Bridging the Gap Between the Scholar and Society.

By Nicolas Mansito

"The best course for humanities departments to take may be to curtail the system of credentialism and specialization, to end the grip of the professionalist mentality, and to open their doors to the art and ideas, and the people who create them, that have always existed beyond their narrow walls." ~*from Louis Menand's, "The Demise of Disciplinary Authority" (109)*

I

In his essay, "The Scholar in Society," Gerald Graff rightfully argues that presently the "distance between the scholar and society is growing" as a direct result of the "publish-or-perish requirements" existing in the scholarly world today (343,346). What Graff explains, as I read him, is that since Humanities (read: English) departments have conducted so much research, researching, in order to progress, has become so overly specialized and cognitively intricate that the "layman," to use David Lodge's terminology, can no longer relate to it (Graff, "Scholar" 344). And it is not only those outside of academia who feel this way; many faculty members share the sentiment that our university's publishing and research requirements for tenure and position advancement have created such a dauntingly huge body of research that "no one even pretends any longer to 'keep up' with everything published on even a single major author" (Scholes 173).

What has happened is that, as a direct result of our U.S. universities' focus on publishing as a determiner of success, the body of research conducted has grown to overwhelming proportions, which in turn has forced us (in order to continue to publish and maintain our job security) to specialize our research to such a degree that it is no longer relevant to the world outside of the academy. I myself have been told by many of my colleagues that my professional research is more important than my pedagogical responsibilities. This immediately creates a paradox: How am I to give my students the attention they need and rightfully deserve when all my time is dedicated to my own research? As I see it, because of the way many English Studies curriculums are structured, and because of all the responsibilities we as instructors have, we will

never be able to equally share our time between our students and our research if these publishing requirements continue to exist. Moreover, as I continue to specialize my research– which I must in order to remain competitive– and begin to formulate possible projects, I see how difficult it will be for my work to be relevant outside academia.

For example, lately I have been thinking about retranslating the poems and autobiography of Juan Francisco Manzano, a Cuban mulatto slave, in hopes of gaining a new perspective on the relationship Manzano had with his translators and benefactor. Additionally, Manzano, in some of his letters, tells his benefactor that there are some things he will not include in his autobiography. In light of this statement, I've thought of filling in what Manzano left out in his autobiography. However, even though this may be a viable and extremely productive endeavor in the English field, I feel the material and topic I'm working with may be too specific and not current enough to be easily approached by and relevant to those outside the scholarly world. So I have abandoned this idea in order to pursue projects that will be more relevant to society– agreeing with Graff when he states that we as "academic humanists need to take some responsibility for controlling the way...[our] ideas and projects are represented to a wider public" ("Scholar" 354). Recently, I have been focusing more on Latino Studies, particularly those of Cuban-Americans in hopes of exposing my students to Cuban history and texts so that they may begin to see how Cubans represent themselves and how their sense of identity, in part, is shaped by and influences American culture.

I have recently finished a translation of José Martí's poem *Amor de Cuidad Grande– Love of the Big City*. This poem was written when Martí was exiled and was residing in New York. In her essay, "The (Political) Exile Gaze in Martí's Writing on the United States," Susana Rotker states that in the nineteenth century, "the identity of the individual depended on that whole represented by nation/state; thus, the exile was seen as someone who had been divested of identity" (60). In Martí's case, we can see his writing as a form of redemption, a means in which to recuperate not only his home, but his identity as well. Furthermore, since Martí was in fact an exile, his perspective offers us a new, nontraditional viewpoint, because, as Rotker argues, "the exiled intellectual is seen as occupying a privileged place: not belonging ensures the distancing of the gaze and the denial of concessions to the institutions... (61). So what Rotker suggests is that Martí's poem can indeed present us with a portrait of America that is free of American

nostalgia and ideology. So what is the pedagogical purpose of my research, of looking at Martí's representation of America?

By presenting Martí's vision of America to my students, I offer them a new perspective of their homeland, one much less celebratory than what they've come to believe. Micheal Harmes-García, in his essay, "Which America is Ours?: Martí's 'Truth' and the American Foundations of 'American Literature,'" suggests Martí's "prescient understanding of the United States's coming role of hemispheric dominance" and his "astute observations about the nature of US society" presents us with "a more sharply honed sense of the dangers presented by the US example" (20-21). Harmes-García points out that Martí's work acknowledges and presents the "difference and discord in the United States," which I think is readily evidenced in *Love of the Big City* (23). By aligning my research and pedagogical goals through this critical and interpretive exercise, I expose my students to a different version of U.S. history, inviting them to reevaluate their own notions of American history as they move towards thinking more critically about their own modern situation.

