feeling that…we should do away with class divisions in university honours degrees" (2). While "much of this agitation could be dismissed as extremist nonsense," there are "major administrative decisions…resulting from these so-called 'liberal' views" (2). Again, it is difficult to read this deeply influential call-to-arms today and *not* hear the direct echoes of the contemporary conservative push-back against versions of history education that don't simply sell a white savior theory of greatness in the British Empire or American Exceptionalism. We also see echoes of the push-back of Black Lives Matter or Extinction Revolution (to use two 'liberal' movements with heavy student involvement): "why is it repugnant to 'any liberal-minded academic' to keep order?" (4). Indeed, the contemporary move to quickly call anyone arguing for positive change a socialist appears multiple times throughout (Mowat 12, Conquest 18, for example).[62] In the second *Black Paper*, we even see an early version of the attack on Black History Month and African American Studies: "as there can be no white studies, there can be no 'Black Studies'" (Beichman 138). In short, reading the *Black Papers* today shows how painfully little certain mindsets have changed in the past fifty years, while revealing the historic roots of the conservatism I discuss in my introductory chapter.[63]

To increase the reach of the documents, "a copy of this black paper [was]...sent to every Member of Parliament" as the authors "believe that the spirit of anti-education must be fought" (Cow and Dyson, "Backmatter" 81). MPs were encouraged to bring the concerns to "the attention of anyone [they] know involved in education, including parents" (81).While it would be pleasant to just brush the *Black Papers* off as an unfortunate blip,

[62] In an article from the second *Black Paper*, Michael Swann also makes the tried and tested slippery slope "this will all lead to Nazism" argument (Swann, "Student" 148).
[63] This said, Bryan Wilson's repeated non-ironic use of "ivory tower" as a positive conception of university education would hopefully seem outdated even today (Wilson 73).

they were deeply influential in keeping British education more conservative for the following decades, and thus are an important chapter in our story. As just a small example, C. B. Cox—the co-author of the opening comment along with the tellingly named "In Praise of Examinations"—would two decades later headline the *Cox Report*, the Parliamentary paper that enshrined the National Curriculum that exists to this day in the UK.

The *Black Papers* do not make explicit reference to Dartmouth,[64] but as James Miller argues, "Dartmouth has played its part" in "arousing such big guns and formidable forces to do-or-die battle" and now "the battle is joined" (Miller 4). Almost all of the 'liberal' ideals that came out of Dartmouth are fought here. A more open education that pushes back against prescriptivist English? "I would prefer to see a child develop accuracy in writing, spelling and grammar" via "spelling drill" (Hardie 57). A reformed system that takes away the focus on exams? "Nonsense" as they "provide a good test of knowledge and understanding," and the "common student complaint" that exams "tested nothing but memory…obviously says much more about the student [complaining] than about the exam" (Amis 10). Indeed, "life is a series of tests" and thus "of course this" seems "'unfair' to some more than others" (Mowat 12). In other words, exams just reflect the reality of life. A more student-centered pedagogy? Never: "that students have many good ideas…is not in question" but to listen to their needs is to put "academic standards" in danger (12). Indeed, "it is folly to argue that students and teachers are equals, that all can happily fraternise in a community" (13). Furthermore, repeated references to the new desired focus

[64] The authors place the aforementioned *Robbins Report* (see Chapter 2) and the *Newsom Report* as core sources of their frustration, in large part because they fought to make university education less elitist.

on "talk" (Mowat 13, for example) is a direct callback to the progressivist camp Britton and Moffett are placed in at Dartmouth.[65]

Perhaps most tellingly, however, are how many of the authors make direct references to American university 'issues' occurring at the time, offering a continued sense that allowing American ideology into the British campuses is the very cause of the perceived problem. G. F. Hudson, for example, explains that "student power has come to us from America," specifically "the Berkeley campus" (Hudson 21). Berkeley proves to be a specific sticking point, appearing in three of the articles: Robert Conquest witnessed "one of the Berkeley free speech outbursts" (Conquest 18), while Bryan Wilson explains that students at British universities are "inspired by (or even interested in) what students do at Berkeley" (Wilson 70). Elsewhere in his article, Conquest explains that, "in a few years' time" a degree in "social sciences…will have something of the standing of those degrees in water-skiing for which a Florida university was at one time notorious" (19). Cox is even harder on American universities, placing them as the birthplace of the "course assessment" model of education, where a student's fate in a class isn't just dictated by a single final exam (Cox 37). The issue with this, per Cox, is that "in America students prefer to work for teachers who supposedly are generous markers" and that this opens up avenues for "subtle blackmail with which American professors are familiar" such as "crude sex-appeal [and] pseudo-friendship" (37). Cox's language here is notable: students, in his purview, work "for" *not* "with" their instructors. Even worse, "surveys have shown that American students often suffer from persecution mania" (37), showing why a non-exam system is terrible. Again, as deeply frustrating—albeit amusing—as it is to read these grumbles

[65] Herbert Muller directly connects Moffett and Britton as *the* two "talk" scholars in *Uses of English*: more below.

today, it is vital to remember how deeply influential these comments were: as of the *Black Papers* being published, the only major British university to follow a non-exam-only route was "the University of East Anglia" (37),[66] and following Cox's comments it would remain this way for much longer than it may have otherwise: no university wanted to be singled out as the weak or overly American institution.

It's important, however, to recognize that the *Black Papers* were not being written and distributed in a vacuum: British education policy following the *Robbins Report* had been becoming increasingly conservative in nature, and the *Papers* simply offered an 'academic' support to continue down that road. For example, the Parliamentary *Plowden Report* of 1967 offered the progressive ideal of raising the mandatory minimum age to leave school to 16, but in the process doubled down on conservative K-12 education. Per Britton, the *Report* "misrepresented the truth of [the] matter when it daubed that 'one of the most important responsibilities of teachers is to help children…by the provision of a suitable vocabulary'" (*Plowden* qtd. Britton, *Language* 91). Here, then, "the notion of 'providing vocabulary' is a limited and misleading one, suggesting an all too static conception of language" (Britton, *Language* 91). This static conception plays directly into the hands of the various *Black Papers* authors, whose goals were, ultimately, to maintain the status quo (or, perhaps, to set the clock back on progressive education). I present this breakdown of the conservative nature of British education following Dartmouth, as it was within this realm that Moffett and Britton's academic ideals were being floated.

[66] I would be lying if I said I didn't feel mild pride that my undergraduate institution was such a trail-blazer here. I would be deeply amused to see what Cox and colleagues felt about my other undergraduate home, UC Santa Cruz: the infamous (albeit deeply overblown) no-grade policy is everything they fear about American education.

Moffett and Britton at Dartmouth[67]

Britton and Moffett entered Dartmouth from deeply different places—Trans-Atlantic pun not intended. Whereas Moffett was among the most junior members of the American group, Britton was a well established, and respected, scholar in the UK, and was already known in the US. Britton arrived at Dartmouth as a 58-year-old and Moffett at a considerably younger 37. Britton had held the position of Head of the English Department at London University since 1954, whereas Moffett had spent a singular year as a research assistant in English at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, following a decade at Phillips Exeter Academy. Britton had long since held the title of Professor, whereas Moffett would *never* hold such an academic position. However, despite these clear differences, the two scholars entered the conference with a similar conception: the classroom should be student-centered, *not* teacher-focused. In this sense, then, while both Britton and Moffett fit the incorrectly named "British" camp,[68] they more accurately represent the progressivist ideals of both the US and the UK. As will become clear below, however, many in the US were displeased with Moffett's direction; it would be through Britton's uptake of his work that American composition would finally see it as palatable.

Signaling the important role he would play, Britton is found on the list of potential delegation members from the very beginning, appearing in Squire's 1965 proposal, albeit as the misspelled "J.N. Brittain" (Squire, "Proposal" 26). Moffett, on the other hand, was seemingly a later choice: as noted in the previous chapter, he was not included in the

[67] James Moffett material partially adapted into "James Moffett as Trans-Atlantic Nexus," submitted for publication in *Toward a Re-Emergence of James Moffett's Mindful, Spiritual, and Student-Centered Pedagogy*.
[68] See Chapter 3 for more.

proposal's list of idealized participants *or* their alternate replacement.[69] Yet, despite this, Moffett was one of the most widely represented scholars at the Conference. Per the *Agenda* for the Conference, three of Moffett's papers were included in the "Additional Readings" all participants were expected to read: "I, You, and It"; "A Structural Curriculum in English"; and "Telling Stories: Methods of Abstraction in Fiction." Here, then, Moffett makes up an entire 5th of the Additional Readings and is the only scholar to have three readings included on the combined reading lists.[70] In short, Moffett is the most represented of all 27 authors whose work was distributed prior to the Conference beginning. All of this to say, it is perhaps logical that an American with relatively young seniority would be picked up by so many senior British scholars, as they had simply had more of a chance to read his work. Britton had a similarly headlining role in the readings. As well as his response to Kitzhaber's now famous opening question that was covered in the previous chapter, he was also tasked with writing "Response to Literature," one of the ten study group papers. In other words, Britton not only provided the Kitzhaber response that ultimately changed the course of the entire conference, but he also provided the paper that one of the main study groups would itself respond to.

In "Response to Literature," Britton follows a similar pattern to his other work at the Conference: "our aim" as instructors "should be to refine and develop responses [that] children are already making" (Britton in Squire, "Response" 4). Here, then, Britton defines developing student writing as "increasing a sense of form" (4), which I would argue is what

[69] See Appendix B for the full list of possible attendees.
[70] Frank Whitehead appears twice, as do co-authored works by Roger Applebee and James Squire, and Francis Keppel and Northrup Frye; notably, however, both sets of co-authored works are taken as selections from the same book. In other words, it could be argued that Moffett and Whitehead are the only two authors to appear on the reading list twice with entirely unique works. That Whitehead was the head of NATE at the time of the conference makes *his* extended inclusion feel somewhat cynically like self-promotion.

first-year English classes are attempting to do, even though Britton is seemingly explicitly discussing K-12 development. In short, instructors need to make classrooms a student-focused experience—with writing development at the core—instead of trying to make our students bank the information they deem important (to borrow from Freire). This, of course, is the epitome of what would be referred to countless times as the "British" ideology of Dartmouth, even if it directly flies in the face of the so-called Cambridge school of thought. Britton further distances himself from his Cambridge-based colleagues in redefining literature as "an utterance that a writer has 'constructed' not for use but for his own satisfaction" (9). Here, then, Britton attempts to chip away at the ivory tower of literature scholarship, moving the conversation away from what a few canonized authors have said towards what students personally have to say. Indeed, were there any doubt of Britton's position here, he ends by explaining that "what a child writes is of the same order as what the poet or novelist writes and valid for the same reasons" (9). It is notable for our purposes that Britton clearly mixes what are often two almost entirely separate fields in the US: literature and rhetoric/composition. This, then, may offer a hint into why the UK does initially appear to have a standalone Composition studies: unlike America it has never left the side of literature and, instead, is part of all writing-based education.

Of Moffett's work at Dartmouth, one of the most influential pieces ironically does not even appear on the *Agenda*'s reading list: the manuscript for *Drama: What is Happening*. This text would be published as a stand-alone book by NCTE in 1967 and included in *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, appearing throughout multiple accounts of the Conference, as will be discussed below.[71] Moffett argues that "drama and speech are

[71] I cite from the 1967 book publication, rather than *Teaching*, as this is, logically, closer to what participants read at Dartmouth.

central to a language curriculum, not peripheral. They are base and essence, not specialities" (Moffett, *Drama* vii). Moffett explains that "the speech components of a play are *soliloquy*, *dialogue*, and *monologue*—addressing oneself, exchanging with others, and holding forth to others" and that understanding these components is "very important...for the teaching of discourse" (3; emphasis original). With a focus on drama, then, a "student might within one class period traverse on a small scale the whole continuum of dialogue -> vocal monologue -> written monologue" (23). In other words, the student "converses in a small group, extends one of [their] utterances before the entire class, then takes the monologue to paper and finishes it there, thus moving through a short version of the general learning progression" (24). As well as centering his drama-based pedagogy, Moffett also uses the chapter to critique the concept that "students can learn only from the teacher" (31), placing his work directly in line with that of student-centered British scholars at Dartmouth, most notably Britton. Moffett concludes that "since discourse is ultimately social in origin and in function, it seems a shame to fight those forces that could be put to such excellent use in teaching the subject" (54). With this manuscript, then, Moffett introduced his components of speech which would directly influence Britton, as will be discussed below.

While Moffett's ideas would gain traction post-Dartmouth, in the moment they were not without their detractors: Ann Berthoff, for example, "was publicly critical of what she saw as the undue influence of...Moffett on the deliberations" (Vee, "Introduction"). Berthoff's criticism can be summarized as Moffett basing his own stance—in particular in regards to drama—on poorly explained (in her purview, at least) signal systems. In this anti-Moffett stance, Berthoff echoes fellow American Herbert Muller: Moffett had ideas

that sounded good in the moment, but could not be backed up.[72] In short, he was practicing theory for theory's sake like Peter Caws feared when he visited Dartmouth. It is, however, telling that it is the American, not British, critics of Dartmouth that single Moffett out in their critique, as becomes clear when the British texts are examined. Furthermore, it speaks to Britton's senior status in deliberations that he is mostly removed from character attacks from either side of the Atlantic.

Moffett and Britton in Dixon, Muller, and the Seminar Papers

When it comes to the official reports on the Conference, the rising role of Moffett quickly becomes clear: in every case, he is the more cited and quoted scholar than Britton, despite Britton's initial central role in proceedings. This is foreshadowed in the letter James Squire sent to Peter Caws following the Conference's ending, wherein the writer exclaims that Moffett "turned out to be one of the most interesting and influential participants at Dartmouth" (Squire, "Letter 1966" 3). While Moffett may not be *the* core attraction in John Dixon's *Growth Through English*, he—and his ideas—makes six appearances, beginning with an epigraph for Chapter 2: "In a sense a child over-abstracts at first as well as under-abstracts: he cuts his world into a few simple categories that cover too much and discriminate too little" (Moffett qtd. Dixon 14). Dixon directly attributes the above quote to Dartmouth. Moffett is one of four epigraphed authors for this chapter: the others are members of the British Dartmouth delegation (Basin Bernstein and Harold Rosen) and Noam Chomsky. Indeed, of the approximately 20 authors used in epigraphs throughout the text, Moffett is one of the few Americans: Albert Kitzhaber, for example, makes an

[72] This is a somewhat reductive take on Berthoff's argument that makes a case for basing the path forward for English on the theories of I.A. Richards. I do, however, stand by the notion that her singling out of Moffett is somewhat unwarranted. See "From Problem-Solving to a Theory of Imagination," 1972, for more.

expected appearance given his role in generating the conference. All of this to say: that Moffett is given something of a headlining role in Dixon's second chapter is evidence, I would argue, of the impression he left on the British scholar.[73] Indeed, Dixon drops a further three Moffett quotes throughout his text, on pages 49, 83, and 89, as he becomes one the most extensively quoted American delegates.

There is, however, more concrete evidence of Moffett's influence on Dixon than his repeated citation appearances. To whit: while discussing the role of schemas in English education, Dixon recognizes he is arriving at "the kind of position Jim Moffett had reached in 1966, because [he] now realize[s] how helpful his initial scheme can be in defining the characteristic interests of my teaching of English" (Dixon 117).[74] Here, Dixon seemingly refers to Moffett's Seminar reading "I, You, and It," but he does not directly cite a specific work. Moffett, Dixon attests, helped remind him that "in contrast with many subjects, English is centrally concerned with the elementary levels of abstracting from experience, with enacting and narrating" (Dixon 117). As with Britton after him, Dixon desires to move "beyond Moffett's early position" seeking "refinements" to "his abstract schema" to "double its explanatory power" (Dixon 118). This "refinement" would surface in Dixon's work on growth. Writing in the context of composition in New South Wales, for example, Wayne Sawyer explains that "Dixon himself was influenced by Moffett's work so that it is probably accurate to describe 'growth' in general as also containing Moffett's most important precepts" (Sawyer 292).

---

[73] The third chapter of Dixon's text focuses deeply on drama: while he never directly cites Moffett as the influence for this, it is notable, as expressed above, that he *had* recently read the manuscript of Moffett's "Drama: What is Happening" at Dartmouth.

[74] Dixon's informal use of "Jim" rather than "James" certainly implies the two scholars grew close at Dartmouth. One only needs to read the various retrospectives published in the wake of Moffett's death to see his various friends talk of "Jim" instead of "James." See, for example, *JAEPL*'s 1997 "A Tribute to James Moffett."

Dixon's fellow countryman, however, makes less of a proverbial splash in *Growth Through English*. Britton is not among the epigraphed authors and Dixon never waxes poetic about his role at the Conference. Now, it could be argued that this is simply because of personal familiarity: Britton and Dixon had known each other for many years prior to Dartmouth, so anything Britton offered at the Seminar would, ultimately, be ideology Dixon had heard many times before. The stated purpose of Dixon's book length report also needs to be considered: to bring his personal take-aways from Dartmouth back to British educators. That, then, Britton was himself one of the target audience of Dixon's text suggests a reason for his smaller role. Either way, he makes one less appearance in the text than Moffett: we find an extended quote on 28-29, and shorter quotes on 45, 55, 57, and 58. In short, at no point in his text does Dixon directly interact or engage with Britton further than occasional dropped quotes.

The situation is similar in Herbert Muller's *Use of English*. Moffett appears throughout the text, primarily in the sixth chapter, "Writing and Talking." Muller begins positively, explaining that "James Moffett made a heroic effort to be more systemic...suggesting the model building that is now the fashion in the social sciences. He offered a grid chart, with curves and arrows, to represent parallels between stages of growth in ways of thinking and ways of speaking" (Muller 46).[75] Yet, just as it seems like Muller shares Dixon's excitement, he immediately exclaims that Moffett's "chart satisfied nobody," and, as such, he mentions it "chiefly to illustrate [his] belief that model building is not going to help much in this problem of teaching English" (Muller 46). Later in his text, Muller points towards the Trans-Atlanticism that I argue Moffett becomes emblematic

[75] Note that, unlike Dixon, Muller exclusively uses the more formal "James": to continue the above speculation, then, this certainly implies a lack of closeness.

of: “the seminar seemed more interested...by a rationale suggested by...Moffett” than with an unnamed “American contributor,” which “began with a systematic ‘structure of discourse’...that the British could nevertheless welcome because he built it in personal, dramatic terms” (Muller 109). Britton, on the other hand, is again mainly utilized for brief pull-quotes. The closest Muller comes to fully interrogating Britton’s position is in a brief consideration of his jam tart metaphor (10)—see the previous chapter for more—along with a short overview of “Response to Literature” (81) and Britton’s take on the role of the student in the classroom (86-7). Here we find a similar situation to Dixon’s text: Britton is used more as a source for quotes than for disruptive ideology. Again, perhaps this increased focus on Moffett over his senior counterpart can be attributed to audience: Muller was pointedly writing for the American public, and, as argued in the previous chapter, treats the British position somewhat dismissively. As such, it feels logical that he *would* take considerable aim at a fellow American who he saw exhibiting ghastly Trans-Atlantic ideology while mostly ignoring the British author.

Easily the most interesting section of Muller’s text for our purposes, however, occurs in an almost throwaway implicit connection between Moffett and Britton. During the aforementioned sixth chapter, while discussing the importance of “talk” in the classroom, Muller directly pairs Britton’s concise definition (“the sea on which everything else floats”) with Moffett’s considerably longer definition of ‘talk’ (Britton qtd. Muller 110). Here, then, we find the most direct connection between both the two subjects of this chapter *and* between British and American authors in any of the Dartmouth reflections.

Moffett and Britton also make appearances, albeit brief ones, throughout the five *Dartmouth Seminar Papers*.[76] For example, the Douglas Barnes edited *Drama in the English Classroom* draws directly from the drama study group, of which Moffett was a member. Here, then, Barnes pays close attention to Moffett's ideas through pages 10-14, wherein he essentially summarizes *Drama: What Is Happening*. Furthermore, Appendix B—wherein Barnes explains how the theory discussed can be put into practice—is "based partly on notes written by James Moffett after conversations with primary teachers" (59). More significant, however, is the note that ends the document: "Although this bibliography refers only to works published in the United Kingdom, it would be ungrateful not to mention one American book, *Drama: What Is Happening* by James Moffett...since the ideas it expresses have contributed so much to this pamphlet" (65). Moffett is also quoted in *Language and Language Learning*, edited by Albert Marckwardt: "A teacher listening to a student speak, or reading his theme, may never know whether he produces baby sentences because his perceptions and conceptions are crude or because he can't transform sentences. The best policy in any case is to enlarge the student's repertory of sentence structures" (Moffett qtd. Marckwardt 68). Notably, Moffett was not even a member of either study group (linguistics and literature) that Marckwardt pulled from. In other words, Moffett's presence was strong enough to cross study-group boundaries. Similarly, Moffett appears in a footnote in the James Squire edited *Response to Literature* (72), and the Paul Olson edited *The Uses of Myth* (27). Moffett makes no appearance, so far as I can attest, in the remaining available *Seminar Paper*: *Creativity in English* (ed. Geoffrey Summerfield).

[76] As a reminder: *Drama in the English Classroom*, *Language and Language Learning*, *Response to Literature*, *The Uses of Myth*, and *Creativity in English*.

Britton, on the other hand, appears in just one of the five Seminar Papers: Squire's. Squire says of Britton that "although he speaks of conditions and practices in schools in the United Kingdom, his observations seem largely pertinent to America as well" (Squire, "Response" 2). In other words, his British sensibilities are transferable to American needs. His appearance here is, ultimately, entirely unsurprising: Britton's "stimulating paper served as the impetus for" Squire's study group (Squire, "Response" 2). What is, perhaps, more surprising is his utter lack of appearance in the remaining Papers: no throwaway mentions or special thanks. Indeed, other than re-printing his "Response to Literature" paper, Britton is almost non-existent in Squire's monogram, receiving two passing mentions by the other contributing authors, being directly quoted once—"personal experience as it operates through language in the English class thus has a quality not to be found in other areas of the curriculum" (Britton in Squire, "Response" 55)—and having two texts included in the selected readings section. All of this to say: while Britton certainly entered the Conference as one of the larger figures, when it comes to the post-Dartmouth official publishings, Moffett dominates him when it comes to citations and references. This, then, is a good indication of the role Moffett would soon play on both sides of the Atlantic.

