The current recessionary market has destabilized national hiring practices in the fields of literature and composition in the United States. Some predict a growth in academic openings in the next several years, but the trend is a shrinking of the job market. In response, graduate programs may need to return to the basics of teaching writing and literature at all levels, rather than the current trend of specialization. Graduate studies should begin to refocus on teaching skills in response to the changing job reality.

While enrollments burgeon, many universities are faced with salary and hiring freezes, causing a dangerous dependence on temporary faculty. Also expanding are various kinds of writing courses which are being increasingly offered, like cross-curricular writing and technical writing. Graduate students in English should take courses in rhetoric and stylistics, composition theory, academic writing in all major disciplines, the history and principles of higher education, and the teaching of literature. Rather than focusing on specialized and theoretical inquiries into a literary or theoretical topic, this more generalized curriculum would better prepare the kinds of teachers the universities are more likely to need in the near future. In short, higher education in English must take the training principle seriously, so that graduate students are trained to teach the general service courses which are the mainstay of English departments nationwide.

(A short list of recommended texts for use as a Graduate Studies core is attached.)

---

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.
"The New Breed of Graduate Programs: Preparing for the Changing Market"

The current recessionary market in the United States has destabilized our national hiring practices in the fields of composition and literature. I received a letter from the Modern Language Association asking me to renew my membership just last month, a letter which claimed that most universities and colleges were facing budget crises across the country. It seems that the career market has declined because schools are reluctant to make investments in new faculty. A few years ago, the MLA suggested in one of their newsletters that the job market seemed to be improving; one year there were around 1,000 jobs available for teachers in colleges and universities. Now it's 600, a drop of 40%. That trend, according to a number of academic journalists, won't last; we're due for major changes in a few years. Soon, it is claimed, we will have four applicants for five jobs in the arts and sciences by the year 1997; we will have seven applicants for every ten jobs in the humanities and social sciences by the year 1997.

Graduate studies may need to return to basics, the basics of teaching writing and literature courses at all levels, while de-emphasizing the current trend of teaching specialized research areas. The Bowen report on the future of the profession in the arts and sciences (Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences) and The Future of Doctoral Studies in English both indicate the crisis at hand: our graduate programs shrink, while they narrow in focus; and our of faculty members decline, while our student population continues to demand "practical" courses in the language arts. I don't think we can ignore the continuing demand for specialized writing courses, but we may have to curtail our practice of insisting on overly specialized research that we do in order to receive doctoral degrees. I'm not suggesting that we stop writing dissertations that focus on narrow areas, but I am suggesting that graduate students receive general training in those areas that they will eventually teach.

I teach at a university which offers a D.A. in English. I'm informed by the MLA in The Future of Doctoral Studies in English (Huber, 130) that, indirectly, the D.A. is a degree no longer regarded as
a legitimate degree (because so "few" offer it). Yet the Bowen report clearly projects a need of more instructors at four-year institutions whose primary function would be to teach; these liberal arts colleges and universities will be hard-pressed to hire new faculty by the late 1990's. Research efforts of the kind required by graduate-degree programs won't be that essential for these institutions.

I would suggest that today we need a new focus for graduate studies, especially for programs that emphasize teaching skills, in M.A. through doctoral degree programs. I hope to assure graduate study directors at research-oriented institutions that their programs should continue, but that some graduate students would best be suited for the practice of teaching and that they should be directed toward that end. The trend toward a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Composition indicates the growing necessity of offering both research and teaching degrees. I advocate the expansion of the D.A. degree and the expansion of M.A. programs to give the market of the 1990's some stability. These expanded graduate studies would de-emphasize narrow interests in the language arts, while they would emphasize pedagogical tools and theories, such as play and game theory, psycholinguistic theory, and emerging theories useful in teaching.

Let me give you some facts about our student enrollment and the number of English courses we offer. Our student enrollment has increased steadily over the last three years at about 11% per year. We're very likely to grow at about 11% per year for the next three years, according to our Enrollment Planning Director. The Department of English will offer around 108 undergraduate and graduate courses next Spring; we will teach some 83 sections of composition. One year ago we offered 54 sections of composition; we now teach around 80 sections of composition. That's a growth rate of 50% in composition or in writing courses. Will this growth level off somehow? Possibly, although the Enrollment Planning Director tells me that I need to plan on scheduling at least 85 sections of composition each semester for the next three years, and that she really wants us to keep pace with the growing student population. In a year or so, we'll have to begin offering 100 sections of writing courses.
That sounds like healthy growth, right? Well, no. We haven’t added anyone to our tenure-track faculty. Our salaries are frozen; that’s a state-wide salary freeze, and it’s in place this year. We don’t know when and if our salaries will ever thaw out. Full professors are teaching double their usual load of writing courses; one of my colleagues is teaching only composition classes next semester; he’s supposed to teach half of his courses in literature. We are barely teaching the basic undergraduate literature courses that must be taught so that English majors can graduate.

We support as a department all of the resolutions that the NCTE and the MLA have made concerning part-time and temporary lecturers. Unfortunately, the university budget does not. To teach the increased load that I am sketching out here, we have resorted to hiring part-time and full-time lecturers. Some of these folks receive full salary benefits, the majority do not. Some of these folks are passing through Pocatello; others are our own graduate students. We are far too dependent on temporary teachers to teach the writing classes that we offer.

What we need, of course, is long-range planning. Some of our lecturers were virtually picked off the street. Some of our lecturers are teaching courses they’ve not been trained to teach. Other lecturers teach a cross-curriculum writing course that they’ve never taught before. Somehow we are all coping.