The problematic situation between research and teaching has led many outside the scholarly world to question what it is we as scholars do and how it relates to them. But the problems of overspecialization do not only affect those outside the universities. As I briefly mentioned earlier, the struggle to research and publish also affects the quality of education we offer our students: "But there is a vast effort here, an enormous expenditure of time and energy that might have been much better spent on matters that bear more directly on the classroom" (Scholes 173). Here, Robert Scholes, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Humanities at Brown University, rightfully notes that researching cuts into our teaching time. In essence, we are pulled in two directions– we fight to find enough time to research in order to publish while we struggle to give our students and their work the attention they deserve. Scholes suggests that if publishing requirements were lessened, then the time we would have spent researching could be used to develop new pedagogical approaches and exercises.

In our struggle to research and publish, we neglect our most important pedagogical responsibilities, which are to teach our students how to read critically and write eloquently and efficiently. By having to focus so heavily on specialized research and our own publishing, our personal goals begin to diverge from our pedagogical responsibilities. The fact that we do not

introduce and utilize our research in our classrooms results in the gap Graff highlights. What we need to do to begin bridging this gap is to start aligning our research and pedagogical goals:

> Instead of trying to protect the interests of general education from those of research, it would be more productive for academic institutions to take advantage of whatever in research is potentially of general interest to nonprofessionals. Instead of discouraging scholars from letting their research obtrude into their undergraduate teaching, institutions would begin encouraging scholars to *teach* their research... (Graff, "Scholar" 355).

Not presenting our research to either the public or our students merely perpetuates confusion and misunderstanding. We can't expect those outside academia to understand, let alone relate to what it is we do if we don't share our work with them. As long as we continue to keep our work in seclusion, there will never be any true communication between academia and the public.

Another alternative, Helen Vendler offers, is that we stop expecting all teachers to be writers. Vendler argues that writing "is a different profession even from scholarly research and discovery, a different profession from the profession of critical thinking" (35). Even though this sentiment may not be true for all scholars, Vendler argues that many teachers who are forced by publishing requirements to write do so not out of love for their subject but out of necessity. What Vendler suggests is that we move towards researching and teaching what we love, and in doing so, we will allow our students and respective communities "to love what we have loved" (35).

By researching what we love, and subsequently incorporating our research into our pedagogical practice, we begin to realign our teaching and research goals– demystifying our work and making it more approachable for our students. Through this realignment we might even infuse some of our students with the passion we feel for our work, which will narrow the gap Graff refers to, because, when they finish their academic careers, our students will carry this knowledge and passion with them as they enter into society. As Vendler suggests, "If we would awaken in our beginning students, in their first year, the response that they can all feel to the human story told in compelling ways, we would begin to form a general public who approve of what we are and what we do" (34). But unfortunately, this gap will only continue to widen as

long as "the competitive ranking of universities" relies on "their annual research production rather than their excellence in teaching" (Graff, "Scholar" 346).

Essentially, what is occurring is that as we sacrifice our teaching responsibilities to pursue our research and publishing requirements, we are isolating our communities and our students. We are, quite literally, as seen through the eyes of those outside academia, turning into some type of elitist social club. By isolating our students and the communities they are a part of, we strip them of the very social dimensions we need to educate them. It is no wonder why those outside the scholarly world have trouble identifying what it is we do; it is because we are teaching in a "social void" (Graff, "Disliking" 48).

English Studies calls upon so many other academic disciplines that it is impossible to examine and teach a text in a social vacuum. In order to be fully appreciated and explored, a text must be placed within its social and historical context; we have to examine and consider when it was written, why it was written, and what social and historical conditions influenced the text. By secluding ourselves within a world of research, we are essentially isolating our students from the very critical community they need to be a part of in order to understand what it is we are trying to accomplish– to situate our students within their own community, culture, and more broadly, their world. When our "students are screened from this critical community and its debates, or when they experience only the fragmentary and disconnected versions of it represented by a series of courses," what else can we expect from our students and society but confusion? (Graff, "Disliking" 47) What we need to do is "conceive of education as if it were a process of contemplating important truths, values, and 'cultural literacy' information" as it relates to our students' social situation (Graff, "Disliking" 48).