The above is not intended to either discredit Britton's role at Dartmouth or to argue that he wasn't an important figure in Composition moving forward: far from it. Instead, I use these post-Dartmouth reflections to showcase just how quickly Moffett went from a somewhat unknown figure—not even being on the initial desired invite list—to becoming a 'voice' in the field, and in turn to demonstrate how unlikely it was pre-Dartmouth that he would become one of the major takeaways from the Conference, especially for British academics.

The Moffett/Britton Relationship Grows

Sheridan Blau posits that Moffett's post-Dartmouth work anticipates "the next two generations of sociocultural research and theory about rhetorical exigencies (Bitzer 1968; Miller 1984), situational learning (Lave and Wenger 1991), activity systems (Russell 1997), and classrooms as cultures (Green and Dixon 1993)" (85). Note here the mix of American and British scholars Moffett is credited with heavily influencing. Yet, despite this wide-ranging influence, I argue that the most important take-up of Moffett's work came in how he was adapted by Britton, and as such, theirs was the most important Trans-Atlantic relationship forged at Dartmouth. This is, perhaps, unsurprising. From their arrival at the Conference, they were already speaking the same educational language, even if they were using a different version of English to do so: "Both set out to offer English teaching a coherent rationale and ended with conceptions that transcended curriculum-subject perspectives and carried implications for the whole curriculum" (Burgess et al. 262).

It is indicative of the close ties between Moffett and Britton that Damien Koshnick's *Tracking Our Writing Theorists Through Citations* reveals that "James Britton was cited immediately alongside references to Moffett and his book *Teaching* [*the Universe of Discourse*] 57 times, far more than any other figure" (Koshnick 30). The most common connections, then, were articles about "modes as development," "audience," and, fittingly for my purposes, articles emphasizing "judgement on Moffett and Britton's influence" (Koshnick 385). In short, it is not revolutionary to state that Moffett influenced Britton or that the two academics pursued similar lines of research. What is, however, less discussed is the rarity that this relationship transcended national barriers, and even less so

the extent to which Britton's well-documented British influence on America was itself so deeply reliant on this prior American influence.

In her overview of Dartmouth, Annette Vee suggests that the relationship between Moffett and Britton may have ben prior to the Conference: "Moffett had published an article in *CCC* in 1963, which Britton had read and shared approvingly with the British group" (Vee, "Introduction"). Outside of this mention from Vee, however, I cannot find another reference to this Trans-Atlantic sharing: indeed, the only pre-Dartmouth 1960s *CCC* article from Moffett I *can* trace is from 1965, not 1963: "I, You, and It." This, as a reminder, was one of the three Moffett readings offered to *all* Dartmouth delegates prior to the Conference began. As such, it seems more likely that Britton came to this work via the Conference package than as a fortuitous pre-Dartmouth event.

Whether or not it was beginning to form pre-Conference, the relationship was certainly one that planners of Dartmouth wanted to continue fostering. In his post-Dartmouth letter to Caws, Squire suggests that "one possibility for international cooperation has already arisen. James Britton...one of the most thoughtful participants from the U.K. is beginning a sizable five-year study of student writing in the schools" (Squire, "Letter 1966" 3). Squire continues to explain that "several participants suggested that considerable value might accrue were James Moffett...able to work with the British project for a year, then return to this country to interpret some results and, if it seemed worthwhile, initiate a similar project over here" (Squire, "Letter 1966" 3). While Moffett did not, so far as records show, directly work on the aforementioned British project, his influence can be seen all over it, with Britton specifically citing him in the text that ultimately arose from it, *The Development of Writing Abilities in Children (11-18)*. Indeed, throughout the 1970s,

Moffett's work would become increasingly influential, "particularly in the 'British world'...being taken up in the writing models developed by James Britton and his associates at the London Institute of Education and driving 'Growth Model' English curriculum development" (Green, Sawyer, Burgess, 237).

The Discourse Category System(s) and WAC

Moffett's 1968 *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* is exclaimed (by virtue of the blurb of a 1984 re-edition) to appear "in virtually every bibliography dealing with language and learning." Indeed, in a glowing 1970 review, Janet Emig professes that in Moffett's book, "English education perhaps has been given its prolegomena" (Emig 422). Harris, meanwhile, extolls Moffett for creating a "system that can order and chart all the possible uses of language on a singular page," championing a version of writing that starts with "jotting down inner speech and dialogue" and concluding with "speculative or argumentative pieces" (Harris 15). Adapting "I, You, and It"—again, a reading from Dartmouth—Moffett's second chapter seeks to "piece together a theory of verbal and cognitive growth in terms of the school subject, basing it partly on present knowledge but definitely going beyond what can be proven" (Moffett, *Teaching* 15). This theory, Moffett insists, "is meant to be utilized, not believed" (15); in other words, as with much of Moffett's work, it is intended to be directly implemented in classrooms, not simply talked about. Moffett explains that the concept that most simply allows "us to think at once about both mental development and the structure of discourse" is "abstraction" (18). To this end, he provides two relations: "I-it," which concerns information, and "I-you," which concerns communication. For a "whole, authentic discourse" to be produced, these relations "must be crossed" (31). These relationships are defined by "how much the auditor already knows

what is in the mind of the writer and...how much awareness the speaker or writer needs...to know what cues or information to provide to compensate for the auditors missing knowledge" (Blau 92). Moffett creates a hierarchy of activities "in order of increasing distance between speaker and audience" (Moffett, *Teaching* 33), moving from reflection, to conversation, correspondence, and publication. Finally, Moffett also offers a "highly schematic representation of the whole spectrum of discourse, which is also a hierarchy of levels of abstraction" (47). Here, then, we move from recording, to reporting, generalizing, and theorizing. While Moffett argues that his "linear model falsifies a *lot*," in part due to its lack of multidimensionality (47-8; emphasis added), it would prove to be deeply influential across the Atlantic.

Following Dartmouth, Britton would develop a "discourse category system" of his own, proposing a "developmental model that considered (1) the functions or purposes that students' writing performed and (2) the audiences to whom students addressed their writing" (Durst 389). Here, then, Britton followed "Moffett's work directly in regarding 'who the writing is for' as reflecting a continuum from writing for, or close to, the self to a wider public audience" (Burgess et al. 264). Furthermore, "Moffett's rhetorical distance and abstractive altitude are retained in Britton's work, and are re-enforced by elaboration of categories of audience and by further distinctions made in the abstractive scale" (Burgess et al. 264). In 1975, Britton and other members of LATE would publish a landmark study wherein they "made explicit use of Moffett's discourse scheme" (Blau 85): *The Development of Writing Abilities in Children (11-18)*.[77]

[77] Per Britton: "I must acknowledge my colleagues in the project as jointly responsible for any strengths and weaknesses in that publication: Tony Burgess, Nancy Martin, Alex McLeod, and Harold Rosen" (Britton, "A Response" 183).

At the beginning of their study, Britton et al. acknowledge that there is a "great deal of research in America in the teaching of composition" but that this "yield[s] little in the way of a theory of discourse" (Britton et al, *Development* 7). There are, however, two noted exceptions. First, is "a recent study by [Janet] Emig"—*The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders*—which they posit "shows some interesting parallels to our own work," and "the work of James Moffett," who they openly say they will "be referring in detail to" (7). As a contemporary review of the study explains, it was "one important link in a chain of studies which had been in process for some time" (Rystrom 56). This chain, then, connects across the Atlantic from Moffett to Britton and then heads back across to America to influence Sommers, Flowers, Hayes, and other systematic American theorists.

The core focus of Britton et al.'s study was to find "related sets of categories which would allow" compositionists "to classify within a theoretical framework all the kinds of written utterance which occurs in schools" (Britton et al, *Development* 9). Thus was how they "became interested in James Moffett's scale of abstraction" (15). To whit: "the significance of Moffett's scale for us was in relation to the sub-categories of the transactional, and in applying it we found we needed seven categories in place of his four" (15). Britton et al. propose that there are two core sub-categories of transaction—the informative and the conative—and it is the former to which they directly apply Moffett (85). Their reason for expanding on the number of categories is stated to be "for practical purpose" (85): in short, the scope of the original categories, as Moffett had himself previously warned, is simply too limited for sustained use. Here, then, Britton and colleagues give us the following categories: **record**, **report**, generalized narrative, low-level analogic, **analogic**, speculative, and **tautologic** (149). The bolding, then, shows

Moffett's original categories, albeit with two name changes: Moffett's *generalizing* becoming *analogic*, and *theoretical* becoming *tautologic*. In short, through expanding upon the limitations of Moffett's initial categories, Britton et al. land on the version of discourse categories that re-cross the Atlantic.

It is, perhaps, concerning that the discourse categories that Britton would become synonymous with were based on work that Moffett had expressed to be heavily falsified. In other words, even though Britton and his co-authors did indeed expand upon Moffett's overly simple version of the categories, there is an argument to be made that the original creator's concerns about overly falsifying claims still stand. That Britton's work would be so heavily influential on the British education system—more below—raises the question that the newly overhauled system was based on a flawed premise. Britton's work on developing Moffett's category system would also soon head back across the Atlantic, where it was used by Arthur Applebee, who "adapted Britton's categories in large-scale studies that showed that writing in US schools was even more limited than in British schools" (Durst 389-90). Here, then, Britton's "classification of discourse" was adapted "into transactional, expressive, and poetic functions" (Russell, 162). In other words, Moffett's system crossed the Atlantic to directly influence Britton's system, which itself re-crossed the Atlantic to influence Applebee's iteration. This, then, is Trans-Atlanticism in action: ideas can freely travel the ocean and return to their home as an entirely evolved version of what initially left. Britton et al.'s project would, however, offer a secondary—and, ultimately, more influential—aspect of Composition for America.

In their attempt to create a "satisfactory way of classifying writing" (Britton et al. 1), Britton et al. gathered a sample of six pieces of writing each from a group of 500 student

candidates. These students came from "as many classes as possible, so that any sample…would be representative of a larger pool" (51). General findings included noting significant associations between the sex of students, the type of school they were enrolled in, their year in school, and the subjects they were currently taking. The actual writing in the corpus included two pieces from English classes, and "each of the remaining four pieces" were "taken from a different subject" (51). The reason for the split in subject matter is simple: the report is attempting to break the notion that "an English teacher has only to teach pupils 'to write' and the skill they learn will be effective in any lesson and in any kind of writing task" (3). In other words, through the report Britton et al. wish to voice their frustrations that "a learning process"—writing—"properly the responsibility of teachers of all subjects is left to the English teacher alone, and the inevitable failures are blamed upon him" (3). Instead, the core goal is to create "a system of categories which would overarch the disciplines and which would be refined enough for use to be able to say…that a piece of writing in geography and a piece of writing in science, irrespective of subject, were alike (or different) with regard to function or audience or context" (9). This system of categories was, again, indebted to the prior work of Moffett, and would directly fuel the origins of WAC, or "language across the curriculum" (LAC) as it would become known in the UK.[78]

The LAC initiative began when, following a series of small conferences, LATE published *Language Across the Curriculum* in 1969 (Bullock 192). Following this, other teaching groups—including the Association of Teachers of Mathematics (192)—became interested, and by the 1971 annual NATE conference, a "series of working groups on

[78] Moving forward I will be using WAC (writing across the curriculum) as synonymous with LAC (language across the curriculum) as, for all necessary purposes, they are essentially two names for the same concept: spreading composition education across all subjects, not just English.

various aspects of language across the curriculum" was taking place (192). These conferences would themselves directly lead to the Schools Council creating the "Writing Across the Curriculum" project, in the process coining the term we are familiar with today (Britton et al, *Development* 199). As a central figure of both LATE and NATE, Britton was at the center of these conversations from the beginning, and *Development* was, therefore, partially completed to provide a theoretical backing that had thus far been missing from the movement.[79]

Indeed, the text is indicative of Britton's overarching pedagogical aims: he "was not interested in teaching students formal conventions of specific disciplines or helping them use language to gain membership in a professional or academic group" (Durst 389), but instead wanted to demonstrate how language transcended discipline. The conception of a writing mode that transcends the boundaries of the curriculum would become the leading influence on the parliamentary Bullock Committee, and in the process would become the way British education would be formulated moving forward.

Why, though, was this specific report taken so seriously by the British education authorities? Well, for one, it was the largest study of its kind completed at the time. For another, it was the first major assessment of cross-discipline pedagogy following the aforementioned *Plowden Report* and the *Black Papers*. Furthermore, Britton et al. "found that there were some irreconcilable differences between the ways writers work, and the way many teachers and composition textbooks are constantly advising their pupils to set about their tasks" (Britton et al, *Development* 20). In short, for a government that was

[79] Moffett was also an early adopter of WAC pedagogy. Anthony Paré posits that in 1976's *A Student-Centered Languages Arts Curriculum,* "Moffett's comment that 'there should be a total program in discourse running laterally across subject fields as well as longitudinally over the years'...anticipates what became known as...WAC" (Paré 242).

interested in overhauling education across the nation, the study offers definitive flaws in the system to focus on resolving.

As well as highlighting the origins of WAC, the study attempts to answer the ever present question: "how important is writing, anyway?" (Britton et al, *Development* 201). While no satisfactory answer is found—and nor would we really expect it to be—this doesn't mean that the report doesn't make claims that will become leading ideas in Composition moving forward. For example, Britton et al. claim that a writer "is an individual with both unique and socially determined experience, attitudes and expectations" (9) foreshadowing the work of Elbow and other social theorists. Similarly, the London-based authors flag the importance of studying "the psychological processes involved in writing" as they are "not well understood" (19). Here, then, we see an early call-to-action for cognitive theorists like Flowers and Hayes. The work is also concerned with process theory—"as writing becomes more complex and its varying functions become distinguished and developed, so too do the processes by which the writing is achieved" (20)—and expressivism: the relationship of "expressive language…to thinking, seems particularly direct and this suggests its importance as a mode of learning at any stage" (11). In short, over the course of this singular study Britton and his co-authors hint at almost every major direction Composition will take in America over the coming decade or so.

In the Foreword to the 1983 reissue of *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, Moffett pays homage to the "rather direct testing of the developmental hypothesis in both the United States and the United Kingdom," in particular the work of Britton on the matter (Moffett, *Teaching* v). Here, then, Moffett quotes Britton, who himself is quoting Moffett: "What does come through" from Britton's research "is the firm nature of the association

between Moffett's abstractive scale and progress through years of schooling" (Britton qtd. Moffett, *Teaching* v).[80] Two years later, in an 1985 interview, Moffett would again openly recognize the similarity in the work he and the British were conducting: "We...were really working on very much parallel courses" (Moffett qtd. Tirrell 82). In other words, if there was any vague doubt that Moffett was unaware of how his work was taken up across the Atlantic, it can be put to bed.

Language and Learning

Britton would also directly pull from Moffett in 1970's equally influential *Language and Learning*, a treatise on how we learn language,[81] where he suggests readers spend time with *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* as a "theoretical study of the English curriculum" (Britton, *Language* 153). As well as this reading suggestion, Moffett makes multiple additional appearances. First, Britton explains that per "James Moffett, of the Harvard School of Education…'in order to generate some kinds of thoughts, a student must have *previously* internalized some discursive operations'" (77-8; emphasis original). Britton again draws on Moffett to help explain why instructors should re-center their classroom around children, as this is "when a speaker takes over a conversation and sustains some subject alone…[and] bears more responsibility for effective communication" (Moffett qtd. Britton, *Language* 92-93). Indeed, throughout his study Britton echoes the idea that closes Moffett's chapter on discourse: "The teacher's art is to move with this movement"—the growth of their student—"a subtle act possible only if he shifts his gaze from the subject

[80] See Britton "Language and the Nature of Learning," 1977.
[81] *Language and Learning* was published five years prior to *The Development of Writing Abilities*, but I cover it second purely as the latter work can be read as a direct follow-on to Moffett's project.

to the learner, for the subject is in the learner" (Moffett, *Teaching* 59). In other words, shifting the classroom from a subject-focus to a student-focus.

Moffett is the only American compositionist included in Britton's list of recommended texts, and is the only American Dartmouth delegate to make even a brief appearance throughout the book, aside from a singular reference to Squire (Britton, *Language* 154); British delegates like the Rosens, Barnes, and Dixon *do* appear, but they were known colleagues of Britton long pre-Dartmouth. This said, Britton does make heavy use of American linguists and psychologists: for example, in his second chapter, which focuses on the psychological issues with children learning language by copying adult speech, he pulls from Harvard psychologists Roger Brown and Ursula Bellugi (20), George Miller—"who is very much concerned with the way language works" (22)—and Susan Ervin (22). Elsewhere, Britton pulls from Noam Chomsky and Edward Sapir a great deal, and little of the book is not framed through the lens of Jerome Bruner's education theory. In short, the theory that Britton relies heavily upon is itself deeply indebted to American scholars, just not, for the most part, American Compositionists. Indeed, as the text is so overtly America-centric, perhaps the strangest omission here is Kenneth Burke: a lot of what Britton has to say is deeply reminiscent of Burkean terministic-screen theory, yet the direct connection to this is never to be found. This could, perhaps, be simply because Burke's *Language as Symbolic Action* was only published four years prior to Britton's book, but as more contemporary scholarship is cited, the absence is still surprising.[82]

[82] Also absent, any references to Lacan or Derrida; Lev Vygotsky, however, is *the* dominant European voice throughout. Durst posits that "Vygotsky's theories played an important role in Britton's constructivist view of mental development, particularly the idea…that learning has a strong social component rather than being an internal, individual process" (Durst 389).

Burke's absence aside, then, this Trans-Atlanticism is a major part of Britton's lasting legacy: he is among the first theorists to freely blend American and British scholarship to reach his goals, and he in no way remains confined to sticking within the wheelhouse of composition. This work, simply put, reads more like a bridge between psychology and rhetorical theory than the Composition theory Britton is otherwise known for. This, along with the WAC focus on *Development* points towards the biggest difference between British and American Composition studies: at the point where in America the field begins to fully solidify and draw definitional lines in the sand (in part through use of Britton's work), in Britain the field dissipated into a cross-disciplinary movement, more interested in generally changing curriculum than defining itself. Russel Durst points to the implicit irony in Britton, therefore, becoming part of the American canon: "while Britton pursued scholarship that helped to establish a discipline, he himself was a profoundly anti-disciplinary figure; he studied the role of language in teaching and learning in order to construct a pedagogical framework, but he opposed the idea of developing an academic area" (Durst 385).

Trans-Atlantic influence aside, for a moment, what was Britton actually trying to achieve via *Language and Learning*? According to Durst, it was "a framework for understanding the role of personal writing in students' language and intellectual development" (Durst 385-386) that would become "instrumental in countering the current-traditional approach" (389). This is, in many ways, the theory-heavy counterpart to *Development*: throughout the book, Britton muses about the various ways in which writing helps us "symbolize reality" (Britton, *Language* 6) while working through seemingly endless writing-heavy case studies. There is something deeply conversational about the

text that surprises me each time I return to it: this could, perhaps, be indicative of Britton's desire to ally himself with teachers more than scholars. Among the various take-aways from the text—such as the notion that learners "must practice language in the way a doctor 'practices' medicine" (72)—however, I personally find Britton's take on Standard English (SE) to be the most interesting, especially in light of the critique that can be easily held against the British compositionists of this era: it can, as explained in Chapter 3, be a little galling to read people espousing the importance of speaking in a local dialect while they themselves speak the forced RP of elitism. Here, then, Britton is quick to point out that "the term indicates in fact not one but many varieties of English. The [SE] in Glasgow differs from that used in Edinburgh that of Boston differs from that of San Francisco—and so on" (73). In short, despite "differences in vocabulary and…in syntax…these differences are of far less importance than the common intelligibility and the common functions of [SE]" (73).

Britton *seems* to make the case for SE *not* to be an elitist form of English used in the academy, but simply any form of the language that all other speakers of the language can actually understand. This, then, is markedly different from the version of SE that had haunted British—and American—academia previously: think, say, of the English that was being pushed in the 1800 Scottish universities and that was adopted by the early American academies, that explicitly focused on cutting out regional differences.[83] And yet, it's hard to not feel that Britton doesn't go far enough: while SE "will be the mother tongue of some…in our schools, others will have acquired it…by the time they leave" (74); in other cases "the question of whether…they should acquire it simply will not arise: other matters

[83] See Chapter 2 for more.

will be of obviously greater importance" (74). This, then, leaves the door concerningly wide open for just what "other matters" Britton refers to: in short, the sense of elitism never *quite* leaves. Indeed, it's interesting to read Britton's take on SE in the context of Mina Shaughnessy's deeply influential *Errors and Expectations*, a text that was published just 7 years later. Shaughnessy includes *Language and Learning* on her suggested reading list (Shaughnessy 300), so she was aware of Britton's text, and as such his version of SE *could* have proven to be influential on her own take on basic writing.

One final takeaway from the SE section: Britton goes to lengths to point out that "all living languages are subject to change" and, as such, there will always be a difference "between speakers of an early and a later generation" (Britton, *Language* 74). While this is, perhaps, a painfully obvious statement, Britton posits that "educators have often ignored this difference…and wasted a good deal of energy over battles they were destined to lose: battles to preserve…decent standards of speech: battles that were in reality attacks on quite trivial changes from the forms of their own speech" (74). This notion that language evolves and that what instructors think of as SE will never be what students personally use feels deeply modern to appear in 1970, and is something many contemporary instructors could stand to actually learn.

Bullock, Swann, and Cox: The Parliamentary Reports

To see the extent of Britton's influence on British and American education, one need look no further than "A Language for Life," known more commonly as the *Bullock Report*.[84] The 1975 Parliamentary *Report* pulled from "a random sample of 1,415 primary and 392 secondary schools" (Bullock xxxiii) to gain an understanding of the standards of English

[84] To offer the full title: *Report of the Committee of Enquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the Chairmanship of Sir Alan Bullock F.B.A.*

education and "reflect the organic relationship between the various aspects of English, and to emphasise the need for continuity in their development throughout school life" (xxxv). Furthermore, the Committee, of whom Britton was a member, tasked with putting the *Bullock Report* together "drew up a list of 66 individuals and 56 organisations" central to education from whom it needed to hear (xxxiii). Indeed, the Committee visited "100 schools, 21 colleges…and 6 reading or language centres" to gain as full a picture as possible (xxxiv). While the *Bullock Report* was *not* explicitly aimed at university level composition due to budgetary constraints, this is a common occurrence in these sweeping British appeals to reform: reform K-12 education to directly improve the universities, not the other way around. Furthermore, while *Bullock* does not explicitly acknowledge the *Black Papers*, it is hard to *not* read it as a direct response to their push for conservative reform.

