

Young Scholars Affecting Composition: A Challenge to Disciplinary Citation Practices

Amy E. Robillard

Scene 1. *College English*. 1993. As epigraph to her article, “The Limits of Containment: Text-as-Container in Composition Studies,” Darsie Bowden cites a nameless student, who is labeled only as “Student in a Composition Class” (364). I find it interesting that Bowden—or the editor of *College English*—chose to capitalize the entire label as though it were a proper name.

* * *

With the inauguration of *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric*, composition scholars now have access to student writing that is not accompanied by—and therefore not represented as an instantiation of—the pedagogical apparatus that has historically accompanied the publication of student writing in composition studies’ flagship journals. Students from schools as varied as the University of Missouri–Kansas City, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, Oberlin College, and Messiah College publish their work in this new undergraduate rhetoric and writing journal founded by scholars Laurie Grobman and the late Candace Spigelman of Penn State Berks–Lehigh Valley. As is the case with any other work published in a journal, authors’ full names, institutional affiliations, and short bios are provided. Each essay that appears in *Young Scholars* has been reviewed by peers

Amy E. Robillard is assistant professor of English at Illinois State University, where she teaches graduate courses in authorship theory and composition theory and undergraduate courses in rhetorical theory and the politics of writing. Her recent work has appeared in *College English* and the edited collection *Authorship in Composition Studies*. She is currently coediting *Sites of Plagiarism, Sites of Pedagogy* with Rebecca Moore Howard and is completing a book manuscript on student authorship in composition. Amy would like to thank those whose names function in this work as more than “nametags”: Becky Howard, Judy Goleman, and Laurie Grobman; and those who don’t appear but who figured prominently in this essay’s multiple revisions: Collin Brooke and Jim Zebroski.

College English, Volume 68, Number 3, January 2006

and almost all of the essays have been through at least one revision. For Volume 1, students in a senior capstone English course called *The Editorial Process* served as blind peer reviewers. For subsequent volumes, previously published *Young Scholars* authors have joined students in the capstone course to serve as manuscript reviewers. Unlike most other student writing published in composition studies journals, students are not identified as students of particular teachers or particular pedagogies, but as authors in their own right. In the Fall 2003 inaugural issue, which includes articles on, for example, basic literacy, collaborative learning, online texts and identities, and peer tutoring and literacy narratives, Grobman and Spigelman suggest that readers approach the published student writing *as scholarship*. Should this approach take hold in the field, composition scholars will be faced with important theoretical questions about what it means to cite the work of *other teachers' students* by full name. What implications might such citation practices hold for the field's current practices of citing students anonymously or by first name only?

In this essay, I will argue that citation practices are, at least in part, determined by affect. We cite the people we cite for a variety of reasons, and one of those reasons is that we have what Robert J. Connors calls “feelings of debt and ownership” (“Rhetoric,” Part 1 7) toward the texts and the authors we cite. While my argument implies a new understanding of writing teachers' relationships to the work students produce in their classes, my goal here is not to evaluate the consequences of this changing relationship or to suggest classroom methodologies for managing such changes. My primary concern in this essay is twofold: first, I want to focus on the specific way in which a shifting disciplinary focus from writing as *verb*—as represented most clearly by the pedagogical imperative—to writing as *noun*—and object of study in its own right—has created a new opportunity for students to contribute to the disciplinary knowledge of composition studies. Second, I am concerned with the specific potential that *Young Scholars in Writing* has to prompt a reevaluation of composition studies' citation of students anonymously or by first name only. When student texts are represented in composition studies as more than instantiations of particular pedagogies—when student texts are not indebted to *our* pedagogical work, in other words—as they are not in *Young Scholars in Writing*—what patterns of citation will we establish to acknowledge our “feelings of debt and ownership” toward these student authors? In his work on the rhetoric of citation systems, Connors notes that, though such systems “constrain many of the ways we deal with each other and each other's work, they have largely gone unremarked” (Part 2 242). I've set myself the task of remarking on composition studies' citation of student authors, largely because I see in students' opportunity to publish their work a new challenge for composition scholars.

WRITING, N.