Our students are unable to envision how the work conducted by English Studies professionals relates to their modern situation. They find it overwhelmingly difficult to draw connections between the various courses they take, and how what they learn in these courses relates to their public life, because our curriculums do not foster these connections. In our research pursuits, we have not only isolated ourselves from society, but we have also isolated ourselves within our own English departments, which has resulted in a fragmented curriculum. Not sharing our work with each other, and not drawing connections between the courses taught

in English departments leads to an inter-departmental communication breakdown. As a result of this breakdown, our curriculum fails to become a unified body of knowledge; it fails to create a general picture of how the information presented in these courses and our research relates to the lives of our students and nonprofessionals. We need to be aware of the fact that the gap between the scholar and society directly reflects the professional striation and lack of communication within in our own departments. Richard Ohmann sums it up best when he states that the

> centrifugal tendencies in theory and method over the past fifteen years have a lot to do with a deepening class division in the academy, which parallels that outside of it. Teachers of English in the more expensive private institutions and in some of the most prestigious public ones feel less pressure than before from students' vocational needs and anxieties... And many feel less professional solidarity with those who teach mainly composition to middle-class and working-class students. That division expresses itself not only in recent angry proposals by writing teachers to secede from the uneasy alliance of the English department, but in the freedom of the more privileged academic group to pursue theories and approaches not very directly related to classroom exigencies or to guild traditions (94-95).

Because our research has become so specialized, so compartmentalized, it is beginning to become only relevant to our specific, narrow field of study, which is leading us, as we pursue this specialized knowledge, to isolate ourselves from our own colleagues– from the very same people we need to be interacting with in order to create a more global, cohesive body of knowledge we can present to the public:

> [...] universities, in particular, because their eyes are supposed to be firmly focused on the distant frontiers of truth, neglect the kind of social, psychological, and even in certain cases physical upkeep that makes the capacity to go searching for truth possible in the first place. What I'm saying is that more of a spirit of collectivity, a commitment not simply to finding the latest truth in your subfield but to the people you work with in your department and to the institution as an alma mater for the students who are coming through– a much more local focus for people's energies, drives and ambitions than a focus on becoming nationally known for this or that discovery or contribution– might help to defuse and make less tempting or desirable that kind of combat and grasping after visibility that seems to characterize the profession so much of late. The culture of the institution is what needs to change (Tompkins, "Interviews" 175-176).

What Jane Tompkins suggests is that instead of highly focusing on developments in our own subfields, we should be examining new ways to conduct our research that will begin to foster a sense of solidarity on a more local level.

In an attempt to create this sense of solidarity within Humanities departments– and between the community– William L. Andrews, E. Maynard Adams Professor of English and former chair of the English department at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, conducted a conference entitled, *Teaching for the Public Good: The Future of the Humanities in Public Higher Education* (ADE 2003). The goal of the conference was to discuss and present what Humanities departments should be doing "in the specific context of higher education" (Andrews, ADE 2003). The conference was driven by two fundamental questions:

> First, what effect can and should the humanities have on public higher education now? This isn't simply a matter of how the humanities should be packaged in the curriculum of public higher education but also what role it should have in shaping the priorities, values, and missions of public education in general. Second, what do we mean by public education, and who is public? (Andrews, ADE 2003)

Striving to create a connection with the local community, the conference also focused on determining what the North Carolina Universities' responsibilities were to the people of the state. The conference consisted of the following sessions: *Diversity and Growth in North Carolina Postsecondary Education*; *Instructional Technology and its Effects on the Humanities*; *Pedagogy and Teacher Education: What is the Role of the Humanities?*; and *The Future of the Humanities Curriculum* (Andrews, ADE 2003). As a result of the conference, a speaker's board of Humanities faculty members was created and entrusted "to address humanities issues to a wide range of audiences including high school guidance counselors... and business audiences" (Andrews, ADE 2003). But, unfortunately, one annual conference alone cannot fix the problem, although it is a great step towards finding solutions.

In sum, the problem with our university's "publish or perish" requirements is a two-fold one: First, it is isolating our students and communities from the very social contexts they require to situate themselves in the conversations English departments are currently participating in; secondly, particular fields in our English departments are isolating themselves not only from

society, but from other English fields and academic disciplines. This problem is not a new one, nor has it been ignored by many in English departments; and since the problem is a two-fold one, it logically follows that there be a two-fold solution, a solution that focuses on restructuring the university itself and reintroducing our students and communities to what we do in ways that highlight the relevancy of our work to their social situations.