From a Trans-Atlantic standpoint, the "Committee also studied…the practice of…other English-speaking countries" including "Canada, and the United States" (Bullock xxxiv). To help here, members "paid a visit to North America, studying developments in schools, colleges, and universities" (xxxiv).[85] Indeed, Bullock is quick to note how similar the report is to those published in America following the launch of Sputnik in 1957 (see Chapter 2). Despite this noted similarity, Bullock points out that "few British teachers would subscribe to…the attention to rhetoric and analysis in the teaching of composition" (5) that American education had begun to focus on. In their breakdown of American Composition, the Committee makes explicit use of Muller's *The Uses of English*,

[85] Specifically, CSU San Francisco, UC Berkeley, and the New York Reading Cooperative (583). I cannot help but wonder how visiting a wider variety of institutions—i.e. not mainly going to the Bay Area schools—would have led to the Committee having a warmer perception of American Composition.

demonstrating a way, albeit a small one, in which Dartmouth did influence proceedings. Indeed, later the *Bullock* briefly refers to "the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966, when British and American teachers of English met to discuss the subject in depth" (125). In other words, Dartmouth did *not* occur in the vacuum some would suggest, and at the extreme least the Trans-Atlantic meeting was still being felt a decade later, despite Britton being the only Dartmouth delegate to sit on the Committee. This said, there is no mention throughout the 609 pages of the report to the more contemporary Vancouver or York seminars, pointing again to their somewhat muted legacy. While the Committee explained that "it is difficult to compare standards objectively between…nations" (11), much of the early report offers direct comparisons between the percentage of British and American students undergoing various issues in English. This continued comparison is justified as "it is reasonable that the problems [studying America] reveals would also be found in some measure in" the UK (116).

Yet, despite the continued pulling from American Composition studies throughout, the Committee has a deeply negative reaction to "the 'freshman composition' course in some American colleges" (Bullock 343), as they see these as synonymous with "remedial" education (342). Obviously the American Composition of the 1970s was a different beast, but it is a little frustrating to read that "we believe that the students' own language should receive serious attention in college"—i.e. the work performed in First-Year English classes—but that "a separate 'remedial' course is not the best means" (343). In other words, there is a direct conflation between education that focuses on writing and the painfully remedial writing classes of the past: that this report released two years prior to *Errors and Expectations* is notable, as it shows the British already viewed American Composition as

an overly basic-writing focused regime before Shaughnessy's landmark text was released. At this stage, the Committee are also concerned that "such a course would [not] bring about any lasting improvement which would survive transfer from the narrow context in which it took place" (343), foreshadowing the on-going transfer conversation that post-process theorists would pick up decades later. Instead of remedial writing education, then, the Committee suggests using "the students' own spoken and written language as a starting point" and this will help them become "more explicitly aware of their own practices" (343). Britton's influence can be found all over this stance: it pulls directly from the on-going theory that encompasses *Language and Learning*, in particular his updated concept of what SE actually is and how it should be incorporated in education. Considering that *Bullock* was issued in 1975, three years after *CCC* adopted their Students Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) policy, it is tempting to also see the above as a direct British adoption of *this*; there is not, however, a more direct reference to SRTOL within *Bullock*'s 609 pages.

Britton doubles down on language equality during his "Note of Extension" (Britton in Bullock 554-5). Here, then, he applauds those instructors whose "methods appear to differ from" typical pedagogy "in that they promote the development of language uses which are effective within the narrowed context in which they operated" (555). Britton argues that breaking away from standards is "in the spirit of the best teaching of the humanities" as it is "directed towards a student's better understanding of himself and his potential in a multi-cultural and changing society" (555). Indeed, he also makes a stance against a singular SE as "any spoken form of English, be it cockney or Creole or anything else…can produce spoken or written utterances that have the status of 'literature'" (555).

Again, then, this has clear echoes of the position statement that is *Language and Learning*. Britton also points towards the split between expressive, poetic, and transactional language that is a core focus of *Development*, and that he adapted from Moffett's Dartmouth-era texts. Indeed, it's not too great of a stretch to argue that without the Moffett influence, in particular on *Development*, Britton's work on *Bullock* would have looked different, resulting in an entirely different model of British education developing. This, in turn, would have resulted in a deeply different version of American Composition: it was via the Bullock Commission that Britton most saliently argued for a language across the curriculum initiative, which was quickly adapted across the Atlantic as *writing* across the curriculum.

In his "Note of Extension" Britton "realise[s] that the problem" of teaching writing "affects all subjects of the…curriculum" (Britton in Bullock, 555). This is a notion reflected throughout the *Bullock Report*: "all our education depends on the understanding and effective use of English" and as such "The Report concerns all who have responsibilities in education" (iii). While WAC ideals are felt across the *Report*, Chapter 12 (118-197) exclusively focuses on promoting the "role of language in other areas of the curriculum than English" (188). It's notable that this chapter draws heavily from Britton et al.'s *Development*, again showing the influence the text held. Here, then, the Committee advocate for convincing "the teacher of history or of science, for example" that they need to pay "attention to the part language plays in learning" (188). While *Bullock* is deeply enthusiastic towards WAC, it recognizes that "there are still comparatively few schools which have introduced it as a policy" and that "it cannot be pretended that a policy of this kind is easy to establish" (192). WAC, then, is a major reason for why *Bullock* remains an important artifact almost fifty years later: it was the first major government document to

take WAC from the level of pedagogical theory and suggest applying it on a far wider level. In short, it brought the ideals of WAC to wider education policy in the UK, and in the process, the US. The Committee acknowledges that they cannot "endorse any one" singular approach to applying WAC to the curriculum as it "would be to produce a prescription that would not suit the circumstances of every school" (193). However the policy is enacted, "it would be important to establish a proper working relationship" between English and other departments. The Committee raises the concern that this English-heavy focus "might make it harder for the concept to win acceptance among the staff" (193). The big takeaway, however, is that the Committee believed "a policy for language across the curriculum should be adopted" across education, a recommendation that would become highly prominent in the *Cox Report* of 1989, and the founding of the first British National Curriculum that would follow. In short, *Bullock* is the founding block for the next fifty years of decentralized British language education, and as one of its core architects, Britton is largely responsible for this. It also helps further explain the lack of Composition as a singular subject within British education: since this time writing education has been spread across all departments, *not* a centralized sub-field of English.

It would, of course, be both naive and incorrect to simply say that "after *Bullock* WAC lived happily ever after in the UK." Indeed, by 1982 the Parliament issued *Bullock Revisited* which pointed to a lack of success: "only a minority (of schools) have been able to translate such a policy into effective practice" (Proctor 80). *Revisited* "place[s] most blame for…the shortcomings on teachers of subjects other than English" (83). This, however, just shifts the 'blame' if any is even to be had: *The Bullock Report* goes out of its way to explain that it *won't* offer any hardline suggestions on how WAC should be

achieved nationally, and thus it feels a little hypocritical to return half a decade later and express confusion that others did not get the ideas running. Nigel Proctor's "Bullock Refreshed" argues that the biggest issue is simply saying that there should be *one* language across the curriculum, and that there should actually be five: written, spoken, numerical, graphical, and physical (86). While I understand what Proctor is arguing—education authorities may be more inspired to push for across-curriculum policies if they see it as more than 'just' spreading the influence of English—there is a deeply flawed logic in thinking that an even more convoluted version of things would be more quickly picked up. Indeed, it would not be until the 1989 Parliamentary *Cox Report* that the goals of *Bullock* would be realized.

The *Cox Report* is itself a direct follow-up to the 1985 *Swann Report*[86] which echoes the concerns of *Revisited*: *Bullock* had great ideas but little had been done to ensure they were actually met. The *Swann* committee "fully support the principles and objectives of language across the curriculum as important to…education…and of particular relevance to the needs of ethnic minority pupils" (Swann, *Report* 416). Drawing from a NATE report, the *Swann* committee explains that WAC policies are so important that they cannot be "left to the vagaries of the system" (417). In other words, *Bullock* offered good suggestions, but by leaving their implementation to a disorganized education system little would occur. It fell to the *Cox Report* four years later to actually implement a National Curriculum that built upon what Britton, and therefore, *Bullock* had been arguing for over a decade earlier. To highlight its continued influence, Britton et al.'s *Development* is, once again, a referenced text. The National Curriculum is, however, a good example of birthing a

[86] Fully: *Education for All: The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*.

monster: in a 1991 interview, Britton is openly critical of those behind *Cox* for turning education into "a kind of market exchange" which Britton argues is "not *real* education" (Lobdell and Britton 5; emphasis original). That the head of the Cox Committee—C. B. Cox—had been a core member of the *Black Papers* group a decade earlier makes it unsurprising that the progressive ideals of *Bullock* would be twisted and commercialized. Since its 1989 inception, however, the National Curriculum has grown and ensured that WAC policies have ever since been part of British education, from the K-12 to university level.

To briefly draw from my personal experience of British WAC: in my first year of undergraduate studies in the UK, I was required to take a two-part "Introduction to Humanities Writing" and "Introduction to American Studies" course. These classes did not cover the exact material that our FYE classes do—for instance, the terminology drawn from ancient rhetoric was nowhere to be found—but the general concept was the same: the courses were designed to help transition students from the K-12 system to the discourse community of higher education (to borrow from Bartholomae). This, then, is a direct result of the work of Britton pushing WAC, which itself borrowed heavily from Moffett. In this sense, then, one could argue that the biggest lasting legacy of Trans-Atlantic Composition—and certainly Dartmouth—are the versions of WAC still found in both nations. While it would be too far to objectively state that Britton would not have found his way towards some form of category system that helped support his push for WAC without Moffett's influence, it is clear that Moffett's Trans-Atlantic influence was a major contributing factor to this field-defining moment.

The Moffett/Britton Trans-Atlantic Legacy; Or, Why This Matters Today

There is, perhaps, an irony in spending a chapter espousing the importance of Britton and Moffett for Trans-Atlanticism: both had publicly stated issues with the "pretension" of academia (Durst 386). Britton was "opposed to…[the] formality of university subject areas" (386), while Moffett never held higher education titles and offered little in the way of citing his fellow academics. Yet, it is impossible to understate how vital they were for the development of both nations, and the re-birth of Trans-Atlantic Composition: this, after all, is why I have spent so long with them here.

Despite the vital influence Moffett had as the first modern Trans-Atlantic Compositionist, there is a sense that he is now relegated, quite literally, to the footnotes. In the *Norton Book of Composition Studies*, for example, *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* doesn't receive a single cited reference, and Moffett is only directly referenced in five articles; Britton, in comparison, is cited in thirteen different articles, more than almost any other author.[87] Outside of the *Norton*, however, Moffett is a deeply cited author: *Teaching* alone has been cited by 2453 articles. Britton's two texts are even more widely cited: *Language and Learning* appears in 3070 articles, and *Development* in 3397 articles.[88] Indeed, as proof of his Trans-Atlantic importance, Britton "was one of the twenty most-cited authors in *CCC* between 1980 and 1994" and until the rise of Freire was "the only non-US figure in the group" (Durst 385). Notably for Moffett, British journal *Changing English* dedicated an entire special issue in 2010 to "Re-Reading James Moffett." While every single article included in here contains at least one moment where the author asks

[87] I use the Norton for my example simply because of how widely used it is in graduate level Composition History classes: it's likely many young compositionists' first wide exposure to the field, myself certainly included.

[88] Citation numbers accurate as of 03/31/22, per *Google Scholar*.

"how do we re-raise Moffett's profile today?", that a UK based journal was focusing an entire issue on an American compositionist decades after his final text had been published is, I would argue, indicative of the deep roots of his influence. Similarly, *CCC* offered a 1990 collection of essays titled "Re-Presenting James Britton"; the similarity in naming convention does not feel coincidental. Unlike Moffett, Britton was still alive at the time of *his* Trans-Atlantic reflection, so got to be part of the proceedings.

Britton's legacy in the US has long been traced. Joseph Harris, for example, argues that "Britton's main contribution was to portray the field of English not as an academic body of knowledge, [but as] that space in the curriculum where students are encouraged to use language in more complex and expressive ways" (Harris, *Teaching* 5). Furthermore, Durst argues that Britton "helped to legitimize collaborative research and writing in composition studies" (Durst 393). The various essays of "Re-Presenting James Britton" echo both Harris and Durst: Mary Kay Tirrell, for example, argues he popularized the "scholar/practitioner" concept (Tirrell 167). Tirrell also points out that "talking [as] a basic way of learning, remains…an undisputed and singularly important premise" and comes from Britton's two core books (167). For our purposes, however, Britton stands as the first major *modern* British influence on American Composition; in other words, he is the first major British influence since Blair, Bain, and the other Scottish rhetoricians of the 1700s and 1800s. Moffett, meanwhile, stands as the *first* major American influence of any kind on British Composition: he is the first stage when this Trans-Atlantic story stops being almost entirely one directional and becomes truly Trans-National. Furthermore, Moffett helped "transform, gradually, primary and secondary classrooms into places where talk was valued as a means of learning" (Andrews 255). Yet, as influential as Moffett was here,

it was ultimately Britton who proved to be the bigger influence on this shift, using Moffett's ideas. In other words, by influencing Britton's work, Moffett is the catalyst for the Trans-Atlantic moment that arguably birthed modern Composition theory, and without this cross-ocean work, Composition as a field would look markedly different. To reiterate, then: Moffett is the first major American influence on British Composition, and, in turn, Britton is the first major British influence on American Composition of the 20th century.

If we move away from the Trans-Atlantic nations and head towards Australia, however, Moffett and Britton's shared legacy becomes even clearer. The two scholars were so deeply influential on Australian Composition—which, to recall Chapter 3, was coming of age around the Trans-Atlantic conferences that immediately followed Dartmouth—that in 1980 both were invited to be co-keynote speakers at the Sydney International Federation for the Teaching of English (Beavis 297). Furthermore, to this day the core composition curricula of New South Wales and Victoria directly uses excerpts from *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* alongside work from "Britton, Dixon, Martin, Barnes, Rosen" and other British compositionists (303). In other words, when any concept of a Trans-Atlantic split is removed, Moffett is simply used alongside British authors as though they are one and the same. This brief sojourn away from the UK and US helps showcase two things: 1) how thin the line is between Trans-Atlantic scholars once we stop getting bogged down in notions of different historical exigencies; 2) what further research needs to be done for a Global-Composition version of this project.

The Myth of Contemporary Trans-Atlantic Decline

Moffett and Britton are, I argue, *the* quintessential proof of Trans-Atlanticism. As such, the stage is now set to bring this Trans-Atlantic history to the present day. Beginning in the

late 1980s, a series of education reforms in the UK created an environment ready for the adoption of American Composition pedagogy across the country. As I explain in depth, these reforms centered around the 1992 *Education Act* that allowed for the university system to rapidly grow, which in turn allowed for a far greater part of the British populace to enter higher education, creating a situation similar to post-Vietnam America. While these attempts at bringing American education to the UK weren't all successful—as an extended case study of the work of Alex Baratta demonstrates—they are proof, I argue, of how viable Trans-Atlanticism is when it is allowed to flourish. This final Chapter focuses almost exclusively on US-to-UK Trans-Atlanticism: I find it fitting that a story that began with an almost entirely one-way transfer of pedagogy would reverse course in its conclusion. Contemporary Trans-Atlanticism, then, offers a glimpse of what British Academic Writing looked like before the 2008 recession and Brexit stemmed its growth, and, therefore, what it could look like again.

Chapter Five: The Myth of Contemporary Trans-Atlantic Decline

Thus far in this work, we have moved from the ancient universities—Oxbridge, St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh—to the Dissenting Academies, through the early UK influence on the US, the much discussed Dartmouth Conference, and the relationship between James Moffett and James Britton. What, however, of contemporary Trans-Atlanticism? As discussed in the last chapter, there is a notion that, following Dartmouth, there was little in the way of Trans-Atlantic sharing between the UK and US, which, to an extent, is what makes the Moffett/Britton relationship so important: it is seemingly the exception, not the rule. Indeed, part of the reason I began this project was because there *doesn't* seem to be a contemporary British Composition studies: on the surface, at least, our story *does* seem to end here. This, then, is the myth I will dispel in this final historical stretch: Trans-Atlantic Composition *is* alive—it has simply evolved.

To dispel this myth, I first trace the remaining years of British Composition up until Brexit—the opening exigency of this project—upended everything. As I explain in depth below, the keystone year for this new British direction is 1992: in short, this year allowed Polytechnic colleges to become universities, which itself led to the creation of government quality assessment tables and, eventually, the implementation of student fees a few years further down the line. These three reforms, I argue, are all equally central to *why* discernible Composition studies arrive in the UK: they are the combined catalyst for the Trans-Atlantic story reversing direction and becoming a multiple-decade spat of America-to-England influence. In many ways, then, this final historical chapter acts as an echo of my first: where

in the 1800s, America had little in the way of a Composition studies of its own and therefore directly adapted the British model; starting in the 1990s, the UK adapts America's. Where, however, the British pedagogy of the Ancient Universities and the texts of the Scottish universities were freely adopted across early America, here we find British scholars using the preceding century of American Composition research to pick and choose the exact version that fits their needs. The above is not to say there is no British-to-America transfer during this contemporary era, it simply isn't as common *or* as boundary-shaking, and thus is not focused on in this chapter.[89]

Here, then, I walk through the major contemporary[90] adoptions of—and adaptations from—US Composition in the UK. From here, I move to an extended walkthrough of the work of Alex Baratta, an American who spent a decade attempting to bring FYE to the UK. I frame Baratta as a mirror to my own academic journey. Baratta serves as a cautionary tale of not only trying to force a 1:1 Trans-Atlantic connection, but trying to do so on the back of misconceived notions of just what American Composition is. I then finish the chapter, and in turn my history, by discussing the somewhat bleak current existence of Academic Writing (to use the British term) in the UK. In short, this chapter sets the stage for presenting contemporary approaches for both sides of the Atlantic to make the most of this undiscussed shared history.

British University Reform: 1992-2006

To best understand the current situation in the UK, the reforms in Higher Education that occurred across the 1990s and 2000s need to first be laid out. While these reforms were

[89] For example, David Russell's 1995 "Collaborative Portfolio Assessment in the English Secondary School System" argues for reorienting US college-entrance testing to reflect that of the UK; as of 2022 his calls have remained unsuccessful.
[90] A term I use loosely here to refer to events that fell in my own lifetime.

not, in themselves, aimed at bringing writing to the forefront of education, they are crucial for creating a system where writing could become a norm across all majors. Prior to the 1980s, British Higher Education remained—despite ground efforts to make it otherwise—the realm of the elite. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams defines this as any education system wherein less than 15% of the eligible population has access. Between 1987 and 1992, however, "student participation in Higher Education nearly doubled" breaching the threshold between "elite and mass higher education" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxi). This rapid growth continued, and "by 1995 32[%] of the population under 30 had entered the sector" (Ivanič and Lea 7). Thus, British Higher Education was "in the process of becoming a 'universal system'" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxi).[91] As such, "a consequence of these increased numbers and the diversification of student backgrounds that accompanied them" was "the need for new teaching methods and the need to be more explicit about writing practices" (xxi). This, as anyone with even a vague knowledge of the US story will know, is essentially a British version of the post-GI Bill era: "as a result of the unprecedented rise in student numbers, academic members of staff are teaching larger and larger classes, and are spending less and less time with individual students" (Ivanič and Lea 7). As explained in Chapter 2, the 1963 *Robbins Report* had already attempted to prepare the British university system for an influx of Baby Boomer children coming of age, but the continued elite nature of who enrolled implies it was working three decades too early. With the uptick that began in the 80s, however, universities were increasingly "held accountable to public interest, and…to the requirements of graduate employment" leading

[91] For reference, in 2021—the most current numbers—~37% of university age British students entered the system (Bolton 4). This is far shy of a 2003-set goal of "50 per cent of 18-30-year-olds in higher education by 2010" (Ivanič and Lea 7), although the pandemic is logically partially responsible for holding these numbers back.

"government policy-makers for educating" to attempt to establish "targets for key skills—including skills in writing—that students should attain" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxii). As such, British educators in the mid-90s and early 2000s increasingly began looking towards just how America dealt with its version of the influx issue decades earlier, and ultimately fell upon the revamping of Composition.[92]

In 2000, 124 staff and faculty members across all universities in the UK were surveyed, and 111 (90%) felt that writing should, indeed, be taught at the university level (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxv). In other words, along with government concerns, the desire was notably there on an academic level too. Before moving forward with this history, then, it is necessary to pause to ask why writing had previously not been considered a necessary part of UK Higher Education. Here we have to turn our attention to the vastly different secondary school education in the UK compared to the US. Whereas, generally, K-12 students in America take a general education throughout their time—with specialized AP classes being available—the UK essentially ends this general education when students complete their General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) exams.[93] One of the compulsory GCSEs, then, is English: students taking the direct route to graduation take a combined course, while those seeking to continue English education at a higher level take separate Language and Literature courses. When these GCSEs were implemented in 1988,

[92] In multiple texts from this transitional era, there is a sense of authors bemoaning the loss of the gated elite system: Ivanič and Lea, for example, point out the issues of "a system which now precludes most students from receiving the individual, discipline-based tuition that was available with higher education was an elite rather than a mass system" (Ivanič and Lea 7). This *is* a fair concern: too many students with too few staff *does* mean that it becomes impossible to offer the same level of one-to-one education. *However*, I struggle with the continued adherence of the term "elite": it implies, for me, that the issue is less with the quantity of students, and more with the quality.