In their article, “When Peer Tutors Write about Writing: Literacy Narratives and Self Reflection,” Heather Bastian and Lindsey Harkness demonstrate that composition scholars have constructed “an image—a critical image—of students,” and that such critical images of students

are further supported by the type of student the discourse community of composition chooses to discuss in their essays. Struggling or poor writers remain the focus. The preoccupation with “poor” and “struggling” students establishes these writers as the norm and disregards other students, such as competent college writers. (81)

Bastian and Harkness suggest that students ought to be provided opportunities “to engage in the rhetoric of the composition field, so that they can create more accurate representations of themselves” (91), a suggestion that makes sense when one considers the extent to which composition studies—unlike, say, astronomy or biology or economics—has relied upon student writing as the subject of so much of its research. While I agree wholeheartedly with Bastian and Harkness’s claim that providing students the opportunity to represent themselves in composition scholarship might allow the field to “learn about the concerns of student writers and student writing from the writers themselves” (92), as a disciplined compositionist I also know that composition studies remains far more interested in the *how* of teaching writing than in the *what* of that writing. The pedagogical imperative—the expectation that all scholarly and theoretical work in composition translate relatively seamlessly to classroom practice—has functioned to perpetuate the field’s interest in teaching practices—the *how*.

Recently, a number of compositionists have begun to consider what a writing course might look like were we to combine the *how* with the *what*. In WPA-L listserv discussions, Doug Downs, Christina Fisanick, and Elizabeth Wardle advocate a focus in first-year composition courses on the very questions underpinning composition studies itself—especially student empowerment. This small trend represents a shift in the central question of composition studies, as John Trimbur notes in his article “Changing the Question: Should Writing Be Studied?” In the 1960s and 1970s, the central question of composition studies was “Can writing be taught?” (16). The process movement, in what Trimbur calls “a kind of trickster operation,” revised the question to “How can writing be learned?” shifting the subject of the question from teacher to student and leading to “a proliferation of answers with no end in sight” (22). The question that seems now to be at the forefront of composition studies is “Should writing be studied?” and the answer that the process movement, with the writing workshop at the center of undergraduate writing instruction,

seems to be providing is a resounding “no” (22). Trimbur cites the pedagogical imperative—on the part of not just teachers but also *students* who expect to become better writers through classroom practice—as the reason the question “Should writing be studied?” has met with such negative responses. The pedagogical imperative fixes writing as a verb, whereas Bastian and Harkness’s work—and the publication of *Young Scholars in Writing* more generally—forces us to see writing as a noun, an object of study for students *as well as* for teachers. More recently, Nancy DeJoy argues in her book, *Process This: Undergraduate Writing in Composition Studies*, that engaging students in the questions of composition studies is essential to reconceiving students’ current positions as *consumers* of composition’s disciplinary knowledge and seeing them as participants in and contributors to such knowledge. Such work explicitly shifts the focus from writing as verb—as represented by the process movement’s tenet that all students can write and all students can be taught to write—to writing as noun and object of classroom study. If students are studying and theorizing about writing, rather than simply learning *how to write*, as clearly they are—and they’re publishing their work in peer-reviewed journals—composition studies will need to revise its citation practices.

I have to step back at this point and confess that my first professional impulse on citing the work of Bastian and Harkness is to *analyze* their work *as student writing*, to draw on it as support for a pedagogical argument I’m making (“See, when we ask students to write about writing, they do so eloquently and convincingly,” writes the teacher hero). I approach the writing in *YSIW* as student writing even though I have no knowledge of the pedagogical apparatus that shaped the writing. Jane E. Hindman might say that this is because I’ve been disciplined to approach student writing in particular ways, that my professional identity involves conflicting functions: those of both “a guardian of cultural capital disciplined by the conventions of professional practice *and* a cultural critic committed to revealing and decentering hegemonic domination of access to power and knowledge” (103). To analyze student writing for what it demonstrates about a particular pedagogy—this is an authorizing move in the discourse of composition studies, perhaps *the* authorizing move. Further, Anis Bawarshi’s notion of the “genre function” offers a compelling explanation of how genre shapes our disciplinary responses to student writing. Bawarshi explains that “as individuals’ rhetorical responses to recurrent situations become typified as genres, the genres in turn help structure the way these individuals conceptualize and experience these situations, predicting their notions of what constitutes appropriate and possible responses and actions” (340). Our role as teacher is constituted by the genres within which we work and which shape our understanding of both students’ and our own “appropriate and possible responses”: the genre of the assignment prompt, of the student essay, of responses to student writing. To approach student writing as an

instantiation of a particular pedagogy, as we've been disciplined to do for decades now, is to fix writing as a verb, to focus on the *how* rather than the *what*. But *Young Scholars in Writing* doesn't allow readers to make that move because it includes no pedagogical apparatus. Instead, the journal's editors ask that we read student writing as scholarship that contributes to the "on-going formation of this disciplinary community" (5). To approach student writing as scholarship fixes writing as a noun, as a *contribution* to the work of composition.