II

Building the Bridge

"Too much reliance is now put on perfunctory outside reviews, where internal evaluation might serve better. And far too much stress is placed upon quantity of publication than on the quality of learning and teaching displayed in writing, lectures, course designs, and assignments for student work" *~from Robert Scholes', The Rise and Fall of English (177)*

In response to this dilemma, Scholes proposes a complete reevaluation and restructuring of the English Ph.D. Scholes' new curriculum would cut the number of graduate courses taught by faculty, which would allow them to teach more undergraduate courses. The reasoning behind this move is that if senior faculty members were to incorporate their research into their undergraduate teaching, then this would create a new student body equipped with the knowledge and practical cognitive tools that before were reserved only for graduate students. Essentially, this new approach would destroy the elitist knowledge barrier, because every college student, even non-English majors, would still be exposed to the types of critical and analytical thinking more seasoned English scholars engage in. Since the number of students who possess this knowledge and will later enter into society increases, society, as a whole, will gain a greater understanding of what it is we as scholars do, thus, the foundation for the bridge between the scholar and society is begun.

Scholes also argues that his new program, which focuses highly on student education and teaching, would reduce the amount of debt Ph.D. students fall into because, since his new ten-year program would consist of fewer students, there would be more funding available for each of them. Even though I appreciate Scholes' new program, and indeed I agree much of it is favorable, I find it hard to imagine universities responding kindly to it because of Scholes' ambiguity in outlining his program. For one, Scholes does not mention when or how this new

ten-year program would be introduced into English Studies curriculums, nor does he explain how students already engaged in a four-year Ph.D. or two-year M.A. program would situate themselves in his new program. Where would, let's say, a current third-year Ph.D. or second-year M.A. student stand if a university were to adopt Scholes' new program? Obviously, restructuring the English Studies curriculum would be a long and tedious process, surely something not done overnight, and since Scholes offers no time line as to how his new program should be practically approached to situate it within the English Studies curriculum, nor how current students would be placed in his program, even the most willing university would find adopting Scholes' program rather tricky. Furthermore, Scholes' program focuses highly on teaching not researching, which, if universities cannot reduce their publishing requirements as fast as Scholes' program releases its graduates, will then result in a body of graduates unequipped to compete in the academic world. Although I find Scholes' ten-year program problematic, I do believe his practical pedagogical restructuring of English Studies could bring about fruitful changes.

Scholes argues that English Studies curriculums place too much emphasis on *coverage* rather than *method application*. He argues that English departments' concerns must shift from *coverage* and *periodization* to producing students with high reading and writing competence. Scholes believes that the English program must refocus its goals from covering literary history through a canon of texts to constructing a canon of methods students can practically apply. His approach consists of using modern writers to entice or inspire students to travel backwards through a lineage of texts– to see who authors were reading and who inspired them. Additionally, by traveling backwards, the student will have to examine the author's historical and cultural place. Scholes stresses that students read various types of texts, learning to read both sympathetically– inside the text searching for intention– and critically– distancing themselves from the text, examining and analyzing intention. In doing so, Scholes believes that current students will subsequently be able to foster a connection between the past and their modern situation. He uses his Discipline of Textuality to do so. Scholes' Discipline of Textuality consists of four major components– Theory (a canon of methods used to evaluate the other three aspects of textuality), History (how to situate a text), Production (how to compose a text), and Consumption (how to read a text).

Before going into depth concerning Scholes' Theory on a canon of methods, since it is rather involved and leads to other tangential discussions concerning the problems with the traditional canon, I want to quickly highlight the other three components of his Discipline of Textuality. Scholes' History component involves a cross-departmental approach in which our students are provided a historical, orientational framework by inviting history faculty members to teach our students political, intellectual, art, music, science, and technology history. The framework is created, as aforementioned, by working backwards– beginning with the present and working back through a lineage of texts– thus both creating a connection to the students' modern situation and providing a historical and literary time line to the present.

In his explanation of his Production component, Scholes argues that not enough serious attention is paid to student writing, and that our students are not reading enough. Scholes suggests that "Better reading and better writing go hand in hand" (160). He believes our students should engage in imitating and parodying the texts of the renowned authors of the past. His reasoning is that these texts serve as models of "syntactic and semantic possibilities" (160). Moreover, by examining the works of the past, students can begin to form a connection between the past and their modern situation.