[93] As a good example of the UK *not* being united on education policy, the GCSE only applies to England, Wales, and Northern Ireland: in Scotland, students instead complete Scottish Qualifications Certificates.

students could choose to leave education upon their completion at age 16.[94] Students who continued to stay in education would then either take two years worth of Advance Level (A-Level) classes, or take classes at a college; these colleges, commonly known as Polytechnics, were *not* degree-granting institutions and thus were explicitly considered distinct from the university system.[95]

The education UK students undertake from 16-18 mirrors the early years of American university education: classes become more specialized, class sizes become smaller, and the general conceit is for students to take specific A-Levels that "provide discipline-specific preparation for the subject" they then "specialise [in] at university" (Ivanič and Lea 6).[96] A result of this system, then, is that students could effectively take their last ever English class—the space where writing instruction occurs in the UK—as they turn 16 and finish their GCSE requirements, and then those who enter the university system would *still* not receive any writing instruction, on the logic that it had already been taken care of. Furthermore, "this lack of practice in writing would not" be "considered a disadvantage" as most "degree subject[s] would not have been seen to require much writing" (7). In other words, the pre-reform British system (and, to an extent, the current iteration) simultaneously downplayed the importance of writing in education, while

[94] This was raised to 18 by the 2008 *Education and Skills Act*.
[95] See Chapter 2 for a breakdown of the hierarchical difference between the university and colleges in the UK.
[96] I, for example, initially intended to pursue a law degree, so took A-Levels in Law, English, History, Geography and Psychology. I gained a love for English and History, so instead pursued an American Studies degree. *This* degree, then, required A-Levels in English, History, and at least one other humanities adjacent subject. I use this example to show how finely students have to thread their future career needles at age 16: had I taken different A-Levels, this particular path would have been closed to me before it could begin, and I would not be writing this. Case in point: throughout K-12 I wanted to pursue a degree in marine paleontology, yet because I could not take the right GCSE electives, I was blocked from the required A-Levels, which meant a science degree was impossible. For this reason, I will always appreciate the American choose-your-own-adventure approach that allows students to actively make decisions once they are old enough to understand the repercussions of their choices.

ensuring that those who didn't continue to take a writing-intensive degree program would have little to no resources to gain help.

The point of this breakdown of the pre-reform British system is not, entirely, to offer critique: there are, ultimately, advantages to allowing students to specialize early, as it helps ensure a 3-year degree program is not only viable, but is the national standard; in short, by cutting out any and all general education, British students can get straight into the proverbial meat of their degree immediately. Instead, I mainly want to paint a picture of how, and how not, students were being prepared for writing in Higher Education. In short, the university system was in no way designed to handle the expansive growth in the student body that occurred: whatever deep flaws early US Composition had, at least it existed. In the UK, on the other hand, any form of writing help was considered remedial and thus entirely left to the Polytechnics: for many, they were an entry-way to university education, similar to US Community Colleges, albeit with an even lower hierarchical standing in the elitist system. In short, until a mere 30 years ago, there was a distinct binary between 'elite' universities and Polytechnics.

It was, therefore, something of a shock to the aging system when the 1992 *Further and Higher Education Act* "abolished the binary divide between polytechnics and universities, bringing them together for administrative and funding purposes under one body, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)" (Ivanič and Lea 7). For a moment that forever changed British Higher Education, the language of the 1992 *Education Act* is minimalistic: "the Universities Funding Council and the Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council…shall be dissolved, and all property, rights and liabilities to which either of the existing councils were entitled or subject…shall become…property,

rights and liabilities of the" HEFCE (Further, Part II, Section 63, [1 a-b]). In short, the governmental definition of "higher education institution" was simplified to include any space in which students could continue their education post-A-Level (Further, Part II, Section 65, [5]). What this in itself meant was that aging and prejudiced distinctions that prevented Polytechnics from granting degrees were now lifted: while these institutions still had to explicitly apply to become degree offering spaces, the path was now open. The effect was dramatic: following the passing of the *Education Act*, 33 English Polytechnics, three Scottish, one Irish, and one Welsh officially became Universities.[97] To this day, these are known in the UK as the 'new' universities, despite having been operating for three decades. Following this initial burst, a further three 'new' universities have been formed from Polytechnics; in total, then, the 1992 *Education Act* has allowed for the creation of 41 degree offering institutions, vastly increasing the access to Higher Education for British students. The 1992 *Education Act* is, therefore, at least partially responsible for the aforementioned jump of 15% to 32% of eligible students gaining degrees across the early 90s. Despite this, the prejudice against the former Polytechnics remains, "even though we now have whole cohorts of graduates which were born after 1992, even though the 'post 1992' universities have now all been universities for longer than they were polytechnics" (Ratcliff, "The End"). In short, even thirty years on some *still* see the binary divide.[98]

Despite resistance, the addition of the former-Polytechnics to the university system marked the beginning of further shifts in UK Higher Education that made the system more prepared for Composition Studies pedagogy, in particular WAC initiatives. As explained

[97] These include Anglia Ruskin University, University of Greenwich, and University of Gloucestershire.
[98] See the Top 20 table (2.1) in Chapter 2 for evidence of this: other than the University of Manchester, itself only a New University by date coincidence, is included.

above, the traditional British model was regimented: students would arrive prepared to study their singular major, and, over the course of three years, experience a predetermined series of courses. The Polytechnics, on the other hand, offered modular degree programs, which "allow[ed] students to follow their own pathways to degree completion" (Ivanič and Lea 8), and continued to follow this model once they became Universities. This 'new' model, then, is considerably closer to that which exists in America and allowed British students to "combine courses from different fields of study" (8) for the first time, encouraging interdisciplinary pedagogy. In short, prior to the 'upgrade' of the Polytechnics, the concept of a biology student taking a writing class—for, hopefully obvious, example—was unheard of in the UK, and without this vital move, writing classes that are taken by all majors would be simply impossible to implement in the UK. Indeed, perhaps the biggest difference the late adoption of modular courses made is that, right from the beginning, the UK was more invested in WAC and WID initiatives than traditional Composition (the fact that the term WAC, as explained in Chapter 4, is a British one is not lost on me). In other words, "because UK university students specalise within disciplines very early in their degree programmes, many of those now teaching and theorising Academic Writing in UK Higher Education are drawing upon WAC and WID concepts…rather than looking to the model of the general first-year writing course which features so prominently in [the] US" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "Introduction" 52). Sally Mitchell and Alan Evison support this claim: at Queen Mary, University of London they "were able to draw directly on several decades of pedagogical research and practical experience from US…WAC and WID…programmes…to equip academics to recognise writing as a valuable learning process and to support writing effectively in their courses"

(Mitchell and Evison 72). Furthermore, due to the "early focus on discipline specific learning…WID rather than WAC has become *the* operative term for UK writing programmes" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "Introduction" 52; emphasis added). In other words, British education administrators were introduced to the concept of interdisciplinary university modularity at the same time that they had to first truly deal with educating a far larger portion of the public than before, so it does make a certain sense that these two ideas would gel together.

At the same time as Polytechnic modular education allowed for early forays into cross-curricular writing instruction, another factor forced the hand of reluctant universities: the birth of league tables. The 1992 *Education Act* established, for the first time, "a committee, to be known as the 'Quality Assessment Committee'" (Further, Part I, Ch I, Section 9, [1], [b]). The goal of this committee was simple: to quantify "the 'quality' of provision for students in different subjects at different universities" (Ivanič and Lea 9).[99] This government assessment quickly evolved into tables ranking the various institutions, albeit strictly for funding use. The first of these tables, then, found that "academic literacy support for students" should "be seen as a marker for good provision" (9). This created a problem for the 'old' universities: until now, writing provision was "only…found in polytechnics for 'less academic' students, or in universities taking in large numbers of students for whom English is a foreign language" (9). Now, however, it was "becoming more or less a requirement for every university in the country" (9): cynical though it is, government funding is a good motivator to improve access for students. Even with this government mandated push for improved writing education, however, in many institutions

[99] In other words, the quality of services provided.

it "developed as a form of support provision rather than as a subject," leading to writing to remain marginalized "except…when the quality assurance inspectors are visiting" (10). This concern of support vs. subject is a continued aspect of Alex Baratta's decade spanning work on bringing Composition to the UK, but more on that below.[100]

Concerns raised in the earliest government quality assessment reports would themselves lead to the 1997 *Dearing Report*.[101] subtitled *Higher Education in a Learning Society*. This lengthy report covers many topics—from introducing student fees to overhauling student complaint procedures—but for our purposes, it is most notable for highlighting the importance of internationalizing. Here, then, the argument is that "with English likely to remain the predominant international language, the UK has a natural advantage" at attracting international students (Dearing, 8.31). Success here, however, "will be highly dependent on the quality of learning materials" (8.31). *Dearing* also considers how students are being prepared for the job market, where, "professional skills include the ability…to be able to communicate ideas in writing and orally to a variety of audiences" (11.84). Here, then, it is recommended that "special provision for some students who may previously have had limited experience in this area" be made (11.84). Alice Tomic highlights that *Dearing* also "built bridges between the US and UK higher education systems by focusing on skills perceived by both…as significant" (Tomic 56). Indeed, of the various governmental Higher Education reports of the 20th century, *Dearing* has the most references to US education since *Robbins* in 1963.[102] I argue, then, that this

[100] The 1999 *Moser Report* notes that "roughly 20% of adults…have more or less severe problems with…'functional literacy'" (Moser 2). In response to this, the government sponsored the creation of University for Industry (UFI) initiatives that acted like the pre-1992 Polytechnics: they became support spaces for those who did not attend university but still sought writing help.
[101] In full, *Higher Education in a Learning Society*.
[102] *Robbins* features 55 references to the "United States" and a further 14 to "American"; *Dearing* features 8 references to "United States" and 8 to "American." In comparison, the closest level of references elsewhere

demonstrates a notable turn away from the isolationism of the *Black Papers* era discussed in Chapter 4.

As well as needing to work out how to adequately comply with government mandated writing provision, the universities had another issue: who would help run these classes or support centers? In short, "teachers of writing in the UK are rarely English Literature graduates" and there was no Composition Studies to draw instructors from (Ivanič and Lea 10). Instead, writing instructors are housed from "Linguistics, Applied Linguistics…TEFL, Social Sciences, Anthropology, or Social Linguistics" (10). This is, of course, deeply different to the American situation, and is much more linguistics-heavy than would, perhaps, be expected.

While the government's quality assessment tables were intended purely for funding purposes, it did not take long for the British media to capitalize on the idea and begin publishing their own league tables.[103] This would, in and of itself, have two key effects: first, it helped cement concepts that certain campuses were simply superior to others, with names like Oxbridge constantly topping tables. Secondly, however, it promoted competition between campuses: the public was now being encouraged to be more keyed into what made different institutions strong, and thus there was a perception to aim for like never before. This perception issue would become all the more important when, in a move first suggested in the *Dearing Report*, the passing of the 1998 *Teaching and Higher Education Act* allowed for both "fees payable by" students (Teaching, Introduction); in

---

are found in the 1999 *Moser Report*, with two references to each term. The 1988 *Kingman Report* and 1997 *Kennedy Report* both feature one singular reference to each term, while the 1978 *Oakes Report* and 1985 *Jarratt Report* feature none. As such, *Dearing* is positively full of Trans-Atlantic crossover in comparison.

[103] The actual date of the first media-driven table is oddly hard to discern: an article from 2002, for example, makes it clear that the both "the Guardian" and "Times Higher Education" had been publishing tables long enough to draw ire from those who saw the tables as a mere excuse to "sell newspapers" (Beckett, "Serving"), yet the actual *Times Higher Education* report allegedly didn't exist until 2004.

other words, the previously fully government-funded university system would now require personal student funding. Fees would remain fixed for all institutions—to promote equity, I imagine—until the 2004 *Higher Education Act* declared that universities could set yearly fees anywhere between £0-£3000 (Higher). A direct result of this shift in fee expectations, for our purposes, is that "students [would] come to expect increased student services, including writing support" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxv). Furthermore, the shift in funding created a new need for student work: "because university education" had been free "it was unusual for any student to need to take paid employment during term time" (Devet et al. 207). This, in turn, meant that universities had no real reason to create student jobs. Now, however, "the changes to students' financial position" meant it was "in our institution's interests to supply safe, valuable work opportunities for students" (208). In other words, not only did the shift in funding create a new expectation in student services—like writing centers, for example—but it also directly created a student workforce to man those services. In short, it created both the problem and the solution.

To recap, then: the period of great expansion of the British university system that began in the early 1990s, was a contributing cause to the Polytechnic colleges being offered university designation. At the same time, the UK government began issuing the first quality report tables, placing universities in direct competition with each other. One of the core areas highlighted for national improvement was offering writing help to all students. As the former Polytechnics had already been offering this help, their teaching pedagogy and modular course design was adopted across the university system, as older institutions struggled to adapt. All of the above coincided with tuition fees being implemented for the first time, leading students to begin making greater demands of what their education should

bring: it would no longer be enough to study for three years and have a fancy certificate. At the heart of all the above, then, is a system that is being reshaped to focus on writing skills in a way it never had a reason to be before. It is, therefore, to this struggle that British writing scholars respond, and as they did not have a defined field to draw from, they turned towards America. In short, the above series of interconnected exigencies are, I argue, the reason our Trans-Atlantic story fully reverses course from where it started in the 1700s, and it is America that becomes the source of pedagogical ideas.

Bringing American Composition to Britain: Reversing Trans-Atlanticism

Multiple 2000's era attempts to solve the question of how to bring Composition to the British market are collected in the Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams edited *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*. That this text released the same year variable student fees were officially enacted offers a sense of urgency to proceedings: to campuses that weren't already prepared for new student demands, things had to change quickly. Among the goals of the text is to "add to the knowledge pool of US scholars and those from other countries whose views on teaching may have been informed…almost exclusively by US Composition pedagogy and scholarship" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxiii). In other words—and as I have stressed throughout this project—breaking the illusion that just because other areas don't have specifically named Composition degrees or classes, doesn't mean that the knowledge base and research interest hasn't developed. Indeed, Ganobcsik-Williams points out that "the founding of UK and European Academic Writing organisations, the publication of cross-national comparative work on the teaching of writing, and a burgeoning international participation in US, European and UK writing conferences demonstrates that Academic Writing scholarship is becoming unmistakably—

and irreversibly—cross-cultural" (xxiii). Ganobcsik-Williams also posits that "the use of WAC and WID in this collection is a key example of cultural cross-over inherent in the field of Academic Writing" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "Introduction" 52). In short, the era of American pedagogy freely traveling to the UK had begun.

Each text in the last section of *Teaching Academic Writing*—the appropriately titled "Responding to Other Models"—focuses specifically on looking towards America, and, in one case, Australia, for potential inspiration *and* issues. John Heyda's "Sentimental Education," for example, offers a basic history of US Composition, before arguing that Compositionists only hold onto problematic elements of the field out of sentimentality (in a way, my overall argument of breaking the traditional historical canon speaks to this). Elsewhere, Mary Jane Curry's "Skills, Access, and 'Basic Writing'" offers a case study of a US Community College[104] to demonstrate "the shortcomings of the skills model of teaching Academic Writing" and to "highlight issues of concern to educators and policy-makers who are involved in widening participation in post-compulsory education" in the UK (Curry 181). The most interesting text from this selection, however, is Joan Mullin's "Learning From—Not Duplicating—US Composition Theory and Practice."

Mullin is, to put it bluntly, using First-Year English as an example of how not to do things in the UK. In short, "there is a cautionary tale" in the "disturbing disconnect between writing research and the actual practice of teaching writing" in the US (Mullin 167). Specifically, there are three elements within US Higher Education that demonstrate this disconnect: "the discreet writing classroom, the placement test, and the textbook-

[104] Curry uses the pseudonym "Monroe Community College" (184) and offers little in the way of hints as to the real name of her subject.

driven curriculum" (168). To avoid this disconnect, then, Mullin makes four core suggestions for British instructors and administrators to follow:

1. use research to "build a well-regarded body of interdisciplinary knowledge that informs teaching writing";
2. "involve colleagues in writing across the curriculum";
3. "establish writing centers" to bridge "the research-practice gaps";
4. "engage the public to change the perception of writing as a simple and finite set of skills" (175).

Here, then, we find four suggestions that I would hope most American programs now follow: in other words, Mullin's cautionary tale is less "avoid the current mistakes of America" and more "avoid the historical mistakes that Americans are now actively trying to overcome." This said, the first three of Mullin's suggestions can be found throughout the various 1990s-2000s British attempts to create writing programs, so they were clearly listened to. Indeed, Mullin will eventually become a key influence in the work of Alex Baratta—the focus of my next subsection—appearing in almost every article he has penned on bridging Trans-Atlantic gaps. What, however, of more practical applications of US pedagogy in the UK?

The first "university in the world" to be accredited by both US *and* UK certification boards was Richmond University in London (Tomic 56-7). Since the 1980s, a two-semester "Principles of Writing" course has been taught by "a mixture of English Literature faculty and part-time staff…most [of whom] were British or American" (58). In short, American-inspired First-Year Composition has been taught—in some form—in the UK for over three decades. Alice Tomic explains that as the "Principles" course grew, "it became clearer that

the issue of student writing had a direct connection with the interest the faculty members had in *whether their students were learning*. In other words, we had the beginning of a…WAC initiative" (59; emphasis original). To support this growing initiative, Tomic appointed Catherine Davison, "a US academic…who had studied…Professional Writing" at the University of Southern California (59). Davidson, in turn, introduced her new British colleagues to "the latest US writing theory and practice" (59): "the work of Toby Fulwiler…and Anne Herrington…and others in the forefront of WAC" along with "people like Irene Clark…Gail Hawisher and Cynthia Selfe," bringing new pedagogical strategies to Richmond (59-61). Swales's "book on genre," Tomic attests, was particularly popular as he "seemed to have the same transatlantic approach that we felt we had" (60). Tomic explains that "the impact of these [pedagogical] discoveries was profound" on Richmond University: "the profile of writing in the institution was highlighted [and] those hired to teach it were increasingly highly qualified" (61). In short, the situation at Richmond is an early indication of how positive Trans-Atlanticism can be for British education.

Richmond, of course, was in a unique position to implement American Composition: it is, after all, a literal Trans-Atlantic institution. What, therefore, of other British universities? Among the first—perhaps *the* first—FYE style program is found at Anglia Ruskin University (ARU). To briefly return to my history above, ARU was one of the 33 Polytechnics to gain university status in 1992: as such, that it was the site of one of the earliest adopters of Composition thus supports my argument that this particular shift was vital to our story. Between 1997-9 a two-semester course—"Varieties of Speaking and Writing I and II"—was developed to "focus on the acquisition and development of advanced communication skills within the discipline of English studies" (Young and Avery

89). These courses would later be renamed "Introduction to Critical Argument" and "Introduction to Writing," bringing them all the closer to common Composition terminology (89). The biggest difference, perhaps, is that, at ARU, these courses are only "compulsory for all English undergraduates" *not* all undergraduate students (89). Even so, these courses were clearly responding to concerns raised by the *Dearing Report* as "the skills acquired are crucial not only for successful academic study but for future employment" (89). While discussing the development of these courses, Tory Young and Simon Avery note a major difference between US and UK education models, that arguably undermines any Composition education: "at Anglia Ruskin and at many other UK institutions" requirements relating to student parity of experience mean that "academic staff are discouraged from reading drafts of student writing" (96). This, of course, fundamentally alters how our classes work: this limited British experience essentially means that the draft-and-revise process of American Composition is gated.

As mentioned briefly above, in 1999 Mitchell and Evison drew upon a mix of American WAC research along with the "significant insights drawn from UK research and practice" (Mitchell and Evison 72) to create Queen Mary, University of London's cross-curricular "Thinking Writing" program (71). This program was influenced by "Cornell and other US institutions" (72), along with the research of "Bazerman and Russell (1994), Bean (2001), Gottschalk and Hjortshoj (2004)" and the WAC Clearinghouse (83). In short, "Thinking Writing" was heavily influenced by American Composition research. Indeed, Queen Mary's program was so successful that representatives were "invited…to attend Cornell's Summer Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines…in 1999, 2000 and 2001"

(72). Notably, it was "the first non-American university to participate in the consortium" (72).

In 2004, following "over eight years of discussion," Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams set up the Center for Academic Writing (CAW) at Coventry University (CAW, "History"). The initial intent was to create a writing center in the UK, although over the years the center has grown to "engage in writing research that is recognised internationally" (CAW, "History"). CAW was the third ever US-modeled writing center in the UK, and the first to be fully centrally funded, and as such "has served as a model upon which other universities have drawn" (Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams 197-8).[105] To create the CAW, Ganobcsik-Williams "engaged a US writing center" along with a WAC "colleague and an Australian learning centre colleague as joint consultants" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "Reflecting" 506), namely Joan Mullin and Jan Skillen (508). To avoid the stigma still connected to writing help, the initial proposal for the CAW took efforts to not use "terms such as 'skills'...and any sense of being a remedial centre" (Noon qtd. Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams 191). In "Peering Across the Atlantic," Devet et al. make an argument for *why* American style peer tutoring was not common in the UK before this point: due to the specialized nature of UK degrees, as opposed to the general nature of US ones, it was simply harder to match a peer with someone who would actually benefit from their specialized knowledge.[106] The shift towards interdisciplinary modular education, however, opened up a space that could not be present before.

[105] The first was at Newcastle Polytechnic (now Northumbria University) in 1979; the second was at the University of Glasgow in 2002 (Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams 198). Note, yet again, the role the Polytechnics played in this early implementation.

[106] The example Devet et al. use for a strong US peer tutoring model is our very own University of South Carolina writing center (Devet et al. 197).

As well as becoming a blueprint for UK based writing centers, in 2012 the CAW "launched the first taught postgraduate programme in academic writing in the UK and Europe" (CAW, "History"). Here, then, students are offered three different tracks: an MA in Academic Writing Theory and Practice, a Postgraduate Diploma in Academic Writing Theory and Practice, and a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Writing Development (Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams 199). The programs are still in operation, with course listings for 2022-23 currently available online, albeit not through UCAS, the UK's main University and Colleges Admissions Service: see below for more. Current graduate students can, then, study courses in "Teaching and Supporting Academic Writing," "Writing Centre and Writing Programme Development and Management," "Writing in the Disciplines," and "Academic Writing in a Multimodal World" (CAW, "Academic"). In short, extremely similar courses as one finds in an American Composition degree.