If we take up Grobman and Spigelman's call, the ongoing formation of composition studies' disciplinary community is going to be marked by shifting conceptions of what it means to draw on undergraduates' writing. Despite composition scholars' earlier suggestions that, for example, we read the work of beginning writers as the work of authors, thus allowing for the possibility of reading students' work "as we might read any other author's texts, not as the 'emerging' or 'failed' work of outsiders" (Greene 189), disciplinary citation practices preclude scholars' citing students as they might cite any other author. Citation practices suggest a great deal, as Connors notes, about authors' "feelings of debt and ownership" ("Rhetoric," Part 1 7). When we cite one another but leave students nameless or pseudonymous, we perpetuate an author/student binary that works against our liberatory disciplinary ideals. If, as Connors suggests, the author's name functions as a sort of "nametag" for a work (Part 2 239),¹ the student's name has to this point functioned in composition scholarship as evidence of the *teacher's* pedagogical accomplishment.

* * *

Scene 2. *JAC*. 2001. In her published response to Thomas Rickert's work, Judith Goleman finds herself unconsciously challenging the prevailing discourse of composition studies when she grants student writing the same stature as the work of colleagues. Goleman explains that,

in the process of writing this response, I have come to understand how "John White" [her pseudonym for a student] succeeded in disrupting my normal reading with his act. Two-thirds of the way through my first draft, I noticed that I had stopped referring to my former student as "John" and had begun calling him by his surname, "White," extending to him the same stature I had given Rickert and Bartholomae. I have decided not to correct this inconsistency but to retain it as a marker of the way my authoritative relationship with John White's work was altered. ("Writing" 661)

I cannot help picking up on Goleman's choice of the word *stature*. While Goleman consciously gave her student the pseudonym "John White," her respect for her student's writing led her to grant him the kind of authority we usually consciously try to (and are told to) avoid.

THE FUNCTIONS OF CITATION

As scholars of authorship have noted, citation practices are explained to students primarily via economic metaphors (Gilfus; Howard; Rose). Students are taught—in handbooks and in classroom exchanges—that the primary function of citation is to avoid plagiarism by giving credit where credit is due. Students are admonished to reveal their indebtedness to the authors whose work subsidizes their own. In composition studies, a field whose research has for decades now been advanced by the work of both scholars and students, it seems rather logical to argue that composition scholars ought also to give credit where credit is due, to acknowledge their indebtedness to the students whose work has provided so much rich data for their research. But, as I will demonstrate below, citation practices are not governed by logic alone. Rather, *affect* governs so many of our citation decisions that one cannot help but wonder what role affect plays in our disciplinary practice of citing students by only their first names.

I break down the following functions of citation into three permeable categories: those functions that primarily serve the reader, those that primarily serve the citing author(s), and those that primarily serve the cited author(s). My purpose in establishing such categories is to emphasize the relational functions of citation. While many of the following functions most certainly fit into more than one category, I construct this rather arbitrary system of categories so that I may demonstrate the differing degrees to which reader, writer, and cited author benefit from scholarly citation practices.

For the reader of a scholarly work, citation functions to

1. Provide access to source material.² As Connors notes in his history of citation systems, parenthetical systems such as APA and MLA “had as their clearest purpose the easing of a reader’s task of finding and accessing cited sources” (“Rhetoric,” Part 2 238). This function of citation is perhaps the second most frequently cited explanation of citation systems given to students. Imagine a reader who wants to follow up on an idea you mentioned only briefly, we tell students. I imagine there are very few writing teachers who ask students to imagine a plagiarism-obsessed teacher who wants to police the students’ work, though this second function of citation undoubtedly performs double duty in this way.
2. Establish relationships among texts. As Shirley K. Rose has noted, multiple citations in a text function to establish coherence relationships, including the coordinate relationship (“and”), the opposite (“but”), the generative (“for”), the consequential (“so”), the appositive (“or”), the exemplary (“for example”), the sequential (“first, second”) and the iterative (244). Interestingly, Rose names the exemplary relationship as that which “makes the strongest of claims for the value of its contribution to the disciplinary economy” (246). Student texts for decades now have been and continue to be represented in the scholarship as examples and therefore as strong claims for the value of a *particular peda-*