Scholes' third component, Consumption, focuses on perceiving reading as a dynamic, creative process. He argues that the process of reading should be more important than the coverage of texts. Instruction should focus highly on close and careful reading, intertextuality– how to situate a text in relation to others– and extratextuality– how to situate the text in relation to culture, society, and the world. Again, the reasoning behind this approach is that it will build a bridge of understanding between the past and the students' present.

Scholes' concept of Theory abandons the traditional notion of the literary canon as it attempts to equip students with practical knowledge: "It is not what is covered that counts but what is learned. It is not what students have been told that matters but what they remember and what they can do" (149). Scholes proposes this can be accomplished by broadening the scope of English Studies outside of American and British Literature– to bring literature to the modern culture of the student by developing specialized literature courses. Essentially, what Scholes is suggesting is a multiculturalist approach. As society continues to ethnically diversify, in order

for our work to remain relevant, we must begin to formulate new theories and pedagogical

approaches that take into consideration the ever-changing ethnicity of our society. Regarding this

notion, Jane Tompkins has stated:

> The racial and ethnic composition of the student body in colleges and universities is fact
> number one; the racial, ethnic, and gender composition of the professoriate is fact
> number two. These demographic trends are not reversing themselves; they're moving
> further in the same direction. ("Interviews" 174).

This multicultural attitude is already manifesting itself in academies today, and has been for

quite some time now; and it is especially evidenced in the remarks made by Henry Louis Gates,

Jr., Chair of the Afro-American Studies Department and Director of the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute

for Afro-American Studies at Harvard University:

> We must redefine "theory" itself from within our own black cultures, refusing to grant
> the racist premise that theory is something white people do, so that we are doomed to
> imitate our white colleagues... Our task now is to invent and employ our own critical
> theory, to assume our own propositions, and to stand within the academy as politically
> responsible and responsive parts of a social and cultural African American whole (177).

The argument Gates openly expresses and Scholes tacitly suggests is that the traditional canon is

exclusive. Indeed, many scholars, including Tompkins, have argued that the traditional canon is

a vehicle for separatism; "that works that have attained the status of classic, and are therefore

believed to embody universal values, are in fact embodying only the interests of whatever parties

or factions are responsible for maintaining them in their permanent position ("Masterpiece

Theater" 138). By expanding our notion of the canon to include more multinational texts, "we

bring them out of the neglect [to which] they had previously been condemned" (Said 196).

Contingent with Scholes and Tompkins' notion is Edward W. Said's concept of

worldliness, which is

> the restoration to such works and interpretations of their place in the global setting, a
> restoration that can only be accomplished by an appreciation not of some tiny,
> defensively constituted corner of the world, but of the large, many-windowed house of
> human culture as a whole. It seems... absolutely essential that we engage with cultural
> works in this unprovincial, interested manner while maintaining a strong sense of the

contest for forms and values which any decent cultural work embodies, realizes, and contains (196-197).

But multiculturalists have been unsuccessful in creating a new, expanded master canon. Instead, what has happened is that many mini-canons, each representative of their own culture, have begun to form. However, these new mini-canons "have largely failed to dislodge the master-canon from its empirical centrality," but they have "made certain specific works and authors newly available for inclusion in the master-canon," a progression that has effectively challenged "the conceptual anonymity of the master-canon (Sedgwick 185). In sum, many multiculturalists have moved to create their own mini-canons in response to the separatist notion that "Canonicity itself then seems the necessary wadding of pious obliviousness that allows for the transmission from one generation to another of texts that have the potential to dismantle the impacted foundations upon which a given culture rests" (Sedgwick 188).

J. Hillis Miller, former president of the Modern Language Association and former department chair at Yale and Johns Hopkins University, is pleased with the direction some multiculturalists are taking. Miller sees their new focus on cultural studies as a move towards making what multiculturalists do "have some importance in our society" (115).
And Miller perceives that these attempts will only continue to flourish since, as older faculty members retire, "younger professors... will for better or worse be all there is to hire" (141). Rightfully so, Miller envisions that these new, younger instructors will bring about "a lot of interesting transformations" (141).

Many of these changes Miller refers to are already occurring now in various English departments. Vendler has noted that

> more imaginative departments have invented courses, centered on themes or styles, that include a range of authors from Chaucer to Faulkner. And departments of English and foreign languages alike can press for, and participate in, core courses that will restore to our students, so unjustly deprived of a knowledge of cultural riches, a sense of how many great authors there are to know" (35).