It is, once again, notable that Coventry was also a former Polytechnic (in this case Lancaster Polytechnic). I argue that they—the Polytechnics—are to modern British Composition what the Dissenting Academies were to the earliest form of our field: by specifically working towards helping an audience traditionally left out of the university system, they became the leading edge of pedagogy that ultimately benefits everyone, and becomes adopted by even the most elite of locales. Indeed, as I previously argued in Chapter 2, this is a pattern in the British story: each time a former college gains university status, a previously marginalized audience is given access to education and writing-specific instruction increases.

What, then, of the other British nations? In 2006, for example, St. Mary's University in Belfast opened the "Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in

Northern Ireland," aided by a working relationship from Kathleen Cain, director of the Merrimack College Writing Centre in Massachusetts (Worley 329). Perhaps unsurprisingly with the American influence—Jonathan Worley, the director is also American—the Centre for Excellence allows "students…[to] tutor other students" (330). Similarly, in 2007, the University of Dundee created the "Academic Achievement Teaching Unit"—AATU—to help support "the university community by promoting on-campus development of academic literacies of all students" (McMillan 342). As well as providing writing center services, the AATU has developed initiatives "to encourage subject specialists to become more aware of their role in 'unpacking' some of the mysteries of writing required in their field" (350). Both writing centers are still operating.

In the above examples of modern UK Composition, there is clearly a strong Trans-Atlantic sharing of pedagogy and research: in each account the author openly acknowledges how central American scholarship was in their efforts. Moreover, in multiple cases—those with the greatest success, it must be noted—the individual at the heart of the initiative is an American who is directly applying the knowledge they gained during US-based graduate work to the UK; Catherine Davidson, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, and Jonathon Worley, for example. While these individuals certainly make a good argument for physical Trans-Atlanticism—they literally crossed the ocean for their pedagogical goals, after all—the largest corpus of Trans-Atlantic work is authored by Alex Baratta. While much of Baratta's work is ultimately a failure destined for the footnotes, there is no contemporary individual who has tried so many times.

Alex Baratta: A Sustained Modern Comparison

A professor at the University of Manchester since 2003, Baratta serves as a mirror to my own academic background, albeit with a linguistics focus: he began his studies in California, in 2001 earned his MA in the same CSU system as myself, and in 2002 took what he had learned to the UK, where he still teaches today. His body of research falls into two distinct sub-categories: work focusing, first, on accent discrimination in the English classroom and, second, on attempting to bring American Composition pedagogy into the British classroom. While it's this second strand that interests me, it is important to pause on the first: per Baratta, accent softening is at an all time high in the UK, with those coming from outlying areas (the north and midlands in particular) still aiming for an RP-esque tone to their voice.

Accent bias is a constant strand of British academic history: if you don't speak the 'right' type of English, you aren't fit for the club.[107] While there is, of course, not a direct 1:1 correlation, this in many ways is the UK's (and in particular England's) 'equivalent' of race bias in the US: the issue is systemic, and even when those in power say it is no longer a problem, it clearly is (contemporary UK-based linguistics research supports how prevalent and 'preferred' the accent of imaginary London remains).[108] Accent discrimination has been part of the UK story from the beginning, and has appeared in both Chapter 2 and 3 of this project: the Scottish university system inherited the discriminatory bias of Oxbridge in its attempts to teach a singular standard English, and the sheer lack of

[107] In my first week as an undergraduate, I was openly told that my Essex accent would never be taken seriously in the classroom.

[108] Here one just needs to look at the *Queen's English Society* (QES), a group seeking a "better and explicit English language education and regular constructive correction of errors in English language in schools" (QES, "FAQ"). The QES seeks a "prescriptive not descriptive" approach to English education, to "encourage people to enjoy using the tongue properly" (QES, "FAQ"). In other words, groups explicitly trying to force a singular heightened form of English are very much still existent in the UK.

accent (see, for example, Miller 6) variety in the English cohort at Dartmouth undermined their attempts to argue for breaking away from RP-centric education. As such, a linguistics-centered version of my project could trace this specific strand: where it starts, how RP specifically becomes chosen as 'the' accent of education, how attempts to push against it were ultimately futile, and what contemporary academics can therefore do to try and change things for the next generation.[109] While, however, Baratta's work on highlighting this issue is noteworthy, it is also frustratingly similar to the British stance at Dartmouth, in that it offers no path forward: we know there is a problem, and we need to do something about the problem, but without any actual proposed plan, the problem remains for the next generation. Indeed, this frustration is highlighted during *Visual Writing* (*VW*), a 2010 textbook aimed at bringing US Composition to the UK. First, Baratta explains to students that writing with regional dialect does *not* make something non-academic (Baratta, *Visual* 20) before later explaining that "the English language is far too big to be tied to one variety…[so] one form is never 'better' or 'worse' than another" (146): both good examples of breaking accent stereotypes. A literal page later, however, he explains to students that "within Standard English writing" the use of a "non-standard form…is best avoided" (147). In other words, despite making clear steps forward in legitimizing regional Englishes, Baratta's textbook is still beholden to age-old standards he himself is trying to break.

The other strand of Baratta's work, however, is what brings me to focus on him in this chapter: he has authored multiple publications—ten over the course of a decade—that

[109] A version of this hypothetical project which turned the lens towards American education and asked how that initial RP-ness of the Ivy League schools has infiltrated each layer of standard academic English would be equally rich, albeit a project more likely to highlight attempts to block AAE from academia than the British class efforts.

seek to bring American Composition pedagogy to the UK. Throughout these works, Burrata expresses a "need to engage with British researchers within the field of academic writing, in order to further explore ways in which US writing pedagogy might reflect [that] discussion" (Baratta, "Considering" 9). Baratta's Trans-Atlantic work simultaneously offers a sustained idea at what contemporary attempts look like, while also demonstrating arguably the biggest issue with bringing pedagogy from one country to another: basing that pedagogy on outdated misconceptions of the field. As such, Baratta highlights the need for current expertise in any Trans-Atlantic sharing. If, therefore, I identify Baratta as a problematic Composition scholar, why spend this time with him? Simply put, he is the most prolific Trans-Atlantic author of the 2010s, and as such cannot just be ignored. He is, in other words, a notable part of this story, and demonstrates the active care needed for successful Trans-Atlanticism.

Positioning himself alongside the other post-1992 UK-based writing scholars discussed above, Baratta argues that a core problem with the British system is that because "British students are not generally provided with a writing class at the college level," then "study skills websites…function as a substitute for them" rather than as a supplement (Baratta, "Considering" 5). In other words, without dedicated classes, students will never develop as writers. In this sense, then, much of Baratta's scholarship can be read as selling his writing class—"Introduction to Academic Writing"—to British scholars and students (Baratta, "Considering" 6). This, in and of itself, is not problematic: he has identified a hole in the British curriculum and has a working example of how to fill it. In this class, then, Baratta asks his students to repeatedly revise their writing to iteratively become more American in nature. Again, this isn't inherently problematic: he is applying what he learned

in the US to the UK, and is preparing his students for an Anglo-American style of writing which he identifies as "the suggested norm for academic writers to achieve" (Baratta, "Considering" 1). The issues begin to arise, however, as soon as he discusses the specifics of what "American" collegiate writing looks like. In short, it is a relic of the past, and calls for pure remediation: "it is all too often the case that students enter the job market armed with a BA degree, but still unable to distinguish between 'its' and 'it's', not to mention 'there', 'their', and 'they're'" (Baratta, "Mandatory" 28). While this is, perhaps, the form of writing education the British government seeks in its quality assessment, it is disheartening to see American Composition once again get repositioned as a basic writing seminar.

Baratta also generally seems confused at how Composition is run in the US. Considering that his audience pointedly consists of British academics who are turning towards him for expertise, this is problematic. For example, Baratta places "the absence of a nationally prescribed syllabus" in the UK at the heart of why Composition is not taught there (Baratta, "Mandatory" 28). This, simply put, is a faulty premise on which to sell US Composition: while there are clearly similar ideas and assignments at play in different programs across America, it is not a one-size-fits-all case of everyone following a centrally agreed upon syllabus. Furthermore, Baratta explains that US "freshman composition, while mandatory, can be taken at any time within the first two years of a student's undergraduate degree" (28). Not only does this ignore or discount the many students who test out via AP or IB credit, it also ignores the many students who are forced to take 'freshman' Composition later in their degrees due to over enrollment. In other words, when Baratta says "the British model should be offered as a first-year, first-term course, thereby helping

students to get to grips with the demands of their writing assignments sooner rather than later" (28), he is proposing the model that already exists here, even if outside exigencies often prevent it from working in this way.

These misconceptions of US Composition also arise in the aforementioned textbook, *VW*. Intended, in part, to be a guide for UK-based instructors experiencing Composition for the first time, *VW* explains what the "US Freshman Composition course" that inspired the class they are about to teach actually is (Baratta, *Visual* 1). Per *VW*, then, Composition "largely focuses on the basics of academic writing, such as grammar and structure" and "simultaneously approaches…writing from a very specific perspective…perhaps more commonly found within the Literature style" (1). Baratta's definition of rhetoric in *VW* is similarly lacking: it is "the ability to persuade an audience of one's argument, using either pathos or logos, or a combination of both" (167).[110] Where, one has to ask, is ethos (or kairos, for that matter)?[111] All of this to say, the US Composition Baratta describes—the one he wants to bring to the UK—is at odds with the reality of Composition as a field. If *VW* were just one of many college-level Composition textbooks aimed directly at the British market it would be a problematic but ignorable text. The issue is that it isn't: when *VW* was published in 2010 there simply were not a wide selection of

[110] Another lesser critique: the book is almost comically filled with references to the *James Bond* franchise, seemingly in a way to connect to British students; as a British student myself, this feels pandering, and akin to a British scholar making a textbook for American students that was filled with eagles and the *Fast and Furious* franchise.

[111] Baratta has authored a further two Composition textbooks: *World Englishes in English Language Teaching* and *A Guide to Academic Writing in Britain*. The TESOL focus of the former text makes it tangentially applicable to our conversation at best, while the latter text is an entirely *student* focused guide: somewhat similar to *Visual Writing* (discussed below), it is a textbook designed to introduce British students to the "nuts and bolts of academic writing" so that they "will have the knowledge they need to tick all the relevant boxes in order to produce quality assignments" (Baratta, *Guide* blurb). There is, of course, a problematic nature to selling a literal "box ticking" instruction, especially coming from a scholar who explicitly argues *against* such pedagogy elsewhere.

texts for British instructors to pull from, and thus the likelihood that the misconceptions on display would be identified as such becomes smaller. It is difficult to say how widely—if at all—*VW* was adopted as a textbook in the UK, and the text has only been cited seven times globally, three times in writings penned by Baratta himself.[112] Even so, the point remains: in a teaching landscape that does not have the same breadth of available material as the US, there is a great danger in an 'expert' selling an incorrect version of the field.

The outdated version of US Composition on display here is directly evidenced through Baratta's citation choices. In 2008's co-authored "Using Film to Introduce and Develop Academic Writing Skills Among UK Undergraduate Students," for example, Baratta and Steven Jones base their multimodal theory off of American names like Peter Elbow (Baratta and Jones, 18, 19, 25, 32) and Flower and Hayes (19, 32): while certainly vitally important scholars to Composition history, it would be absurd to not note that the context they were writing in is entirely different to our contemporary one, especially from a multimodal standpoint. Indeed, it is only with 2012's "The Implications of Bringing Freshman Composition to a British University" that Baratta draws from more contemporary Composition theory, acknowledging that "it is true that post-process theories of composition have widened US-based approaches to writing" (37). Even here, however, the nod to less outdated theory feels like a passing mention at best. As such, if "the US *Freshman Composition* class….is becoming the basis for the theory and research of academic writing lecturers in the United Kingdom" (15; emphasis original), we need to ask just which parts of US pedagogical theory *are* being used for this basis. In other words, if Baratta holds an MA in Rhetoric and Composition/Writing Studies and he is using a

[112] Citation numbers accurate as of 3/31/22.

mixture of outdated material and a skewed perspective of what Composition classes should look like (one grounded in his personal experiences in 2001), we have to ask what less informed British academics are basing their conception of the American model off of. If, therefore, an end-goal of this dissertation project is to propose that American graduate students (and, therefore, future-instructors) be offered classes exploring the Trans-Atlantic history of Composition—rather than just focusing on American history as is currently standard—then their British counterparts will require one that introduces them to more contemporary American theory and pedagogy. I will address this in my concluding chapter, where I offer hypothetical models for what these sister-classes could look like.[113]

Baratta's most recent Trans-Atlantic work—featuring in two different articles published in 2017—has shifted gears towards bringing a British, or, as he calls it, "Anglo," model of writing to the US. This model, he argues, is "more relevant for students in developing their critical thinking skills" (Baratta, "Considering" 1). The difference is thus:

- **American model:** Intro = thesis; body = support; conclusion = restating ideas;
- **Anglo model**: Intro = state intentions; body = explore from several sides; conclusion = state opinion.

Baratta argues that his proposed British model "is more explicit" with "how a student's central opinion has been reached" (Baratta, "Considering" 2). Furthermore, Baratta explains that as "US students put the cart before the horse…and begin with their opinion" instead of "consider[ing] the subject at hand from multiple viewpoints," adopting the Anglo model would help here (3). Indeed, the "Anglo model is comparatively more explicit in

[113] My concerns with Baratta basing much of his understanding of the US system off of personal experiences over a decade before he wrote about them raise an important acknowledgement: my *own* knowledge to the British education system is *also* partially informed by decade old experiences as a student; America *is* where my pedagogical experience lies.

terms of revealing the critical thinking that is wholly needed in order to reach a well-reasoned conclusion," whereas in the US this "criticality" is "more on the level supporting one's argument from the outset and refuting the opposition" (3-4). As such, Baratta believes that a "pedagogical adjustment" to introduce the UK style in the US "might be welcome" (2), and help answer criticism that the US follows a "one size fits all" approach to pedagogy (3). The differences Baratta notes between the Anglo and American writing models also have direct practical applications in the UK: as "the thesis statement, as taught within US Composition classes, is not reflective of the thesis statements of UK" students, "American lecturers who teach academic writing in the UK" should rethink how they approach it, "regardless of subject" (Baratta, "Implications for Teaching" 137-8). As these 2017 texts are the last Baratta has authored on the subject, his Anglo Model has, for now, gone silent. As the contemporary era of our story is entirely dominated by American pedagogy traveling to the UK, however, it is notable to see a scholar reversing this flow.

While I certainly see Baratta as a flawed example of Trans-Atlanticism, I offer this extended case study for several reasons. For one, he offers the most extensive collection of writing relating to contemporary Trans-Atlanticism and as such is a vital inclusion to situate where the story currently lies. For another, Baratta is notable for asking how both nations can benefit from shared research: while his earlier texts exclusively speak towards bringing US Composition to the UK, his latter shift towards bringing UK Academic Writing to the US is notable. Throughout this he continues to speak to audiences who are often left out of this conversation, be they American Compositionists working in the UK who need to adapt their pedagogical approach, or British scholars struggling to understand the American model. More simply, however, his flaws are examples of what future Trans-

Atlantic scholarship needs to avoid. It is not enough to try and bridge the gap with outdated and otherwise skewed conceptions of one nation; instead, authors need a working understanding of *both* nations. As of now Baratta's attempts at Trans-Atlanticism seem to have fully given way to his work in accent discrimination but they remain as a useful corpus for future researchers.[114]

British Writing Research

Moving beyond Baratta, what is the general shape of British Composition academia? Two core groups would arise from the historical university reform. First, in 1994, the Interuniversity Academic Research Group was "convened by Mary Scott at the Institute of Education, University of London" (Ganobcsik-Williams, "General" xxiv). A year later, Flo Ali at the University of Northumbria would convene the Writing Development in Higher Education (WDHE) network (xxiv). Notably, not only did these groups form within two years of the 1992 Education Act, but Northumbria—the initial home for WDHE—was one of the 33 Polytechnics that became a university. WDHE has hosted numerous conferences, at universities like Luton, Reading, and Leicester (xxiv). Pre-Brexit, these groups could be considered the British counterparts of European groups such as The European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW); now, however, that relationship remains in question.

It must be noted that these groups are not the first modern example of British research into university level writing: as well as the various examples laid out throughout this project, there are also 1980s scholars like Dai Hounsell and James Hartley. However, they are the first sustained groups exclusively focused on promoting academic writing in

[114] I recognize the absurdity in referring to a grand total of ten texts as a "corpus": continued Trans-Atlantic scholarship is simply rare enough to make this the case.

the universities. Other notable groups, then, include the British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL), the British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes (BALEAP), and The English and Languages in Professions in Higher Education Applied Research Group (ELPHE), This latter group was founded in Coventry University in 2008 (CAW, "Research"): between this, CAW, and the graduate programs, Coventry is perhaps *the* bastion of British writing studies.

While each of the above groups hosts regular conferences, they do not offer journals or other avenues for research publication. Instead, British authors turn towards either NATE[115]—the party responsible for the British delegation at Dartmouth—or international journals, like those of America. Since 1964, NATE has published *English in Education*, "one of the leading academic journals in the field, with an international reputation" (NATE, "English").[116] Tying our story together, NATE explicitly notes John Dixon's *Growth Through English* as a key inspiration (NATE, "English").[117] *English in Education* is, as of this writing, in its 55th Volume; in comparison, the closest American comparisons *CCC* and *College English* recently hit Vol. 71 and 84 respectively. On the other hand, the journal of EATAW, *Journal of Academic Writing*, is considerably younger, currently sitting at 11 volumes.[118] All of this is to say that British publishing in the field of Composition is comparatively old compared to the European equivalent but still notably younger than the American equivalents.

[115] As a reminder from Chapter 2: the National Association for Teaching English.
[116] NATE also publishes two magazines: *Primary Matters* and *Teaching English*, although these are entirely focused on K-12 education.
[117] See Chapter 3 for an extensive read on Dixon's book.
[118] Despite its European focus *JAW* is currently housed at CAW, a potential sign of hope that UK-EU academic relations can still thrive.

What, then, are researchers discussing? Trawling through each article published since 2012, the overwhelming selection of *English in Education* work is focused on K-12 writing pedagogy, not university level: we find, for example, articles like Michael Lockwood's "Attitudes to Reading in English Primary Schools" (Vol. 46, No. 3), Helen Gregory's "Digital Poetry and the Next Generation" (Vol. 47, No. 2), and Bethan Marshall's "The Politics of Testing" (Vol. 51, No. 1). Indeed, in the last decade there are a grand total of five articles that are explicitly concerned with the teaching of writing at the university level, and even here things are somewhat tangential. For example, two of these—John Hodgson's "A Conversation with John Dixon" and Paul Tarpey's "Disrupting Continuities" (Vol. 51, No. 3 and 2, respectively)—are less interested in how Dixon's work in growth affected the university, and more on how it generally stands up five decades later. Elsewhere, we find an article dealing with A-Level reform at the university level (Giovanelli, et al. Vol. 52, No. 3), and another offering cross-national comparison between British and Norwegian university students (Syed, et al. Vol. 55, No. 1). As such, there is a single article—John Hodgon and Ann Harris' "Improving Student Writing at HE" (Vol. 46, No. 1)—that has broadly applicable use for those working in university level Composition. Extending the net a little further, back in 2010 we find Arlene Archer's "Multimodal texts in Higher Education" (Vol. 44, No. 3), but the blunt truth is that the journal is not focused in any sense of higher-education leaning texts. This is not, necessarily, a critique of *English in Education*, but more just pointing out that British writing researchers working at the university level need to look outside of their own borders to find a location for publishing. In short, and clearly unlike America, there is no dedicated space to find university-level peer reviewed academia on writing studies in the UK.

The Continued Language Barrier

Lack of dedicated journal aside, British Academic Writing exists, in one form or another, and has done so as a continued field for at least the last three decades. Yet, despite this, there is a lingering notion that a well considered Composition field is unique to America. The question, then, remains: why? Obviously one aspect of this misunderstanding is historical: in America, as discussed in Chapter 2, there is a notion that Composition is largely a product of America-specific exigencies, and thus would not have developed elsewhere. Dispelling this myth—and demonstrating that the American story has been Trans-Atlantic from the beginning—has, of course, been a core goal of this project. I believe, however, that there is a considerably simpler reason for this confusion than "scholars haven't studied hundreds of years' worth of historical texts": there remains to this day a definitive language barrier, to the extent that our typical tools like academic searches fail to bring up the wealth of sources that are there. This runs frustratingly close to the concern of Herbert Muller who argued that a lack of consensus at Dartmouth resulted from linguistic misunderstandings: see Chapter 3 for more (Muller 22). In short, the use of different terminology can imply that ideas prevalent in one locale are non-existent in another.

One simple example of this is the close proximity of American WAC work and British Literacy Studies: "ideologically both are oppositional, attempting to reform Higher Education and make it more open. And both use writing/literacy to resist deeply entrenched attitudes about writing, and about students and disciplines" (Russell et al. 396). Yet while the adoption of US WAC work in the UK is documented throughout this chapter, the UK equivalent has not been so quickly taken up on this side of the Atlantic: because of the

different vocabulary used—WAC/Literacy Studies—on the surface it can seem like the British didn't produce any WAC-adjacent scholarship from when Britton coined the term in the 1960s until it made its 'comeback' in the 90s.

There is also the consideration of terms that both nations use in entirely different ways. *Teaching Academic Writing*, for example, offers a glossary of commonly confused terms, including course, faculty, graduate and postgraduate, and tutor. For those not versed in the difference between these terms, attempting to compare British Academic Writing scholarship to American Composition theory can become confusing, and implies that there is a considerably deeper barrier to sharing ideas than the unprepared would imagine. In short, even when we "restrict our knowledge to what we can read in English" (Anson and Donahue 22), we still lose vital context from within the same language.[119]

One major takeaway from this project—and this chapter in particular—is the vitality to look beyond common American naming systems. Most readers, for example, can hopefully see "British Academic Writing" in a journal and immediately understand this is, indeed, a form of Composition Studies. However, once terms like "Literacy Studies"—as preferred by numerous British authors—is used, the immediate connection is lessened, even if the pedagogical goals are ultimately the same. Once we move towards the split between English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP)[120]—as used largely in continental Europe, but also the UK—the 1:1 naming

[119] My focus entirely lies in bridging the UK-US gap, but when we move beyond English-language texts, we find a wealth of Composition-adjacent work: in France, for example, there has been a recent push for social-linguistic studies into the development of students (Romain and Robaud), while Norwegian compositionists are increasingly looking towards digital writing (Skaar). The International Research in Writing Across Borders (IRWAB) project helps translate writing research of sixty different non-English speaking countries into Anglo-centric prose; as such, we can no longer just pretend other Compositions don't exist.