But we would better cope if we had a corps of trained professionals to choose from, a group of teachers with specific teaching loads, a group of teachers who have been somehow certified for the kinds of courses that we must offer in our budgetary uncertainty. We need teachers who are specifically trained for the cross-curricular writing course, for the remedial writing course, for the technical writing course, for the business communications course, and for the freshman writing course.

I’m not saying that we should have a national pool of teachers that we can exploit. These teachers need to be on the tenure-track line. My university is not presently able to offer those new lines, thanks to the
recessionary pressures that we’re all aware of. We should, however, be able to hire faculty who specialize in areas of composition which have become our curriculum backbone. All of us now teach that cross-curricular writing course, but not because we have been trained to teach it. We created the course just three years ago because of a clear demand on campus that we offer it. However, we are largely self-trained in teaching the course. I’d feel much better about scheduling these cross-curricular writing courses if I knew that the faculty teaching them were trained in cross-curricular composition.

Ideally, once our State Legislature realizes that we need more full-time and tenure-track faculty members, we will be able to staff our department without exploiting these instructors. These instructors would then join our ranks and we would welcome them. But where are they going to come from? What graduate programs would train them for our growing program in composition?

I can’t really offer the specifics of a full course curriculum. That would be best done at the local level, so that a university can meet the needs of a region or a state. I would, however, like to describe the kinds of teaching needs we can expect, and how to train teachers for those future needs.

We can expect our writing programs to grow, simply because we will see our enrollment continue to grow. We can also expect to see the our writing courses change with the times, so that we will need to offer cross-curriculum writing courses, writing courses team-taught with faculty in other disciplines, such as engineering, business, and history. We can expect to teach specialized writing courses, such as business communications and technical writing. Many universities and colleges have adopted cross-curricular and specialized writing courses, but many more universities and colleges have yet to make the change.

At the same time, of course, our traditional courses, such as freshman composition and introduction to literature courses, will still need to be taught. These are our service courses, and we can’t forget them.
Then we need teachers professionally trained for writing courses that range from the freshman level through technical and advanced writing courses. These teachers should also be trained to teach traditional introductory courses in literature. I think that upper division literature and graduate-level courses in literature are best left to faculty trained in the traditional Ph.D. programs, simply because that's what they are trained to teach.

I would suggest that a graduate student take the following kinds of courses: a theoretical course or set of courses on the composition theory and practice, a course or set of courses on rhetorical principles and stylistic analysis, a course or set of courses on academic writing in all of the major disciplines, a course or set of courses on the history of education and the principles of higher education, a course or set of courses on the teaching of literature.

A graduate student well versed in composition theory and practice would understand the needs of remedial writing students, the cognitive models of thinking in producing a written document, the social roles of writer and audience, the collaborative models of writing practice, and the practical process of writing. That student would need to read such authors as Mina Shaughnessy, Linda Flower, Peter Elbow, James Kinneavy, James Britton, James Moffett, Kenneth Bruffee, Robert Brooke, and James Berlin, just to name a few.

A graduate student well versed in stylistic analysis and rhetorical principles would understand the way writers have used the English language. That student would need to read Richard Lanham, Edward Corbett, J. Middleton Murry, James Kinneavy, Kenneth Burke, to name just a few.

A graduate student well versed in the various disciplines in a university setting would understand the needs and requirements of such fields as pharmacy, nursing, engineering, business, art, history,
chemistry, and so on. That student would need to read Toby Fulwiler, James Kinneavy, Lee Odell, Ronald Kellogg, Glenn J. Broadhead, Richard Freed, to name just a few. That student would also read authors who have produced textbooks in business communications and technical writing.

A graduate student well versed in the history of education and the principles of higher education would understand the place of the educator in relation to the student in our educational system. That student would need to read Carol Hartzog, Paul Connolly, Teresa Vilardi, James Berlin, Joseph Tussman, Robert Hutchins, Frederick Rudolph, just to name a few. Educational reform, if it is to proceed, must take note what currently exists and what has existed in our educational system.

A graduate student well versed in the teaching of literature will understand the general themes and history of literature. That student would need to read as many of the general works in literature as is possible, probably specializing in one or more areas of English or American literature. That student would also need to be trained in conventional methods of teaching literature courses.

Those graduate students who have succeeded in these kinds of courses should then have the training that we require of them. We need instructors who know writing, theoretically and practically, who know style and rhetoric, who know the style of writing in various disciplines, who know the educational system and its process, and who know methods of teaching literature.

Those are basics. We need to change these kinds of courses so that graduate students will be aware of the changes that are occurring in our academic world. Students who wish to become our colleagues need to be aware of computer-assisted education, social roles in the classroom, cognitive styles of writing, educational history and theory, style and rhetoric, and everything else that we need of professionals who teach.
These professionals do not need the kinds of specialized coursework that we may insist on in our research universities. We probably do not need all of our graduate students to take the traditional paths of specialized graduate studies. There will always be a place for the 17th Century British Literature expert who knows Donne and Herbert. But there will be an increasing need for the generalist who can teach writing and introductory courses in literature. We need to take the "training" principle in higher education seriously, so that we train graduate students to teach the service courses that we all need to teach.

Along with that kind of shift in graduate studies, we need to take note of the impact on our faculty status at colleges and universities. We may be creating a two-tiered system of writing instructors and literature professors. The trick here is to maintain equality and fraternity among all of the members; we simply must be treated equally well. We cannot create first and second ranks of faculty. While we need new faculty members who specialize in writing and introductory courses, we ought not to forget that the Ph.D. candidate has often spent an average of seven years working for that degree, and that this candidate is the best qualified to teach graduate-level courses. We will need, of course, to appreciate all of our colleagues who work with us on our academic team.
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