Vendler also suggests that we take this notion beyond just the university or college curriculum. She argues that those "who end their education with secondary school have been cheated

altogether of their literary inheritance" (39). The gap between the scholar and society exists partly because we are not exposing our students at an early enough age to what it is we do and love as scholars. To combat this problem, Vendler suggests that there are many texts appropriate to every age, and that we begin introducing these works to our students at every step of their development. What I think society does not realize at times is that we engage in literary scholarship because we love it; we love it, in part, because the texts of authors grant a sense that we are not alone in this world; their narratives provide us with a "private experience" from which we may build our own "identifying frame or solacing reflection" (Vendler 39). In a sense, literature not only invigorates us, but it comforts us as well. There should be no reason why we cannot introduce this notion to everyone at an early age. In doing so, we may begin to build a society that appreciates and understands what it is we as scholars do, and why we love it so much.

But this is a daunting, if not impossible task. No one instructor has the power to change the entire school system. In order to bring about this desired reform we must begin to work from within, beginning with ourselves and our own classrooms. We must "give, especially to our beginning students, that rich web of associations, lodged in the tales of majority and minority culture alike, by which they could begin to understand themselves as individuals and as social beings" (Vendler 40). Indeed, as Vendler so eloquently puts it: "We owe it to ourselves to show our students... what we are; we owe their dormant appetites... that deep sustenance that will make them realize that they too, having been taught, love what we love" (40).

Regarding making changes from within the English Studies program and in tune with Said's notion of *worldliness*, Patricia Bizzel has said:

> I think we need a radically new system to organize English studies, and I propose that we develop it in response to the materials with which we are now working. Instead of finagling the new literatures and the new pedagogical and critical approaches into our old categories, we should try to find comprehensive new forms that seem to spring from and respond to the new materials... I think we need an approach to the diverse world literatures written in English we are now studying that focus not on their essential nature, whatever that may be, but rather on how they might, not "fit" together exactly, but come into productive dialogue with one another (480, 482).

She suggests that one way this problem can be resolved is by using Mary Louise Pratt's concept of *Contact Zones*, which is the term that refers to the "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (Pratt 34). One of the functions of and advantages to this approach is that it would fully integrate mutliculturalism into English Studies. By having multiculturalism be the defining feature, we could begin to see how different languages attempt to communicate with each other, and we can thus further explore the unequal power distributions among these languages. Another function is that this approach would completely integrate "composition and rhetoric into literary studies," because studying these texts "as they respond to contact zone conditions is studying them rhetorically, studying them as efforts of rhetoric" (Bizzel 484). In studying these texts in this manner, we would have to focus on their historical context, which would provide a means to focus our rhetorical analysis. In doing so, we would offer our students a way in which to see how each particular author used their texts to situate themselves in the social, cultural, and historical situations they found themselves in, and this analysis would begin to demonstrate and explain to our students how they themselves may begin to use their own language as a means to discover and express their position in society today, to "see writing as a form of self-development and self-discovery," as a means to know and learn about oneself, "or just as a mode of learning pure and simple" (Tompkins, "Interviews" 164).

By structuring our courses this way, we could start to shift away from periodization, as Scholes suggests, because we would begin to

> organize English studies not in terms of literary or chronological periods, nor essentialized racial or gender categories, but rather in terms of historically defined contact zones, moments when different groups within the society contend for the power to interpret what is going on (Bizzel 483).

Moreover, under Pratt and Bizzel's new paradigm, there would no longer be a need for two separate introductory English courses, because in a one-year long composition/literary course, if taught from this paradigm, "Students would learn to critique strategies of negotiating difference

in the writing of others and to practice them in their own" (Bizzel 485). This reorganization and consolidation would decrease the number of classes required to be taught, thus reducing the number of professors needed to teach these courses, which would subsequently increase the amount of attention we could give to our students. Plus, since our class load would be reduced, and we would not need as many instructors, these decreases would free up capital within the curriculum, subsequently reducing the publishing pressures placed upon us, because we would no longer rely so heavily on publishing success to gain additional funds within the program.