[120] See Christine Donahue's "'Internationalization'" and Mary Muchiri et al.'s "Importing Composition" for more.

convention becomes even less clear. In other words, the sheer connection Compositionists have to the term Composition can, whether intentionally or not, obfuscate other international writing-centered pedagogies that we could learn a lot from.

British Composition Today

While the 1990s and 2000s offer multiple successes in our story—even Baratta's mixed work is notable for how extensive it was—we now face a depressing reality: while the CAW graduate programs are certainly still operational, they are today as unique as they were when they began a decade ago. Indeed, CAW touts this fact in an FAQ for prospective students: theirs is an "innovative degree course (unique in Europe)" (CAW, "Academic"). A search of UCAS—the national system British students use to find and apply for courses—finds that almost all degrees with the term "Composition" in their name are for Music, not writing; the few remaining outliers are Composite Engineering courses that get thrown into the search. Similarly, the vast majority of degrees that appear with "Writing" in their name are a myriad of Creative Writing degrees offered by almost all institutions in the UK. There are, however, currently operational[121] Professional Writing degrees, located at the University of Bangor, Falmouth University, and University of Westminster, London, although these lean closer towards writing in publishing industries than their American namesake. In short, of the 211 courses UCAS offers relating to "writing," none fit the type of program Ganobcsik-Williams and her cohort are excitedly promoting a mere 16 years ago. Of the 20 courses UCAS offers relating to "literacy," there is a mix of digital literacy (University of Sheffield), A.I. studies (Cardiff Metropolitan University), media literacy (Queen's University Belfast), and K-12 teacher training (University of Bolton). While none

[121] Read: students can currently apply for the 2023 academic year.

of the above fit the British Compositionist definition of literacy, the University of Exeter's M.A. in "Language and Literacy in Education" offers students "theoretical foundations of teaching reading and writing, and the pedagogical implications of this" with "relevant to post-compulsory educators" (Postgraduate, "Language").[122] Elsewhere, the University of Kent offers a PhD in "Text, Practice Research," but details are light at best: as of the current intake year, they have seemingly only had a single student—the course description talks of "our first student on this programme" in present tense (Kent, "Text")—and research specifics are impossibly vague. UCAS lists no degrees for "rhetoric" or "academic writing."

The above litany of what isn't present is not intended to say that the likes of Ganobcsik-Williams and Tomic necessarily failed in their attempts to bridge the Trans-Atlantic gap, but that British Composition studies has lost ground since the late 2000's: Queen Mary's "Thinking Writing" program, for example, closed doors in 2019. Its legacy: an archived website and a few scant mentions on Queen Mary's "Developing Critical Thinking and Writing" page (Queen Mary, "Developing"). Similarly, ARU's two-semester program has zero online footprint except for references to the text I discovered it in. Add to this the lack of dedicated academic journal for Higher Education writing research in the UK, and the outlook does feel bleak. Indeed, even Baratta, for his flaws, hasn't published Trans-Atlantic work in half a decade.

This said, UCAS itself clearly has holes: notably missing from the lengthy catalog of course offerings is CAW's degree programs that launched in 2012. Initially, their absence made me pause and presume they too had ended: the evidence would certainly

[122] While syllabi are not available, module titles include "Writing: The Future" (Postgraduate, "Language").

support such a loss. Instead, however, they are simply not on UCAS: those interested in the program will instead find them on *The Complete University Guide* (a third-party site), where the MA and certificate program are the only courses in the UK listed for Academic Writing; furthermore, applications for the programs are directly available via the University of Coventry's home site. I have absolutely no idea why the programs are absent from UCAS, but this does offer me faint hope that other similar programs have survived, and are also simply not represented by the search functions of UCAS. Similarly, various Writing Centers across the UK—as discussed next—offer certificates in Academic Writing, yet there is no singular space tracking these. In other words, omission from databases does not necessarily mean that programs themselves don't exist on the institutional or departmental level: there is definitive proof that they do, they just don't have the online footprint they need. This said, without a broad way for prospective students to find these essentially hidden programs—again, via UCAS most logically—there is no definitive way for them to evolve beyond their current status, leaving British Composition unrepresented academically.

Furthermore, each of the writing centers discussed above *is* going strong, and more have sprung up in their wake. University College London, for example, offers both undergraduate and graduate students the Writing Lab, a "free service…which runs workshops, tutorials and support sessions to enhance academic writing" (UCL, "Writing"), while the University of York's Writing Centre offers "advice and guidance on academic writing" but not "help with module content" (York, "Writing"). Elsewhere, Royal Holloway, University of London runs the Centre for Development of Academic Skills (CDAS). As well as a Writing Centre, CDAS offers "academic writing workshops" that

bear similarities with First-Year Composition: "although discipline specific classes were trialed…when students from different writing cultures came together greater awareness was generated leading to more diverse and engaged discussions" (Christie 4). In short, "students seemed to gain more from talking to others outside their subject and learning about how writing is 'done' in other disciplines" (4) than focusing exclusively on their own wheelhouse.

Why, then, have Writing Centers—including those like CDAS and CAW that also offer extensive workshops, short class series, and certifications—expanded while 'actual' writing classes have largely disappeared? Scholarship from the UK offers little guidance here—the 'dead' programs can often only be identified as such because of their lack of footprint, not because "this is where it went wrong" articles exist—and as such, we are left with educated guesses; here the lack of dedicated British journals certainly hurts any attempt to find definitive answers. As writing education *was* historically a support function at British universities, it could simply be that tradition won out. Perhaps more realistically, however, various events of the last two decades—the 2008 recession, Brexit, and now the pandemic—simply drove too many funds away from supporting new initiatives that had too little institutional support. Again, the lack of hard evidence makes this conjecture, but the timeline of when the various programs vanish online does certainly fit here. This said, the continued success of CAW's graduate programs is proof that the gambit has not finished yet. Why, then, has CAW in particular seen such success? Again, I have no definitive proof, but Coventry University, where CAW and its degrees are held, was formerly one of the Polytechnics and as such offered writing education before many other institutes. Furthermore, the founder of CAW, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams is an American

transplant to the UK, and thus brought a pedagogical background in Composition with her. In other words, the program simply had more chance of success than one set up by purely British scholars at an 'old' University would have. The success of CAW, along with the other centers run by American scholars, makes an argument, then, for more US-educated compositionists moving to the UK; the answer to a sustained British field of Academic Writing is, perhaps, increased physical Trans-Atlanticism. There is, however, a paradox at the heart of this situation: for more American scholars to want to travel to the UK, there needs to be stronger signs of a flourishing field, yet the evidence implies that the field won't flourish without their presence.

Contemporary Trans-Atlanticism

In each prior chapter, I have asked how the above therefore matters to our differing UK and US audiences. In this case, however, things are a little different as the boundaries between different fields begin to blur: these are the decades, after all, of Americans physically crossing the ocean to bring their US pedagogy to the UK. This said, if there is a core takeaway from this contemporary history for British audiences, it is how vital the (former) Polytechnics have been to creating a writing system across the UK. This, perhaps, is *the* throughline of British writing history: it has never been the gated elite system that has defined the future. Think, say, of the dissenting academies being more influential to promoting English education than Oxbridge, or the individuals who pushed for holistic student help carrying the day at Dartmouth over those who tried to maintain the status quo. In short, there is a satisfying irony that Britain—a country stereotypically defined globally by snobbish elitism—has been steered by the proverbial underdog. This does not mean to put too much praise on the above 'underdogs': the Dissenting Academies were still for the

upper class, just not those accepted by Oxbridge, those at Dartmouth were still speakers of gate-keeping RP, and only government accepted Polytechnics got to become universities. However, the ultimate goal of these individuals has at each stage been to open education to more and more individuals. The Polytechnics are, then, arguably the ultimate version of this: they were derided by those at the university system, and when they were granted the ability to offer degrees we find the stereotypical cries of "but how will this dilute the system." Instead of diluting, however, the methods of teaching they helped spread across the country not only led to the highest education rates in British history, but made the UK a powerhouse of international education. In short, I have little doubt that had the British system *not* been able to pull from the Polytechnics, it would not have survived the shift into the modern era to the extent it has.

This, of course, is to downplay the vital role Trans-Atlanticism played in this final era: in an isolationist system, the pedagogical growth that stemmed from borrowing American Composition ideas would have been stilted at best, and non-existent at worst.[123] Indeed, on the surface this final era offers considerably less for an American audience—as stated multiple times the transfer of ideas is almost entirely from West to East. I would argue, however, that this era acts as a litmus test of sorts to the continued viability of American Composition: in other words, programs like that at Coventry's CAW are working proof that once you remove these pedagogical and theoretical ideas from an America-only framework they do still work. Yes, they are clearly adapted to fit the British situation, but at their heart they are American Composition concepts successfully at play outside of

[123] There is, perhaps, a different take here: had the UK *not* had American Composition to draw from, it could have become all the closer to European Higher Education, perhaps creating bonds that would have better weathered the storm of Brexit.

America. Furthermore, the occasions where ideas don't transfer successfully make for a good place to look for future American development: in other words, there is a lot to be learned for a US audience by studying how these ideas adapt.

Where Do We Go Next?

And thus, we return to where we started: Brexit and the pandemic. Prior to Brexit, then, the modern British system that originated in 1992 was going strong: my home had become a bastion for international students, and the American Composition derived writing education had operated for long enough to gain its own identity. Furthermore, the burgeoning world of Trans-Atlantic and other international conferences allowed the transfer of ideas that *had* previously been in the hands of a few small academics become commonplace. Our contemporary situation, however, throws this comfortable new stasis into flux: as stated in the introduction to this project, Brexit has essentially shattered UK-EU academic relations, and the pandemic has made simple international travel a considerably more complex situation. In short, as we collectively adjust to the so-called 'new normal' it is hard to know how much of the established system will remain down the proverbial road. While it would, therefore, be easy to simply depressingly turn to a dark corner, I instead look towards a more hopeful future. As such, in my final short chapter I offer suggestions for how both the UK and US can adapt Composition studies based off of the historical concept of Trans-Atlanticism: by this point I have, hopefully, proven just how interlinked our two Composition stories are, so now it remains time to posit where we can productively take this. Trans-Atlanticism, in short, is not a myth, so where do we go next?

Chapter Six: Breaking the Myth

Until I began this project, a sustained history of British Academic Writing did not exist, and any notions of a Trans-Atlantic history were typically kept to passing mentions. The core goal of this project, therefore, has been to write the history that has otherwise existed in the footnotes of other arguments: to bring the background to the foreground. Having brought this history to the present day there are two final questions to tackle in this short conclusion: what can we productively do with this and where do we go next? Before getting to these questions, however, first a short refresher of the Trans-Atlantic history that binds our two countries.

Trans-Atlanticism: A Brief Refresher

In Chapter 2, we walked through the first 800 years of Trans-Atlanticism. The Ancient Universities—the first bastions of British higher education—were founded between 1096 (Oxford) and 1592 (Dublin). From the beginning, the trivium—grammar, logic, and rhetoric—was a required subject for all students, and as such became a core part of the early university system, as first-year English is today. These first British institutions were only offering instruction in Latin—and it would remain so at Oxbridge until 1960—and as such are arguably more important to our story for forcing the proverbial hand of other institutions. Here, then, the 1662 *Uniformity Act* made membership of the Church of England a requirement to attend or teach at Oxbridge, directly inspiring the creation of the "dissenting academies" for those who still desired access to higher education. It would be

at these academies—*not* the Ancient Universities—that English language instruction enters the scene, and thus the Trans-Atlantic story truly begins.

At these academies, students would engage in a mixture of writing and oral reporting—in English not Latin—covering argumentative topics not dissimilar to those found in our contemporary classrooms. For the first time in history, then, English writing—and, again, argumentation—was being taught to college-age students. Furthermore, in 1686 Charles Morton—the founder of Newington Green Academy—would leave the UK for a teaching position at the newly founded Harvard. Here he continued to lecture both in and about English, and thus provides the first definitive example of Trans-Atlanticism in action.

Both this proto-Composition and English language instruction was picked up by the Scottish universities and, eventually, the newly formed English Red Bricks. The next major step of Trans-Atlanticism is found, therefore, in the American adoption of the textbooks that arose from *these* institutions. In short, British writing textbooks dominated the American market from the birth of the nation until the Antebellum era. Key examples include Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, and Richard Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric*. It would not be until the 1855 publishing of George Quackenbos' *Advanced Course in Composition and Rhetoric* that a US-born scholar began to compete with the British. As such, between the English-focus of the Dissenting Academics (and, later, the Scottish), and the reliance on British proto-composition textbooks, the first centuries of American composition *are* a Trans-Atlantic story; indeed, there is arguably no such thing as a purely-American Composition until Quackenbos' text makes it so.

The first notable occurrence of reversed Trans-Atlanticism—the UK looking towards America for guidance—is found with the 1966 *Robbins Report*. Issued to develop the British university system in preparation of baby boomers coming of age, *Robbins* looks directly towards the US for inspiration. This same year, the American *International Education Act* attempts a similar goal: redeveloping the university system based on international (in particular British) standards. It was in this environment of actively looking across the ocean for help that the most heavily discussed section of our history occurs: the Dartmouth Seminar.

That Dartmouth is the focus of my entire 3rd Chapter—and my 4th is arguably the direct response to it—is indicative of the weight the Seminar holds when considering attempts to bridge the ocean. The actual legacy of Dartmouth is—I argued there—more complicated than "oh nothing really changed," and is best seen not in specific education policy changes that exited the Conference (James Squire's list of 11 proposed changes to English teaching that all members allegedly agreed upon had close to no effect in the long-run, for example). Rather, that legacy resides in the Trans-Atlantic connections forged. Both book-length projects that left the Seminar—John Dixon's *Growth Through English* and Herbert Muller's *Uses of English*—make it clear how indebted their takeaways were for the academics from the other side of the Atlantic, a notion that is echoed throughout each of the five official monographs. In short, whether Dartmouth had any immediate effect is less relevant than the lasting relationships it fostered.

The most important of these—and the focus of Chapter 4 of this project—was that of the UK's James Britton and the US's James Moffett. To recap, briefly: Moffett's US-based pedagogy was brought to the UK by Britton. Britton would then adapt and evolve

Moffett's work to better fit his own London-based projects. This UK-version of Moffett's work would then, in turn, re-cross the Atlantic to heavily influence American pedagogy. Without their meeting at Dartmouth, it is arguable that this transfer could never have occurred. The Trans-Atlantic work of the two Jameses fueled a number of pedagogical developments in both nations, but arguably the most important was the advent of WAC-based policies, that helped direct numerous education policies in the British 1980s and 90s, and continue to play a core role in contemporary pedagogy in both nations.

A series of connected events—as chronicled in Chapter 5—that begin with the 1992 *Education Act* flip the direction of our story. Now we find a British education rebuilding itself in the wake of reforms, allowing for the embrace of American Composition pedagogy. First, former Polytechnic Colleges are granted University status, allowing their more American modular course design. Next, government league tables direct Universities to invest more in skills based education, starting with writing. Finally, the introduction of student fees creates both a student body demanding more services *and* a body now in the need of work like that offered in US peer-tutoring centers. This series of events leads to a rapid boom in writing programs, most notably Coventry University's CAW. A new era of international and interdisciplinary British education is on the horizon. And then Brexit occurs, and our story comes to an abrupt halt. The only currently operating Composition-adjacent graduate program in the UK (and, notably, Europe) is housed at the CAW, and no UK-specific academic journals that focus solely on writing in higher education currently exist.

As such, this is truly a story of three Acts: the first (1600-1850) sees an American Composition that is almost entirely building itself off of British pedagogy. The second (the

1960s and 70s) sees a period of fervent sharing between both nations, with an equally weighted Trans-Atlanticism on display. The third (1992-now) sees British pedagogy in a space where it can rebuild itself based on American concepts and practices.

Trans-Atlantic Composition

At this juncture, it is worth pausing to ask: is there even such a thing as "British" or "American" Composition? In other words, does this binary exist, or is Composition a more universal concept than is sometimes believed? The truth, as always, lies somewhere in the middle. On the one hand, the likes of Alex Baratta—those who tried, and failed, to directly transplant American pedagogy to the British Universities—are evidence that differences on the institutional level make a 1:1 international Composition unlikely, if not impossible. On the other hand, however, we find *so* many of the same theoretical concepts being practiced on both sides of the Atlantic that it becomes absurd to stay within our national borders. This, then, is why I have argued for Trans-Atlanticism: this concept is *not* intended to fully replace either existing version of Composition, but instead acts as historical proof of the benefits of not closing ranks and operating in an isolated national system. In other words, to embrace Trans-Atlanticism is to simply embrace possible solutions to problems plaguing the discipline on the both national and international level. This, I argue, is where accounts of Dartmouth and other individual case studies so often get it wrong: they get too hung up on overwhelming systemic change, when even small evolutions caused by international cooperation *are* evolutions.

To phrase the above differently, my goal in writing the history at the heart of this project is *not* to categorically say we need to dramatically overhaul UK Academic Writing or US First-Year English programs: instead, my intention has been to demonstrate how

vital this Trans-Atlantic relationship has been throughout both of our countries' educational histories. In other words, Trans-Atlanticism serves to expand what already exists, not to replace it. However, there is ultimately no point in arguing for expansion without simultaneously suggesting how this can take place: while I would clearly love for my work to be taken up by Composition as a field, I appreciate the hesitance some folks have for changing an approach that has mostly worked. As such, then, I argue we need a two-step approach for expanding: first, we help educate new graduate students—who are ultimately the future of any field—in a Trans-Atlantic history of Composition, and then, second, *they* naturally bring these ideas to their own undergraduate classrooms. In other words, by breaking away from just teaching the same tired—and international-exclusionary—canon, we set up the next generation of educators to continue Trans-Atlantic pedagogy. How this actually occurs, however, will be different on both sides of the ocean, as I will explain in my next two subsections.

The US: New Graduate Classes

As Composition is such a well-established part of American higher education, my idealized goal here would be to introduce two connected graduate level classes that help prepare students for the realities of a more internationalized version of the field. Both classes would be requirements for PhD degrees, and highly recommended options for MA students. In the spirit of Trans-Atlanticism, these courses would be designed so that instructors from both the US and UK could share materials: in other words, were these courses to get off the ground in one country, they could then be more readily adapted for the other.

The first of these courses, "Trans-Atlantic Composition History," would spend the entire semester covering the wide passage of history that my project has worked through.

As this would replace current Composition History classes, the course would be balanced to reflect this. Early weeks, then, would be spent introducing students to the Trivium as practiced in the Ancient Universities, before focusing on the heavy British influence on early American Composition. These early years are easily moved over as something of a footnote to get to the 'true' Composition Studies birth in the 1960s, but I believe a deeper historical grounding can only help *and* offer more rhetorically minded students something to play with in the Latinate texts. These early weeks would also help introduce students to the systemic nature of forcing a problematic standardized English. Following this, students would work through the shift to CRT pedagogy and the need to improve the education system in the US: while British developments such as the *Robbins Report* could certainly be discussed, the focus would remain on the US side of our story to best reflect the audience. In all, we would arrive at a discussion of Dartmouth at the center of the semester: the case can be made that this is the fulcrum point of Trans-Atlanticism, and thus should be placed as such. In short, the event that many courses place in the first week or two would not be reached until long past that point: by having a longer focus in pre-1960s Composition, this course could more holistically introduce students to the many American voices that are also left out of our canonical conversation, not least the women who were essentially running Composition for much of its existence. The following table, then, offers a breakdown of this course, as I picture it.

Table 6.1 Trans-Atlantic Composition History Outline

Week 1	Introduction to Trans-Atlanticism
Week 2	The Ancient Universities: The Birth of Anglo Education
Week 3	The Dissenting Academies and Scottish Universities: The Origin of English Education

Week 4	The 1800s #1: The First American Education
Week 5	The 1800s #2: The Trans-Atlantic Split
Week 6	The Early 1900s: Different Exigencies, Similar Needs
Week 7	The Dartmouth Seminar
Week 8	The 1960s-70s: Britton and Moffett as Trans-Atlantic Torchbearers
Week 9	The 1990s-Today: American Theory in the UK
Week 10	Foundational Theory #1: Process
Week 11	Foundational Theory #2: Cognitist
Week 12	Foundational Theory #3: Post-Process
Week 13	Foundational Theory #4: Writing Across the Curriculum/In the Disciplines
Week 14	In-Class Conference #1: Other American Histories
Week 15	In-Class Conference #2: Other Trans-National Histories

The second half of the semester, as shown, would follow a more traditional Composition History approach, walking students through foundational moments of the field—process theory, the Cognitists, etc.—albeit while constantly asking how these theories directly built upon internationally derived research. One benefit for this approach, then, is that it allows students to gain a deep understanding of where the likes of WAC come from *before* we ask them to consider how these concepts are best applied today. Course-length projects would ask students to compile their own revisionary Composition histories: these could focus on American voices left out of the canon (women or almost anyone who isn't white, for example), they could allow students a chance to complete their own cross-national historical project, or they could write "what if" counter-histories ("what would American Composition look like had Dartmouth never occurred?"). A goal here, whichever option students take, would be to build a resource library of different versions of our history: just as I was the first student to tackle an extensive Trans-Atlantic history, it can be guaranteed that many of these other histories haven't been written either, and the space for counter-histories is even wider.