gogy, that pedagogy designed and implemented by the author of the article. Rose goes on to argue that “exemplary citations implicitly argue that within an area of study or category of texts, one text can stand for all, which can also be understood as a claim to uniformity and reliability” (247). When students are known to a disciplinary community only as Sarah or Dwayne or Minh or Bobby, readers are led to believe that one student stands for all students in a way that readers would never be led to believe one authorship theorist stands for all authorship theorists, for example.

For the author of a scholarly text, citing other scholars functions to

1. Establish the citing author’s expertise. Connors notes that parenthetical reference systems “were formulated to allow authors to display complete control over previous work in their special field” (Part 2 238).
2. Provide evidence for the citing author’s claims.
3. Affirm the citing author’s membership and participation in a particular discourse community (Connors Part 1; Rose). Rebecca Moore Howard notes that citation is a means by which one “establishes one’s right to contribute a subordinate voice to scholarly discourse” (2). When, earlier in this essay, I cited the work of Bowden, Goleman, and Trimbur, I was letting my readers know that I am versed in the discourse of composition studies. My citations of these scholars might be said to function, as Connors puts it, as a “secret handshake known only to members of the secret society” (Part 2). Clearly, this function of citation overlaps with Number 1. By displaying my “complete control” over previous work in my field, I am also claiming membership in a particular discourse community.
4. Align a citing author with a particular school of thought. To cite Peter Elbow, Donald Murray, James Britton, and Ken Macrorie is to align oneself with the school of thought in composition studies known as *expressivism*. To cite David Bartholomae, Joseph Harris, Bruce Horner, and Min-Zhan Lu is to align oneself with a pedagogical approach associated with the Pittsburgh School: an approach characterized by an emphasis on academic discourse and a social-epistemic rhetorics.
5. Act as a “protective garment” (Howard), “battering any potential critics into silence” (Connors, “Rhetoric,” Part 1 11). If readers doubt my claim about this function of citation, I direct them to the work of Howard and Connors, both of whom are established, respected scholars of compositions studies.

For the authors whose work is cited, such citation functions to

1. Give credit where credit is due. Just as students are required to acknowledge whose work shaped their own, so too are scholars expected to do the same.
2. “Identify and legitimate contributions to a discipline’s economy” (Rose 244). When Jennifer Beech cites, in the same article, both Joseph Harris and Jim Goad, she is legitimating Goad’s contribution to our disciplinary knowledge. Likewise, when Julie Lindquist introduces composition scholars to the ethnographic work of Laura Grindstaff, Lindquist legitimates Grindstaff’s contribution to the field’s understanding of emotions as performance. When students are represented by first name only, their contributions to the discipline are neither identified nor legitimated.

3. Call attention to the work of a little-known or an up-and-coming scholar. When Rebecca Moore Howard, my dissertation director, cites my unpublished work in a keynote address at a national conference, her citation functions to legitimate the contribution my work has thus far made to the field.
4. Suggest a great deal about an author's "feelings of debt and ownership" (Connors, "Rhetoric," Part 1 7). While scholars are honor-bound to cite those whose work they've quoted directly, one could argue that they are not honor-bound to list the names of every writer who has influenced their work; indeed, such a task would prove next to impossible. Therefore, those whose work *is* cited are those to whom the author experiences "feelings of debt and ownership." As Howard notes in "The Citation Mambo," Peter Elbow's feelings of debt and ownership—as evidenced by the acknowledgments he makes in the 1998 second edition of *Writing without Teachers*—have changed significantly since the 1973 publication of the first edition. In the second edition, Elbow acknowledges his "intellectual debts" (qtd. in Howard 13) to the work of Macrorie, Michael Polyani, Peter Medawar, Carl Rogers, Jerome Bruner, and others.
5. Indicate the citing author's respect for the cited author's work. The people whose work we choose to cite in our own work are the people we have deemed worthy of response, and the people we have deemed worthy of response are, I argue, those whose work we respect. I don't think it's a stretch to claim that the decisions we make about whose work to cite are *affective* decisions.
6. "Affirm individual property, relinquishing the citing writer's claim to it" (Howard 6). The words I cite in quotation marks belong not to me but to the author whose name appears in parentheses after the quotation marks. I acknowledge, when citing Howard, that her ideas are her own, and that those ideas have influenced my own. Paradoxically, this move perpetuates the figure of the autonomous author who owns her work (Howard, in this case) and the influenced author who stands on the shoulders of those authors (I, in this case). My work is made possible, in part, by Howard's work.
7. "Show how [others] have shared their work with us" (Robbins 168). Sarah Robbins sees this move as a way of creating a record "of the meaningful, materially situated links between our writing and its sources, not because others we 'credit' with conventions like footnotes are the sole owners of their texts" (168). Rather, this move to acknowledge the ways others have shared their work with us is a move to avoid "the problems that result when authorial credit becomes so blurred as to make the monitoring of textual integrity impossible" (167).