Another move we as instructors can make towards more readily engaging our students is to begin to introduce into our classrooms the various mediums our students are bombarded by in modern society. Alan Purves has stated that

> We strive to help students toward the larger and older perspective, to come to a particular understanding of themselves and their past, to enter that broader world that is defined as literate... But our work is flawed. Flawed because many of our students resist it– some wrongly, I think, but many rightly... our work deals with a medium– print– that is losing ground and neglecting the major change wrought in our literary and artistic world... There is no reason why students should not deal with film, video, audio, hypermedia, and other forms of presentation" (215).

This is not to say that we abandon printed texts altogether, but we should begin to use other mediums in conjunction with printed texts, drawing associations and connections between each type of medium. For example, one could teach Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* as the original precursor to hypertext. I could easily envision actually creating a hypertext document of Whitman's poem in which links are imbedded that could instantly transport the student to other correlating parts of the text. In doing so, we could bring the past and present together, thus creating a connection between the past and our students' modern situation. Introducing newer technologies and mediums into our classrooms would definitely "broaden the focus of our activities" and would bring about "an understanding of the world inhabited by our students as well as by ourselves" (Purves 217).

William Andrews has made many great steps forward in restructuring the English Studies curriculum along many of the lines suggested in this essay. At the University of North Carolina,

Chapel Hill, Andrews, responding to dean Risa Palm's ideas, inducted the *First-Year Seminars Program*, which gives first-year students the opportunity to participate in courses consisting of fifteen to twenty students per class, taught by full-time faculty members on special topics created by the instructor (ADE 2001). This program is offered to all departments, and as an incentive to participate, any department committing to teaching four first-year seminars every year consecutively would be offered a new tenure-track hire (Andrews, ADE 2001). Andrews' own department agreed to teaching eight seminars, so thus received two tenure-track assistant professors (ADE 2001). Of this new program, Andrews has stated that "The key thing for my department is that we have benefited from it, our first-year students appreciate it,
and I can see no downside to it" (ADE 2001). Additionally, Chapel Hill offers a two-semester composition sequence, staffed primarily by English teaching fellows; some full-time faculty members do indeed teach in the first-year program, and they are primarily specialists in research and composition, which effectively allows these faculty members to align their research and pedagogical goals (Andrews, ADE 2001).

This program came about when Andrews analyzed the English department's student body. He determined that 96% of Chapel Hill's English department's student body consisted of undergraduates, thus undergraduates outnumbered graduates approximately 15 to 1 (Andrews, ADE 2001). He found that his senior faculty members were only teaching one graduate course a year and three upper-level courses for undergraduates. Thus, he asked himself: "Is this the right distribution of teaching responsibilities, given the ratio of undergraduates to graduate students in our clientele...? Did we need so many faculty members– about twenty-five each semester– offering graduate courses?" (ADE 2001). The answer was an emphatic *no*. Andrews concluded his faculty, regardless of rank, had to decrease their graduate teaching while increasing their undergraduate teaching. The faculty unanimously voted for a policy by which no faculty member could teach more than one graduate course every four semesters, and every faculty member had to teach one introductory literature course every four semesters. And no one– even administrators and endowed chair holders– were to be exempt (Andrews, ADE 2001).

There have been very little negative consequences to this program. Andrews has noted that since course offerings have somewhat diminished in number, some graduate students have complained about the lack of availability of certain courses. However, Andrews has argued this

has had a beneficial effect on what faculty members offer when they teach their courses, because now, more planning and consulting regarding graduate students' course selection is required. Moreover, under this new system, if a graduate course does not enroll an acceptable number– five for seminars and ten for graduate courses– then the course is cancelled and the faculty member must teach an undergraduate course relating to the instructor's field (Andrews, ADE 2001). Another salutary effect of this system is that Andrews has not had to hire part-time lecturers to cover the costs of undergraduate courses, and his teaching-assistant pool has been significantly reduced, thus freeing up more capital for the program (Andrews ADE 2001). Andrews attributes the program's success to the "culture of his department... Although once the English department at Carolina was as hierarchical as any, over the last decade we have moved toward greater egalitarianism and equal opportunity in teaching at all levels" (ADE 2001).