As this first course would spend the entire semester focusing on the historical background of Composition, there would be little—if any—space for contemporary theory. As such, my second course comes in: "Contemporary and International Composition Theory." This course, then, would do the theoretical heavy lifting the first could not: it would, for example, introduce students to post-process pedagogy, Writing Studies, and other current iterations of Composition that complicate the more basic version of the field that a simple history can present. I fully appreciate that most students won't have the same interest in the British side of this conversation as I do: I stand by this focus for the first course as it simultaneously offers an introduction of non-American theory and a clear grounding for the semester, but the second course would shift focus to any relevant international Composition. Here, then, students would not only read the most current American scholarship, but would also read work published in other countries (and, importantly, other languages; albeit with translations). The goal of these courses is, after all, to prepare students for an increasingly internationalized version of Composition, and as such this class would need to have a strong international focus. Graduate students who then completed these courses would be able to enter their own classrooms with both the most current pedagogy—without any restrictions of where it came from—and the historical backing for how it could best inform their teaching practices. Ideally the same instructor could teach both classes: the first would only require basic upkeep between semesters, but the latter would realistically need to be fully revised each year it was offered for the sake of staying true to its contemporary nature. Due to the constant revisionary nature of this second course it is harder to suggest what it would 'look' like. However, this semester it could offer a shape like this:

Table 6.2 Contemporary and International Composition Theory Outline

Week 1	Introduction to Contemporary Composition
Week 2	Contemporary US #1: What Are The Journals Saying?
Week 3	Contemporary US #2: TBA based on current conversation
Week 4	Canada and Mexico: What Are The Neighbors Up To?
Week 5	Global Composition: The Risks and Benefits of Internationalization
Week 6	UK and Europe: The Brexit Divide
Week 7	Other English Language Compositions
Week 8	Asian Compositions
Week 9	African Compositions
Week 10	S. American Compositions
Week 11	Global Composition Revisited
Week 12	Adapting FYE Classes to Meet Contemporary Expectations
Week 13	Where Do We Go Next?
Week 14	In-Class Conference #1: Contemporary America
Week 15	In-Class Conference #2: International Composition

While these two classes are my idealized outcome, it would be naïve to presume that an entire overhaul of US graduate programs is likely. An alternative option, then, fits Trans-Atlanticism into the current model of graduate courses via a mix of gently evolved required courses and newly created elective topics courses. For example, the standard Composition History class can be adapted with relatively little change to bring a greater focus to Trans-Atlanticism *and* act as an introduction to revisionary and counter-histories. Similarly, a standard Composition Pedagogy class can look towards the successes and challenges of the UK version of WAC; this would be particularly useful as students first begin to grapple with Composition's space within the greater US university model. Finally, to offer a space for students to experience other global Compositions, an optional Topics course can be offered. Here, then, we find two options: the first offers a course dedicated to the history, and present status, of British Composition; the second takes the course I outline in Table 6.2 and removes Weeks 2-4 in favor of a semester-long focus on

international education. The greater point remains: our current system needs to evolve to prepare students for the international realities of both Composition and higher education in general.

The UK: Expanded Composition Certificates

The striking and blunt difference between trying to set up courses like this in the US and UK is that the former has a well-defined framework within which to work: 'all' that is needed is an English department that is willing to try a new version of already existing courses and faculty members willing to teach them. Considering how much of a problem even meeting *those* requirements can be, the UK situation is clearly harder: as explained above, the only operating graduate program in both the UK and wider Europe is that offered by Coventry's CAW. As such, the question is less "what would these courses look like" and more "how could they spread past this one institution." Here, then, I propose a nationally recognized certificate program that can be offered at any participating institution, but is ultimately run by an external body: I'm thinking here of the likes of the *Preparing Future Faculty* certificate offered at, and recognized by, most US universities. In other words, a certificate that allows students an advantage on the job market without needing to be the focus of their entire degree: while I truly admire the work of CAW, I also understand why a prospective student may be averse to receiving the only degree of its kind in an entire continent. Furthermore, a certificate program pointedly does *not* require a university to greenlight and support an entire degree program; instead, it offers a chance to collaborate with other scholars nationally and become part of a research network, that in turn it helps further grow. Indeed—and vitally importantly—a certificate program could ensure this education was not limited to English majors: any student interested in

expanding their academic writing would be invited to join, again without the risk of this coming at the expense of their core research interests. As explained repeatedly, the UK more heavily leans towards WAC policies than the US, so it only makes sense to incorporate that into the program.

As hinted above, my proposed certificate program would not originate from any one university; instead, it would be both created and curated by one of the UK's existing writing research groups—WDHE, say—allowing institutions from around the nation to tap into the materials for development. While staff and faculty would have to exist on-site to help students through the certificate, they could be pulled from pre-existing departments, and this additional work could be considered part of their service: in short, by going down the national certificate route, we avoid the risks of any one institution or department having to fully pioneer this work, and instead create a larger platform for those already practicing within the field to continue their work. Indeed, one early goal of this certificate program would be to create a connected journal to help actively publish work connected to British Academic Writing, thus solving the issue of there being no dedicated journal for this needed research.

The general aim of this certificate program would be to better prepare students—and interested faculty—for helping *their* future students navigate the waters of academic writing; no such national scheme currently exists, meaning that newly minted faculty members are entering their own classrooms from extremely different places of experience. Students completing this certificate program, then, would follow British versions of my proposed American classes, as seen in Table 6.1 and 6.2. The first semester would offer a Trans-Atlantic history, albeit one that focuses on the British exigencies and developments

rather than the American. Instead of researching alternate versions of our current canon, however, certificate takers would be asked to research aspects of the American pedagogical story (again, for example, the rise of post-process pedagogy) to have a more rounded concept of where the concepts driving current British development came from. The second semester would, like its American twin, focus exclusively on contemporary international theory and pedagogy. Were the dedicated journal to get off the ground, it would become a core source for readings, as it would represent the most current thought in British Academic Writing.

Trans-Atlanticism: The Journal

In addition to the above proposed courses, another avenue to both widen the voice of British Composition and to encourage US Compositionists to look beyond their borders is to create a journal dedicated entirely to Trans-Atlantic research in its various forms. Here, then, I propose a journal with an editorial board comprised of both British and American academics that eschews the national focus of *CCC*, *College English*, or *English Education* (to use three examples), in favor of purely international conversations. To embrace the British WAC focus—and to encourage its increased pick-up in the US—this journal would be interdisciplinary in nature, opening up the varieties of writing and communication being explored. Were this journal to expand to offering a conference, it could fulfil the promise of Dartmouth's ISC: the host nation would flip with each successive conference. *Trans-Atlanticsm*, to offer the journal a tentative name, would differ from other international journals due to its sustained focus on cross-talk between the UK and US, rather than the rest of the global Composition community. This is in no way intended to imply *this* singular conversation is more needed than others, but, as discussed throughout my project, some

find even the UK/US language barrier too difficult to parse, so I think of this as a way to introduce these individuals to the wider world outside their own borders.

My courses and journal are, of course, entirely hypothetical; furthermore, to be actively taught a *lot* of development would be needed to actually make them a reality. Indeed, the aim of this conclusion is not to say "this is *exactly* what needs to happen," but more "this is one hypothetical direction we *could* move in." It is, however, my stringent belief that without implementing some form of graduate education that encourages new students to look beyond American, or British, borders then Composition, as a field, cannot grow beyond its current means. My hope is that my research project can be *one* of the many steps we need to take to get to a version of education that is truly international.

Global Composition

My focus throughout this project lies specifically in British Composition and the myriad ways it interplays with its US cousin throughout their long and shared history. This focus has, by design, downplayed other global Compositions, partially as the history of Trans-Atlanticism *is* one that excludes additional voices: think of Dartmouth, say, where non-British and American scholars were briefly considered as participants before being entirely excluded from conversation (to the frustration of some delegates). Despite this, my project has various implications for Compositionists beyond these two nations. Indeed, as evidenced by the success of the Writing Research Across Borders (WRAB) conferences, and the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research (ISAWR) that emerged from these, the international community as a whole is stronger now than during the days where two nations meeting for a month was worthy of so much conversation.

A goal in my project has been to demonstrate the need to write extensive histories beyond that of America's: below I offer suggestions for what future versions of these histories could, and should, look like, but I believe it is important for all nations to take claim of their own historical writing identity to best ask how their version of our field can now work on the world stage. One possible outcome here, then, would be an edited collection that offers readers the history for teaching writing in each included nation: indeed, this text would be of great value in the International Composition topics course I propose above, and would become a central fixture of any course moving beyond American history. With these initial local histories collected, a secondary text would offer Trans-National histories: I suggest as much below, but a collection tracing the ways in which Composition has evolved in each of the various former-British Colonies would be particularly useful for identifying, and working away from, the colonial nature of education that remains today (here I'm thinking once more of the issues of standardized English that still plague both the UK and US). As WRAB continues to make clear, we can best work on our homegrown problems by seeing how other nations reacted to their own iterations: by collecting our various histories together, we help showcase the universal similarities *and* vast differences in Composition as a field.

Where Next?

To finish this project, then, some brief thoughts on where this future research could go.

Other Trans-National Compositions

As stated repeatedly throughout this work, I chose the UK and US for my comparative focus for two simple reasons: I am from the UK and I work and study in the US. Furthermore, our two countries make for easy comparisons for multiple reasons, not least

a long-shared history. A follow-up to this project, then, could focus on the considerably longer shared history of the UK and the EU, for example. By building a corpus of Cross-National histories, we can begin to catalog those advantages—and issues—that appear repeatedly, thus helping make an argument for wider international Composition.

Canada or Australia

A different version of a Trans-National history would turn to the north. As well as authoring a history of Canadian Composition, this project would ask questions on where the greatest influence occurs: in short, to what extent does Canada, as part of the Commonwealth, share similarities with British education and to what extent does it derive more influence from its closest southern neighbor? Furthermore, as Canada *was* both part of the Dartmouth Seminar and the home of the first follow-up international conference, to what extent has *it* been the influencer of our nations? Another version of this project would look towards the evolution, and current state, of Australian Composition: as noted throughout this project, Australia is the site of multiple contemporary Composition programs that have drawn from both the UK and US.

Other International Histories #1: The Former British Empire

Moving away from comparative Trans-National histories, a future project could look towards those countries and territories that, through having once been part of the British Empire, still teach in English to this day. Here, then, I speak of locations such as India and Hong Kong where the use of English has a systemically enforced hierarchical place over native languages. What tensions lie, in short, between breaking free of colonial ties while simultaneously using the language of the colonizer in higher education?

Other International Histories #2: The Rest of the World

There is great value in writing the histories—and cataloging current practices—in countries that are not part of the US-UK connection. In other words, how have iterations of Composition evolved in nations that are *not* intrinsically connected to either of our global histories? This work would, however, require strong translation skills, along with a working knowledge of the wider histories of the chosen nations.

Standardized English

This project would trace the origins of standardized English in the university system, along with the multiple attempts to expand who does, and does not, speak this version of the language. This project could easily expand into Trans-Atlantic work, tracing the movement from standardized Oxbridge English through to continued attempts to block AAE (for example) in education.

These are, of course, just a few of the many directions follow-up work could pursue: the important takeaway is simply that, as a field, Composition needs to continuously look beyond national borders to expand its pedagogical horizons. The next major institutional crisis could take almost any shape. There were few, for example, who would have predicted a pandemic upending classroom practices for a two-year window. As such, the more international connections Composition has to build from, the more chance it has to readily make it through whatever lies in the future.

Works Cited

Amis, Kingsley. "Pernicious Prescriptivism." *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 9-10.

Anderson, Sir Colin, et al. *The Anderson Report: Grants to Students; Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland in June 1958*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1960.

Anderson, Robert. "University Fees in Historical Perspective." *Policy Papers*, Feb. 2016.

Andrews, Richard. "Moffett and Rhetoric." *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 251-260.

Anson, Chris M. and Christiane Donahue. "Deconstructing 'Writing Program Administration' in an International Context." *Transnational Writing Program Administration*, ed. David S. Martins. Utah State UP, 2015.

Archer, Arlene. "Multimodal Texts in Higher Education and the Implications for Writing Pedagogy." *English in Education*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2010, pp. 201-213.

Baratta, Alex. "Getting Personal in Academic Writing: The Importance of the Personal Essay." *Professional and Academic English*, vol. 34, 2009, pp. 4-7.

---. "Helping Foundation Year Students to Understand Discipline-Specific Writing Skills." *Inform*, vol. 6, 2010, pp. 7-9.

---. "The Implications for Teaching the Thesis Statement in the UK University." *Sociolinguistics*, ed. Edmund T. Spencer. Nova, 2010, pp. 137-151.

---. “Mandatory Academic Writing Classes: They'll Thank You For It Later.” *Times Higher Education,* no. 1959, 2010, pp. 28.

---. *Visual Writing*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

---. “The Implications for Bringing Freshman Composition to a British University.” *Journal of Academic Writing*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2012, pp.35-47.

---. “Abandoning the Rhetoric of Assertion: An Anglo Model Alternative?” *Double Helix*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2017, pp. 1-2.

---. “Considering the Anglo Model of Writing for the Development of Critical Thinking.” *Double Helix*, vol. 5, no. 5, 2017, pp. 1-11.

---. *A Guide to Academic Writing in Britain*. Amazon Kindle, 2019.

Baratta, Alex and Steven Jones. “Using Film to Introduce and Develop Academic Writing Skills Among UK Undergraduate Students.” *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2008, pp. 15-37.

Barnard, H. C. *A History of English Education from 1760*, 2nd edition. U. of London Press, 1961.

Drama in the English Classroom: Papers Relating to the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, ed. Douglas Barnes. NCTE, 1968.

Batty, David. “Only a Fifth of UK Universities say They are 'Decolonising' Curriculum.” *The Guardian*, June 2020.

Beavis, Catherine. “‘A Chart for Further Exploration and a Kind of Rallying Call’: James Moffett and English Curriculum History in Victoria.” *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 297-307.

Beckett, Francis. “Serving Students or Selling Newspapers?—The Rights, Wrongs and Future of University League Tables.” *The Reporter*, Oct. 2002.

Beichman, Arnold. “Where Have All The Teachers Gone?” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 3, 1969, pp. 137-146.

Beloff, Michael. *The Plateglass Universities*. Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1968.

Berlin, James. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. S. Illinois UP, 1984.

Berthoff, Ann. “From Problem-Solving to a Theory of Imagination.” *College English*, vol. 33, no. 6, 1972, pp. 636-649.

Bizzell, Patricia. “Editing the Rhetorical Tradition.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 2003, pp. 109-118.

Blau, Sheridan. “Theory for Practice: James Moffett’s Seminal Contribution to Composition.” *Composition’s Roots in English Education,* ed. Patricia L. Stock. Heinemann/Boynton-Cook, 2012, pp. 81-104.

Bolton, Paul. *Higher Education Student Numbers: Research Briefing*. House of Commons Library, December 2021.

Brimmer, Esther D. “DHS Issues Proposed Rule to Eliminate Decades-Long Duration of Status Policy for International Students, Exchange Visitors.” *NAFSA*, Sept. 2020.

Britton, James. “Response to working party paper no. 1—What is English?” *Working Papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English at Dartmouth College*, 1966.

---. *Language and Learning*. Allen Lane, 1970.

---. “The York International Conference 1971.” *English in Education*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1972, pp. 3-6.

---. “Language and the Nature of Learning: An Individual Perspective.” *The Teaching of English*. Ed. James Squire. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1977, pp. 1-38.

---. “James Britton: An Impressionistic Sketch: A Response.” *CCC*, vol. 41, no. 2, 1990, pp. 181-186.

Britton, James, Tony Burgess, Nancy Martin, Alex McLeod, and Harold Rosen. *The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18)*. McMillan, 1975.

Bullock, Sir Alan, et al., Department of Education and Science. *A Language for Life: The Bullock Report*. Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1975.

Burgess, Tony, Viv Ellis & Sarah Roberts. “‘How One Learns to Discourse’: Writing and Abstraction in the Work of James Moffett and James Britton.” *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 261-274.

Carr, Stephen. “The Circulation of Blair’s *Lectures*.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2002, pp. 75-104.

Cawley, Laurence. “Northampton: The Ancient English University Killed by a King.” *BBC*, Sept. 2016.

Caws, Peter. “Record of Meeting with Squire and Kitzhaber (1/4/65).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

---. “Letter from Caws to Squire (9/7/66).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Centre for Academic Writing. “Academic Writing Development and Research MA: 2022/23 Entry.” *Coventry University*, 2022.

---. “Research Net.” *Coventry University*, 2022.

---. “History of CAW.” *Coventry University*, n.d.

Chorny, Merron. “Chorny's Report from CCTE and Attached Note from Dunham (1972).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Christie, Laura. “Royal Holloway Individual Institutional Profile: Researcher Development Programme and CeDAS.” *Writing Programs Worldwide*, 2014, pp. 1-6.

“University League Tables 2022.” *Complete University Guide*, 2021.

Connors, Robert J. “The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse.” *CCC*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1981, pp. 444-455.

---. *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997.

Conquest, Robert. “Undotheboys Hall.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 17-20.

Copleston, Edward. *A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review Against Oxford: Containing an Account of Studies Pursued in that University*. Oxford, 1810.

Coronavirus Resource Center. “COVID-19 Dashboard.” *John Hopkins University*, 2021.

Cox, C.B. and A.E. Dyson. “Comment.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 3-6.

---. “Backmater.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 81.

Cox, C. B., et al., Department of Education and Science, and the Welsh Office. *English for Ages 5-16: The Cox Report*. Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1989.

Crowley, Sharon. “Let Me Get This Straight.” *Writing Histories of Rhetoric*, ed. Victor Vitanza. Southern Illinois UP, 1994, pp. 1-19.

---. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. University of Pittsburgh Press. 1998.

Curry, Mary Jane. "Skills, Access, and 'Basic Writing': A Community College Case Study from the United States." *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 180-195.

Deane, Mary, and Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. "Providing a Hub for Writing Development: A Profile of the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW), Coventry University, England." *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, ed. Chris Thais, et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 189-201.

Dearing, Sir. Ronald, et. al. The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. *Higher Education in a Learning Society: The Dearing Report*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1997.

Devet, Bonnie, Susan Orr, Margo Blythman and Celia Bishop. "Peering Across the Pond: The Role of Students in Developing Other Students' Writing in the US and UK." *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 196-211.

Dixon, John. *Growth through English*. Oxford University Press, 1967.

Donahue, Christiane. "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse." *CCC*, Vol. 61, No. 2, 2009, pp. 212-243.

Durst, Russel. "British Invasion: James Britton, Composition Studies, and Anti-Disciplinarity." *CCC*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2015, 384-401.

Education and Skills Act, 2008. Chapter 25.

Education and Teacher Training. “Language and Literacy in Education.” *University of Exeter*, 2022.

Education and Training. “History and Timeline.” *US Department of Veterans Affairs*, Nov. 2013.

Emig, Janet. “Review: *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*.” *The School Review*, vol. 78, no. 3, 1970, pp. 415-422.

European Commission. “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Achieving the European Education Area by 2025.” *EAC*. Brussels, September 2020.

European Union. “Treaty on European Union.” *Official Journal of the European Communities*, C 325/5, February 1992.

Evans, Emrys, et al. “Commission Six.” *Teaching and Learning English: York 1971*. NCTE, 1971, pp. 75-88.

Forrest, Martin. “The Abolition of Compulsory Latin and Its Consequences.” *Greece and Rome*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2003, pp. 42-66.

Further and Higher Education Act, 1992. Chapter 13.

Ganobcsik-Williams, Lisa. “General Introduction: Responding to the Call for Academic Writing Theory and Pedagogy.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. Xxi-xxvi.

---. “Introduction.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 49-53.

---. "Section Essay: Reflection on What can be Gained from Comparing Models of Academic Writing Provision." *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, ed. Chris Thais, et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 499-511.

Giovenelli, Marcello, et al. "Responding to Reform: How Aware are Higher Education English Providers of A Level Reforms and How Have They Responded to Them?" *English in Education*, vol. 52, no. 3, 2018, pp. 248-262.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. S. Illinois UP, 1997.

Green, Bill, Wayne Sawyer & Tony Burgess. "Re-reading James Moffett." *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 237-240.

Hampsey, John. *Paranoia and Contentment: A Personal Essay on Western Thought*. University of Virginia Press, 2005.

Hansen, I. V. "English Teaching in the Dissenting Academies." *Australian Journal of Education*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1962, pp. 15-26.

Hardee, A.M. "Let's Return to Sanity." *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 57-59.

Harris, Joseph. "After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict in English." *College English*, vol. 53, no. 6, 1991, pp. 631-646.

---. "Growth." *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. Utah State University Press, 2012, 1-26.

Harvard College Writing Program. "The Requirement." *Harvard University*, 2021.

Hawk, Byron. *A Counter-History of Composition: Toward Methodologies of Complexity*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007.

Heyda, John. “Sentimental Education: First-Year Writing as Compulsory Ritual in US Colleges and Universities.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 154-166.

Higher Education Act, 2004. Chapter 8.

Hodgson, John. “A Conversation with John Dixon.” *English in Education*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2018, pp. 238-254.

Hodgson, John, and Ann Harris. “Improving Student Writing at HE: Putting Literacy Studies to Work.” *English in Education*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2018, pp. 8-21.

Hogan, Robert. “Hogan's Final Report from NCTE (1977).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Hook, JN. *A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE’s First Sixty-Seven Years*. NCTE, 1979.

Horner, Winifred Bryan. “The Roots of Modern Writing Instruction: Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain.” *Rhetoric Review,* vol. 8, no. 2, 1990, pp. 322-345.

Hudson, G.F. “The Berkeley Fashion.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 21-26.

IIE. “Number of International Students in the United States Hits All-Time High.” *Institute of International Education*, November 2019.

Ivanič, Roz, and Mary R. Lea. “New Contexts, New Challenges: The Teaching of Writing in UK Higher Education.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 6-15.

Jarratt, Susan C. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. S. Illinois UP, 1991.

The King’s School. “About: 597 AD—1541.” *The King’s School, Canterbury*, n.d.

Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook, ed. Gesa E. Kirsch et al. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.

Kitzhaber, Albert. "Letter from Kitzhaber to Caws (5/19/65)." *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

---. "What is English?" *US Department of Health, Education & Welfare*, 1966.

Kitzhaber, Albert, and Peter Caws. "Record of telephone conversation between Kitzhaber and Caws (12/2/64)." *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Koshnick, Damian. *Tracking Our Writing Theorists Through Citations*. 2013. University of Santa Barbara, PhD dissertation.

Kroger, John. "In Praise of American Higher Education." *Inside Higher Ed*, Sept. 2020.

Legg, Emily. "Daughters of the Seminaries: Re-landscaping History through the Composition Courses at the Cherokee National Female Seminary." *CCC*, vol. 66, no. 1, 2014, pp. 67-90.

Lobdell, James, and James Britton. "It Needs to Be From Within…" *The Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 4, 1991, pp. 3-6.

London Association for the Teaching of English. "About LATE." *LATE*, n.d.