A colleague of mine remarked earlier this year, after my telling her about my work's being cited by a friend of a friend in *College English*, that she has a small group of graduate school buddies who try to cite one another whenever possible. To risk stating the obvious, this is because there is value in being cited by others in the field. To be cited is to know that one is being read, but, perhaps more important, such citations function as a form of exchange value in the academic marketplace. When my work is cited, I can materially represent my "impact on the field," and my value in the academic marketplace increases. When I cite the work of a colleague whom I know personally, then, I am doing more than indicating the ways her work has influ-

enced my own. I am calling scholarly attention to her work because I know that that attention is valuable in its own right. In addition to establishing one of the eight epistemic relationships Rose points to above, I am representing an affective relationship.

In this list of thirteen functions of citation, one notices traces of affect. Most obvious is Connors's claim that citation suggests "*feelings* of debt and ownership" [emphasis added]. Debt and ownership are not subject simply to the rules of logic. I may feel debt toward Howard for her influence on my work, but I also may feel ownership of the work students in my classes do as a result of the sequence of assignments I designed. My feelings of debt and ownership are evidenced, then, in my representation—my citation—of some writers and not of others. Affect is evident, too, in the metaphors Rose has used to describe the functions of citation. As an *act of faith*, citation might be understood as "a ritual whereby a writer affirms community membership and testifies to his or her acceptance of the shared beliefs of the discourse community" (241). As a *courtship ritual*, citation might be understood as that which builds "identification among members of a discourse community" (247). Faith and courtship are decidedly affective, not subject to logic. The predominant metaphor in writing handbooks, Rose notes, is the economic metaphor (241), that which relies on matters of debt, credit, and payment. When we talk about citation with students, it's the economic metaphor that predominates because it's the economic metaphor that is most susceptible to logic rather than affect. With students, teachers don't often talk about "feelings" of debt; rather, our discussions of citation are likely dominated by the notion of giving credit where credit is due. And credit is due whenever we use the words or ideas of another writer. Simple as that.

But most writers know on some level that citations aren't simply matters of rationality and logic. Citations reveal a great deal about personal allegiances. We cite the people we cite because we *feel* certain things toward them. Judith Goleman has had a tremendous impact on my scholarly growth. My citation of her work in this essay functions not necessarily to showcase my expertise in Goleman's work but as a kind of public acknowledgment of the impact she's had on my thinking. She trained me to see composition studies as a field devoted to the study of student writing and to understand my function as a composition scholar as, in large part, to demonstrate the ways student writing contributes to my disciplinary knowledge. This is not to say that we necessarily know personally the people whose work we cite. When I get really excited about something I'm reading, there is clearly emotion involved. For example, the first time I read Carolyn Kay Steedman's *Landscape for a Good Woman*, I literally had to stop myself from going forward because I wanted to savor each and every word. Steedman was the first writer I'd read who seemed to be putting *my* social class experiences into words, words that I hadn't been able to find up to that point. When I then cite Steedman's work in my own, I am represent-