Andrews, by taking into account and manifesting many of the solutions previous scholars have suggested, has successfully restructured the English Studies curriculum at Chapel Hill. Andrews readily admits that his department is not the only one undergoing these changes; he feels that if he did anything unusual at Chapel Hill it was that he set "an implicit parallel of time and value between teaching at the most advanced and at the most introductory levels" of his curriculum (ADE 2001). Chapel Hill's restructuring, at minimum, provides us with a template, a model to refer to, for which we can begin to restructure our own English Studies curriculums in order to combat the problems with publishing requirements, overspecialization, and the gap between us as scholars and society. In closing, I think Andrews, in speaking about his restructured program and the beneficial changes it facilitated, sums it up best:

> No one in our department talks about teaching as a chore or a necessary evil; there is considerable camaraderie and genuine admiration for good undergraduate teaching, which makes it easy to present a commitment to introductory-level teaching as simply a part of what any responsible faculty member does, not a burden to be borne by a few who can't seem to get published... More striking than committing to regular introductory-course teaching was committing to not offering so many graduate courses and to ensuring that everyone had equal access to graduate teaching opportunities. That step could not have happened if undergraduate teaching was not taken as seriously as it was in my department... I do think that what we have done has given us a greater sense of mutuality and collegiality as a teaching community, while reinforcing our reputation throughout the

college as a department with a manifest and demonstrable dedication to undergraduate teaching. At a public institution, that counts for a lot these days" (ADE 2001).

Our highest responsibility as scholars in the academy is to teach our students how to think and read critically, to write clearly, effectively, efficiently, and eloquently. It is imperative we do not let our research and publishing pursuits get in the way of our pedagogy, for in this pursuit we isolate ourselves from both each other and our communities. We must find ways to present our work meaningfully to our students and the public, drawing connections between our research, pedagogy, and public life so that our students and communities begin to relate to the work conducted within the academy. We must abolish the publishing requirements fueling the competitive fires that are destroying the Humanities from the inside out. We must reestablish a sense of brotherhood and sisterhood, of solidarity in our English Studies departments; only when we have created this bond will we be able to relate to society– only by uniting within will we then be able to bridge outward.

Works Cited

Andrews, William L. "Building Bridges among Institutions: A First Step in the University of North Carolina System." <u>ADE Bulletin</u> 133 (Winter 2003): 57-59.

Andrews, William L. "Teaching Across the Curriculum." <u>ADE Bulletin</u> 128 (Spring 2001): 41-43.

Bizzell, Patricia. "'Contact Zones' and English Studies." <u>Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader</u>. Ed. Victor Villanueva. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 2003.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. "Canon-Formation, Literary History, and the Afro-American Tradition." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 174-182.

Graff, Gerald. "Disliking Bodies at an Early Age." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 41-48.

Graff, Gerald. "The Scholar in Society." <u>Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures</u> .Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992. 343-357.

Hames-García, Michael Roy. "Which America Is Ours?": Martí's 'Truth' And The Foundations Of 'American Literature.'" <u>MFS: Modern Fiction Studies</u> 49.1 (2003): 19-53.

Lodge, David. <u>The Book of Wars: What it Takes to be Educated in America</u>. By James Atlas. New York: Whittle, 1990. (qtd. Pg. 57).

Menand, Louis. "The Demise of Disciplinary Authority." <u>Falling Into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 103-109.

Miller, J. Hillis. "Rhetoric, Cultural Studies, and the Future of Critical Theory: A Conversation with J. Hillis Miller." <u>Philosophy, Rhetoric, Literary Criticism: (Inter)views</u>. Ed. Gary A. Olson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994. 115-151.

Ohmann, Richard. "The Function of English at the Present Time." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 89-95.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." <u>Profession</u> 91(1991): 33-40.

Purves, Alan. "Telling Our Story about Teaching Literature." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 211-218.

Rotker, Susana. "The (Political) Exile Gaze in Martí's Writing on the United States." <u>Jose Martí's "Our America": From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies.</u> Ed. Jeffrey Belnap & Raúl Fernández. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. 58-76.

Said, Edward W. "The Politics of Knowledge." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 188-198.

Scholes, Robert. <u>The Rise and Fall of English</u>. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. "Introduction: Axiomatic." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 183-188.

Tompkins, Jane. "Jane Tompkins and the Politics of Writing, Scholarship, and Pedagogy." <u>Philosophy, Rhetoric, Literary Criticism: (Inter)views</u>. Ed. Gary A. Olson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994. 161-177.

Tompkins, Jane. "Masterpiece Theater: The Politics of Hawthorne's Literary Reputation." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 137-145.

Vendler, Helen. "What We Have Loved, Others Will Love." <u>Falling into Theory</u>. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 31-40.

Whitman, Walt. <u>Leaves of Grass</u> (1855 Edition with Preface). New York: Penguin
      Group, 1986.