Marckwardt, Albert. "The Dartmouth Seminar." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, vol. 51, no. 4, 1967, pp. 101-106.

Language and Language Learning: Papers Relating to the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, ed. Albert H. Marckwardt. NCTE, 1968.

McDowell, Paula. *The Invention of the Oral: Print Commerce and Fugitive Voices in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. The University of Chicago Press, 2017.

McMillan, Kathleen. "Academic Writing at the University of Dundee: A Perspective from Scotland." *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, ed. Chris Thais, et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 341-352.

Meisel, Joseph S. "A Magnificent Fungus on the Political Tree: The Growth of University Representation in the United Kingdom, 1832-1950." *History of Universities*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2008, pp. 109-186.

Michael, Ian. *The Teaching of English: From the Sixteenth Century to 1870*. Cambridge UP, 1987.

Miller, James. "What Happened at Dartmouth? (A Query by One Who Was There)." *Address at Illinois Association of Teachers of English Meeting,* Urbana, Oct. 17, 1969.

The Norton Book of Composition Studies, ed. Susan Miller. W. W. Norton & Company, 2009.

Miller, Thomas. "The Formation of College English: A Survey of the Archives of Eighteenth-Century Rhetorical Theory and Practice." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 3, 1990, pp. 261-286.

---. "Where Did College English Studies Come From?" *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1990, pp. 50-69.

---. "The Formation of College English: Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the British Cultural Provinces." *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*, ed. Susan Miller. W. W. Norton & Company, 2009, pp. 53-71.

Mitchell, Sally, and Alan Evison. "Exploiting the Potential of Writing for Educational Change at Queen Mary, University of London." *Teaching Academic Writing in UK*

Higher Education, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 68-84.

Mitchell, Ted. "Final Request to DHS for Spring 2021 Guidance." *American Council on Education*, December 2020.

MLA, NCTE, and NATE. *Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English Agenda.* MLA, NCTE, and NATE*,* 1966.

Moffett, James. *Drama-What is Happening, the Use of Dramatic Activities in the Teaching of English*. NCTE, 1967.

---. *A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum: K—13*. Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

---. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Houghton Mifflin, 1968; reissued 1983.

---. *Coming on Center: English Education in Evolution*. Boynton/Cook, 1981.

---. *Student-Centered Language Arts, K-12, 4th Edition.* Boynton/Cook, 1992.

Morgan, Rebecca. "New NAFSA Data Show First Ever Drop in International Student Economic Value to the U.S." *NAFSA,* November 2020.

Moser, Claus, et al. *Improving Literacy and Numeracy: A Fresh Start: The Moser Report*. Department of Education and Employment, 1999.

Mowat, C.L. "A Community of Scholars." *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 11-13.

Muchiri, Mary, et al. "Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing Beyond North America." *CCC*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 1995, pp. 175-198.

Mueller, Derek, Andrea Williams, Louise Wetherbee Phelps, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. *Cross-Border Networks in Writing Studies*. Parlor Press, 2017.

Muller, Herbert. *The Uses of English*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Mullin, Joan A. "Learning From—Not Duplicating—US Composition Theory and Practice." *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 167-179.

Murphy, James. "The Earliest Teaching of Rhetoric at Oxford." *Speech Monographs*, vol. 27, no. 5, 1960, pp. 345-347.

---. "Rhetoric in Fourteenth-Century Oxford." *Medieval Ævum*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1965, pp. 1-20.

Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric, ed. James Murphy. University of California Press, 1978.

A Short History of Writing Instruction, 3rd edition, ed. James Murphy. Routledge, 2012.

Myers, Miles, Donald R. Gallehr, Richard L. Graves, Regina Foehr, and Sheridan Blau. "A Tribute to James Moffett." *JAEPL*, vol. 3, 1997, pp. 1-12.

NAFSA: Association for International Educators. "NAFSA International Student Economic Value Tool." *NAFSA*, 2021.

National Association for the Teaching of English. "English in Education." *NATE*, 2022.

---. "What NATE Does." *NATE,* 2022.

Newbolt, Sir Henry, et al. *The Newbolt Report: The Teaching of English in England, Being the Report of the Departmental Committee Appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Inquire into the Position of English in the Educational System of England*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921.

Office of Undergraduate Admissions. "International Costs." *University of South Carolina*, n.d.

Olson, Keith. “The G.I. Bill and Higher Education: Success and Surprise.” *American Quarterly,* vol. 25, no. 5, 1973, pp. 596-610.

The Uses of Myth: Papers Relating to the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, ed. Paul Olson. 1968.

O’Neil, Wayne. "Conference Report: The Dartmouth Seminar." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 39, 1969, pp. 359-65.

“International Student Data.” *Open Doors*, 2020.

Paré, Anthony. “Discourse and Social Action: Moffett and the New Rhetoric.” *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 241-250.

Parker, Robert P. “From Sputnik to Dartmouth: Trends in the Teaching of Composition.” *English Journal,* vol. 68, no. 6, 1979, pp. 32-37.

Proctor, Nigel. “Bullock Refreshed: The Five Languages for Life.” *Reading*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1987, pp. 80-91.

The Queen’s English Society. “Frequently Asked Questions.” *QES*, 2022.

Queen Mary Academy. “Developing Critical Thinking and Writing.” *Queen Mary, University of London*, n.d.

Ratcliff, Mike. “The End of the Binary Divide: Reflections on 25 Years of the 1992 Act.” *Wonkhe.* March, 2017.

Read, Gerald. “The International Education Act of 1966.” *The Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 47, no. 8, 1966, pp. 406-409.

Rebhorn, Wayne. *The Emperor of Men’s Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric*. Cornell UP, 1995.

Redden, Elizabeth. “Number of Enrolled International Students Drops.” *Inside Higher Ed*, Nov. 2019.

---. “Will Coronavirus Crisis Trigger an Enrollment Crisis?” *Inside Higher Ed*, Feb. 2020.

---. “Government Rescinds International Student Policy.” *Inside Higher Ed*, July 2020.

---. “International Student Numbers Decline.” *Inside Higher Ed*, Nov. 2020.

Representation of the People Act, 1918. Chapter 64.

Representation of the People Act, 1948. Chapter 65.

Reuben, Anthony, and Tamara Kovacevic. “Turing Scheme: What is the Erasmus replacement?” *BBC*, March 2021.

Reynolds, Dahliani. *Composition & Public Engagements: Project English, NEH Seminars, & the National Writing Project*. University of Pittsburgh Dissertation, 2012.

Robbins, Lord C. B., et al. *Robbins Report: Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister Under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63*. Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1963.

Romain, Christina, and Marie-Noelle Roubaud. “Naming in Pupil Writings (9 To 14 Years Old).” *International Advances in Writing Research: Cultures, Places, Measures*, ed. Charles Bazerman et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 211-231.

Russell, David R. “American Origins of the Writing-across-the-Curriculum Movement.” *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*, edited by Anne Herrington and Charles Moran. MLA, 1991, pp. 22-42.

---. “Collaborative Portfolio Assessment in the English Secondary School System.” *Clearing House*, Vol. 68, 1995, pp. 244-54.

Russell, David and David Foster. “Introduction: Rearticulating Articulation.” *Writing and Learning in Cross-National Perspective: Transitions from Secondary to Higher Education*, ed. David Foster et al. NCTE, 2002, pp. 1-48.

Russell, David, et al. “Exploring Notions of Genre in ‘Academic Literacies’ and ‘Writing Across the Curriculum’: Approaches Across Countries and Contexts.” *Genre in a Changing World: Perspectives on Writing*, ed. Charles Bazerman, et al., WAC Clearinghouse, 2009, pp. 395-423.

Rystrom, Richard. “Review: *The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18)*.” *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1977, pp. 54-56.

Sawyer, Wayne. “Structuring the New English in Australia: James Moffett and English Teaching in New South Wales.” *Changing English*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2010, pp. 285-296.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. Oxford UP, 1977.

Skaar, Havard. “Does the Internet Connect Writing In and Out of Educational Settings? Views of Norwegian Students on the Threshold of Higher Education.” *International Advances in Writing Research: Cultures, Places, Measures*, ed. Charles Bazerman et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 233-249.

Skinnell, Ryan. *Conceding Composition: A Crooked History of Composition’s Institutional Fortunes*. Utah State UP, 2016.

Squire, James. “Letter from Squire to Caws (11/3/65).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

---. “Proposal for the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English (1966).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

---. “Letter from Squire to Caws (9/23/66).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

---. “Press Release (9/26/66).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Response to Literature: Papers Relating to the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, ed. James Squire. NCTE, 1968.

Squire, James, and James Britton. “Forward.” Growth through English: Set in the Perspective of the Seventies, 1975 ed., NATE, 1975, pp. vii-xviii.

Stratta, Leslie. “Commission One.” *Teaching and Learning English: York 1971*. NCTE, 1971, pp. 1-14.

Sublette, Jack. “The Dartmouth Conference: Its Reports and Results.” *College English*, 35.3, 1973, 348-357.

Creativity in English: Papers Relating to the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, ed. Geoffrey Summerfield. NCTE, 1968.

Swann, Michael. “Student Problems in Edinburgh and Beyond.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 3, 1969, pp. 147-149.

Swann, Lord Michael, et al., Department of Education and Science. *Education for All: The Swann Report*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1985.

Syed, Ghaza, et al. “Developing UK and Norwegian Undergraduate Students’ Conceptions of Personal Social Issues in Young Adult Fiction Through Transnational Reflective Exchange.” *English in Education*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2021, pp. 53-69.

Tarpey, Paul. “Disrupting Continuities—Re-thinking Conceptions of ‘Growth’ in English Teaching.” *English in Education*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2018, pp. 157-169.

Teaching and Higher Education Act, 1998. Chapter 30.

Thomas, Holly. “UK’s Racism Legacy Goes Deeper Than a Few Statues.” *CNN*, June 2020.

Tirrell, Mary Kay. *A Study of Two Scholar/Practitioners in Composition: Developmental Themes in the Work of James Moffett and James Britton.* 1988. U of Southern California, PhD dissertation.

---. “James Britton: An Impressionistic Sketch.” *CCC*, vol. 41, no. 2, 1990, pp. 166-171.

Tomic, Alice. “A Critical Narrative of the Evolution of a UK/US University Writing Programme.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 54-67.

Trimbur, John. “The Dartmouth Conference and the Geohistory of the Native Speaker.” *College English*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2008, pp. 142-69.

Trinity College. “About Trinity: History.” *Trinity College Dublin*, June 2019.

Trudgehill, Peter. “Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich.” *Language in Society*, vol. 1., 1972, pp. 179-195.

Turing Scheme. “Proposed Destinations of Funded Turing Scheme Participants in 2021.” *British Council*, 2021.

Turner, Sarah, and John Bound. “Closing the Gap or Widening the Divide: The Effects of the G.I. Bill and World War II on the Educational Outcomes of Black Americans.” *Journal of Economic History*, vol. 63, no. 1., 2003, pp. 145-177.

United States Senate. “Sputnik Spurs Passage of the National Defense Education Act.” *US Senate*, n.d.

Universities UK. “Higher Education in Facts and Figures, 2019.” *Universities UK*, Oct, 2019.

---. “The implications of the UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement for UK participation in EU research and innovation programmes.” *Universities UK*, January, 2020.

---. “Higher Education in Numbers.” *Universities UK*, n.d.

---. “Horizon Europe after Brexit.” *Universities UK*, n.d.

---. “Immigration Rules After Brexit.” *Universities UK*, n.d.

---. “Student Mobility After Brexit.” *Universities UK*, n.d.

---. “UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement: Implications for Universities.” *Universities UK*, n.d.

UCL. “Writing Lab.” *University College London*, 2022.

University of Cambridge. “Early Records.” *University of Cambridge*, 2021.

---. “The Medieval University” *University of Cambridge*, 2021.

University of Oxford. “Introduction and History.” *University of Oxford*, 2021.

---. “The Boat Race.” *University of Oxford*, 2022.

University of Strathclyde Glasgow. “Why Strathclyde? University Governance.” *University of Strathclyde Glasgow*, n.d.

University of Wales. “History of the University of Wales.” *University of Wales*, 2018.

University of York. “Writing Centre.” *University of York*, n.d.

U.S. News. “2021 Best National Universities Ranking.” *U.S. News*, 2021.

Vee, Annette. “Introduction: What was the Dartmouth Seminar?” *Interviews, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Vee, Annette, and John Dixon. “Interview with John Dixon.” *Interviews, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Vee, Annette, and Paul Olson. “Interview with Paul Olson, a Dartmouth Seminar Delegate.” *Interviews, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Walker, Jeffrey. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford UP, 2000.

Whitehead, Frank. “Letter from Whitehead to Caws (6/14/65).” *Selection of 13 Documents from the Carnegie Archive, WAC Clearinghouse*, 2020.

Whitford, Emma. “International Students Banned From Online-Only Instruction.” *Inside Higher Ed*, July 2020.

Wilson, Bryan. “Youth Culture, Universities and Student Unrest.” *Critical Survey*, vol. 4., no. 1, 1969, pp. 70-77.

Wise, Alana. “Trump Announces 'Patriotic Education' Commission, A Largely Political Move.” *NPR*, Sept. 2020.

Wood, Virginia. “Teachers Presenting White Privilege as Fact are Breaking the Law, Minister Warns.” *The Independent*, Oct. 2020.

Worley, Jonathan. “The Writing Centre at St. Mary’s University College, Belfast, Northern Ireland.” *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, ed. Chris Thais, et al. WAC Clearinghouse, 2012, pp. 325-332.

Young, Tory, and Simon Avery. “Teaching Writing Within a Discipline: The Speak-Write Project.” *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, ed. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 85-97.

Zancanella, Don, Judith Franzak and Annmarie Sheahan. “Dartmouth Revisited: Three English Educators from Different Generations Reflect on the Dartmouth Conference.” *English Education*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (2016), pp. 13-27.

Appendix A. Dartmouth Participants

The following tables are based on Squire's 1965 proposal—names as he wrote them; corrected where possible via []—and Conference *Agenda*.

Table A.1 Participants at Dartmouth by Country

Present at Dartmouth—48		
British—21	**American—26**	**Canadian—1**
David Abercrombie	J. Jeffrey Auer	Merron Chorny
Anthony Lloyd Evan Adams	Wayne C. Booth	
George Cameron Allen	Dwight L. Burton	
Douglas Barnes	Frederic Cassidy (Jamaican)	
James Nimmo Britton	Bernice Marks Christenson	
John Dixon	Benjamin DeMott	
Boris Ford	Wallace W. Douglas	
Denys W. Harding	Arthur E. Eastman	
Barbara Hardy	John Hurt Fisher	
David Holbrook	W. Nelson Francis	
Esmor A. R. Jones	Alfred H. Grommon	
Evan Glyn Lewis	Albert R. Kitzhaber	
David D. Mackay	Robert Julien Lacampagne	
William Wallace Robson	Albert Lavin	

Connie Ruby Rosen	Walter D. Loban	
Harold Rosen	Albert H. Marckwardt	
John McHardy Sinclair	James E. Miller, Jr.	
Barbara M. H. Strang	James P. Moffett	
Geoffrey Summerfield	Herbert J. Muller	
Denys Thompson	Charles Muscatine	
Frank Whitehead	Paul A. Olson	
	Wayne A. O'Neil	
	James R. Squire	
	Michael F. Shugrue	
	Reed Whittemore	
	Miriam E. Wilt	

Table A.2 Proposed Participants at Dartmouth by Country

Tentative List of Participants—39/35 Alt		
British—29 (16/13 Alt)	**American—42 (22/20 Alt)**	**Canadian—3 (1/2 Alt)**
David Abercrombie (Alt)	Jeffrey Ayer (Alt)	Northrop Frye
Anthony L. E. Adams (Alt)	Wayne Booth	Wallace Lambert (Alt)
George Allen	Robert Boynton	John McGechaen (Alt)
Douglas Barnes	Charlotte Brooks (Alt)	
J. N. Brittain [Britton]	Reuben Brower	
Phillip Broadbank (Alt)	Roger Brown	
John Dixon	Dwight L. Burton	
Michael Gregoy (Alt)	Marguerite Caldwell (Alt)	
M.A.K. Halliday	Frederic Cassidy (Alt)	

D. W. Harding	John Carroll (Alt)	
Richard Hoggart (Alt)	Jeanne Chall (Alt)	
David Holbrook	Bernice Christenson	
F. R. Leavis	Wallace Douglas	
E. G. Lewis (Alt)	Alan Downer (Alt)	
Michael Marland	Edmund J. Farrell (Alt)	
David McKay	W. Nelson Francis	
Raymond O'Malley (Alt)	H. A. Gleason, Jr. (Alt)	
R. B. Le Page (Alt)	Edward Gordon (Alt)	
E. A. Peel (Alt)	Albert Guerard (Alt)	
Roger Prestwich (Alt)	Edward Hall	
Randolph Quirk	J. N. Hook (Alt)	
W. W. Robson (Alt)	Charlotte Huck	
John Sinclair (Alt)	Stanley B. Kegler	
John Spencer (Alt)	Allan Kirschner	
Barbara Strang	Albert R. Kitzhaber	
Denys Thompson	William Labov	
Judith Ware	Wilson [Winston] LeBarre (Alt)	
Andrew Wilkinson	Walter Loban	
Raymond Williams	Richard Ohmann (Alt)	
	Paul Olson (Alt)	
	Walter Ong	
	Raven I. McDavid, Jr. (Alt)	
	James E. Miller, Jr.	
	John A. Myers, Jr. (Alt)	

	Wayne O'Neil	
	Thomas Parkinson	
	David Reisman (Alt)	
	Donald Smith	
	Erwin Steinberg (Alt)	
	Martin Trow	
	Uriel Weinreich	
	Ian Watt (Alt)	

Table A.3 UK Participants of Dartmouth

UK Participants	
Included in Proposal: 14 (9/5 Alt)	**Added Post-Proposal: 7**
David Abercrombie (Alt)	Boris Ford
Anthony L. E. Adams (Alt)	Barbara Hardy
George Allen	Esmor A. R. Jones
Douglas Barnes	Connie Ruby Rosen
James Britton	Harold Rosen
John Dixon	Geoffrey Summerfield
D. W. Harding	Frank Whitehead
David Holbrook	
E. G. Lewis (Alt)	
David McKay	
W. W. Robson (Alt)	
John Sinclair (Alt)	
Barbara Strang	

Denys Thompson	
Judith Ware	
Andrew Wilkinson	
Raymond Williams	

Table A.4 US Participants of Dartmouth

US Participants	
Included in Proposal: 12 (9/3 Alt)	**Added Post-Proposal**: **14**
Jeffrey Ayer (Alt)	Benjamin DeMott
Wayne Booth	Arthur E. Eastman
Dwight L. Burton	John Hurt Fisher
Frederic Cassidy (Alt)	Alfred H. Grommon
Bernice Christenson	Robert Julien Lacampagne
Wallace Douglas	Albert Lavin
W. Nelson Francis	Albert H. Marckwardt
Albert R. Kitzhaber	James P. Moffett
Walter Loban	Herbert J. Muller
James E. Miller, Jr.	Charles Muscatine
Paul Olson (Alt)	James R. Squire
Wayne O'Neil	Michael F. Shugrue
	Reed Whittemore
	Miriam E. Wilt

Table A.5 Canadian Participants of Dartmouth

Canada	
Included in Proposal: 0	**Added Post-Proposal: 1**
	Merron Chorny

Table A.6 Consultants at Dartmouth by Country

Consultants—21		
UK—2	**US—16**	**Canada—3**
Sylbil Marshall	Peter J. Caws	Dorothy K. Balfour
Basin Bernstein	Richard Corbin	Robin S. Harris
	Muriel Crosby	Frank McTeague
	Eldonna Evertts	
	Joshua A. Fishman	
	Patrick Hazard	
	Robert Hogan	
	John Marcatante	
	Walter H. Miner	
	Walter J. Ong	
	Harley W. Parker	
	Henry Dan Piper	
	Alan Purves	
	Dorothy Saunders	
	Donald A. Sears	
	William Work	

Appendix B. Full List of Papers Presented or Read at Dartmouth

The following is sourced from *the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English Agenda* as prepared by NCTE, MLA, and NATE for those present at Dartmouth.

Table B.1 Working Party Papers by Country

Working Party Papers—5	
British—2	**American—3**
"What is Continuity in English Teaching?," Frank Whitehead	"English: One Road or Many? Some Historical Reflections," Wallace Douglas
"Knowledge and Proficiency in English," Denys Thompson	"What is English," Albert Kitzhaber
	"Standards and Attitudes," Albert Marckward

Table B.2 Study Group Papers by Country

Study Group Papers—10	
British—5	**American—5**
"The Impact of External Examinations on the Teaching of English," George Allen	"What Use Can Be Made of Technological Innovations in English Classes?," Alfred Grommon
"Drama in English Teaching," Douglas Barnes	"Some meanings and Uses of Myth," Albert Lavin
"Response to Literature," James Britton	"The Spoken Word and the Integrity of English Instruction," Walter Loban

"Creativity in the English Program," David Holbrook	"Through the Vanishing Point," Harley Parker
"Linguistics and the Teaching of English," John Sinclair	"How Does a Child Learn English?," Miriam Wilt

Table B.3 Additional Readings by Country

Additional Readings—15 Note: this is an incomplete list of what was read at the Conference, as it does not include works such as Moffett's "Drama: What is Happening," that is referenced to by multiple participants at Dartmouth. It is, however, the full list of what was presented to participants pre-Dartmouth.	
British—3	**American—12**
Half Our Future, Central Advisory Committee for Education	"A Record of English Teaching," Roger Applebee and James Squire
English in the Primary School, NATE	"A School for All Seasons," Roger Applebee and James Squire
The Disappearing Dias, Frank Whitehead	*Freedom and Discipline in English*, Commission on English, New York
	"The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English," supplement to *Elementary English* and *English Journal*
	Ends and Issues: 1965-1966, Alexander Frazier
	"Who is the Speak for English," Francis Keppel and Northrop Frye
	"Elementary Teaching and Elemental Scholarship," Francis Keppel and Northrop Frye
	"I, You, and It," James Moffett
	"A Structural Curriculum in English," James Moffett
	"Telling Stories: Methods of Abstraction in Fiction," James

	Moffett
	“Literature, Threat and Conquest,” Walter Ong
	“New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE,” Michael Shugrue