ing an affective relationship at the same time that I am representing an epistemological relationship. Hindman might note that what I am doing when I call attention to the affective experiences I have with texts is “bearing witness to [my] own rhetoric” (99). The citation practices I am calling attention to in this essay are part and parcel of the authority composition studies has constructed for itself within the larger academic community. In order to preserve this constructed authority, composition scholars, like other professionals, “systematically and systemically re-route our professional authority from the transient, contextual vicissitudes of our everyday practices and corporeal selves to an already constituted and abstract realm of disciplinary subjects, linguistic patterns, and texts” (Hindman 100). The authors whose work we cite in our scholarship, Hindman seems to suggest, become author-functions rather than materially situated people. It will take more than reading students’ work “as we might any other author’s text” (Greene 189) to affect the way we cite students in the scholarship. I am suggesting that the publication of an undergraduate journal in writing and rhetoric has the potential to disrupt this pattern by forcing us to rethink our relationship to students involved in the scholarship of writing and rhetoric. More than a demonstration of the pedagogical imperative, *Young Scholars in Writing* functions as evidence that students are able and willing to contribute to composition studies’ disciplinary knowledge about writing and rhetoric.

* * *

Scene 3. *College Composition and Communication*. 2004. Goleman’s “An ‘Immensely Simplified Task’: Form in Modern Composition-Rhetoric” foregrounds one student’s work and, in this essay, Goleman does not remark on her decision to refer to her student by full name, leading me to conclude that she has made a conscious decision to grant student writing the same stature as the work of Barrett Wendell and Fred Newton Scott. After introducing her student by full name—“So begins Sahra Ahmed’s essay, ‘Language Identity vs. Identity Crisis,’ written in response to an assignment inviting students to compose their own complex portrait or complex analysis of cause [. . .]” (62)—Goleman refers to her student by surname only, a convention reserved in the discourse of composition studies for authors and scholars.

THE FUNCTIONS OF CITING STUDENT WRITING

In her analysis of Elbow’s evolving citation practices, Howard argues that “citation practices vary according to the status of the person doing the citing” (7), and my analysis of scholars’ patterns of citations of students persuades me that citation practices vary, too, according to the status of the person being cited. Again, to cite particular writers is to align oneself with a particular school of thought. To cite Elbow,

Macrorie, and Murray is to align oneself with expressivist theory. To cite Sahra Ahmed or Silas Kulkarni or Alicia Brazeau is to align oneself with students, to forward the argument that students contribute to the knowledge of composition studies as more than examples of particular pedagogies. To cite students is to forward the argument that writing as a mode of learning (Emig) is a dialogic process; teachers teach students to write, but students, in their writing, teach teachers about more than the results of particular pedagogies. As Goleman demonstrates in her discussion of Ahmed's work, students can push instructors to become deeply involved in the content—the *what* in addition to the *how*—of their writing and its implications for our theories of literacy—as opposed to instructors' published responses to the results of a particular pedagogy. Goleman writes,

Indeed, in the process of puzzling my initial response to Ahmed's paper, I have been challenged to reconsider my commonsense Western assumption that her wish for a "true Somali identity" necessarily contradicts her wish for others to understand both the vicissitudes of heteroglossia in postcolonial contexts and the reality of hybrid identities. I have asked myself, What if the acquisition of full literacy in the Somali language has been a force of resistance against domination and oppression, making its acquisition transformative in a different but equally plausible way as a sociopolitical analysis of one's hybridity? ("Simplified" 67–68)

The relationship Goleman establishes between Ahmed's work and her own theorizing is what Rose would call a generative relationship. While Ahmed's paper might be said to be exemplary in the sense that Goleman does provide the pedagogical context in which Ahmed's paper was produced, Goleman's primary purpose in citing Ahmed is not to forward a particular pedagogy but, I argue, to document the ways that Ahmed shared her work with her (Robbins 168).

When I was a graduate student learning to become a writing teacher, I was one of five teaching interns working under Goleman's direction. When Goleman decided to draw on my experiences as both a graduate student and as a new teacher of writing in a conference paper she was drafting, she requested my permission. I agreed, as long as I was able to read a draft of the paper, to see the way my work was being represented—to see what Goleman *really* thought of my work as a writing teacher. Goleman kept me anonymous, naming me "Charlotte." Though I didn't raise this issue at the time, I remember thinking that I would have preferred to be represented in her work by my real name. If I was going to be accorded the respect that accompanies citation—be it supportive or antagonistic—I wanted to be identified so that I could then point to the impact my work had had on a scholar whose work I respected. I wanted the right to claim the exchange value that accompanies citation. I imagine these feelings were not unique to me.

Every time I've asked a student for permission to use his or her work in my own scholarship, that student has enthusiastically agreed. I've always given students the

choice between remaining anonymous and being cited by their full names, and students have almost always chosen to be represented by their full names. Students, like anyone else, are generally pleased to see that their work has had an impact on someone else's thinking. They, like anyone else, like the idea of seeing their names in print.

The most explicit example of this enthusiasm that I can think of in recent composition scholarship appears in Gail Stygall's article, "Resisting Privilege: Basic Writing and Foucault's Author Function." Stygall describes a project involving graduate students at Miami University, basic writing students at Temple University, and basic writing students at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis. Graduate students corresponded with the basic writing students in an effort to become conscious of the discursive practices involved in constructing students as "basic writers" (322). My interest in this article lies specifically in an exchange between graduate student "Laurie" and basic writing student "Marg." In an explicit acknowledgement of the uses to which her writing is being put, Laurie writes to Marg:

Why are our teachers having us do this? We're interesting people! We write differently, go to different schools, have different lives—all that'll show up in one way or another. Then they can write about us! I don't mind, either. It's really fun to meet another person—even through the mail—and I'll take my paragraph of fame if this winds up going somewhere for my teacher. (333)

My initial reaction to this exchange is evidenced by my marginal notation: "How can you have 'fame' if you're known and represented as simply 'Laurie'?" Clearly, Laurie understands that there is value in being cited in her teacher's scholarship. And now, as I write, my reaction is focused on Laurie's understanding—even as *she's writing*—that her work will be appropriated. Stygall interprets Laurie's statement differently, however. Because Stygall is constructing an argument about the pervasiveness of the author-function in English departments, she sees Laurie's statement as an acknowledgment on Laurie's part that writing is what "will lead to being the author-scholar" (335). Following her reproduction of Laurie's comment about her "paragraph of fame," Stygall writes, simply, "Writing is the game and they intend to be players" (335). Evident in Stygall's commentary is an understanding that Laurie knows the value of being cited; she wants to be a "player" in the "game" of writing. But Stygall resists acknowledging that Laurie's statement evidences an awareness that Stygall benefits from her use of Laurie's writing. Laurie is the subject of Stygall's research. Laurie is thus provided no opportunity to respond—at least publicly—to Stygall's interpretation of her writing. Likewise, as an anonymous student, Laurie cannot lay claim to the exchange value that accompanies citation with anyone other than her teacher or classmates; she cannot claim her "paragraph of fame."

The primary reason provided for *not* citing students' full names in our work is that students need *protection* in ways that published authors do not. In 1994, as editor of *College Composition and Communication*, Joseph Harris issued a statement designed to regulate contributors' use of student work in published scholarship.³ The exigency for Harris's statement is the "exciting" broadening of "the range of texts that are now seen as calling for study and response—drawing attention especially to the writings of students, but also to assignments, comments on students papers [. . .]" (439). Citing the need to "distinguish between citing the published work of a mature scholar and the semi-private writings of students," Harris encourages contributors to *College Composition and Communication* to quote student work "both anonymously and with permission" (440). The issue for Harris is "one of control over text" (439). While published authors have the opportunity to revise their work before it appears in a scholarly journal, students often do not have the same opportunity, Harris points out. Rather than suggesting that authors provide students that opportunity, Harris suggests instead that we keep students anonymous and do not include them in our lists of works cited.

An anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this essay takes issue with my treatment of Harris because, "if students are authors, they are out in the arena and open to criticism." Harris himself, in the same piece, writes that one of the functions of citation is to invoke response (441) and that cited authors ought to be represented "as agents making claims whose particulars are now being disputed, extended, or qualified" (440). The anonymous reviewer suggests that it is with "considerable validity" that institutional review boards "work to protect students' rights as *subjects* of our research." I am suggesting that, with the publication of *Young Scholars in Writing*, students are going to be appearing in our scholarship as more than the *subjects* of our research. While early scholarship in composition studies indeed focused on students as subjects of our research, and scholarship *about* students continues to dominate the field, the function of student writing need not be—and will not be, if Grobman and Spigelman's call is taken up—*limited to* serving as the subject of our research. There's room for us to do more than study our students' writing; with the publication of student work in *Young Scholars in Writing*, we now have the opportunity to establish what Rose calls "coherence relationships" between the published work of scholars and the published work of students. And, significantly, students have the opportunity to represent *themselves* as writers and thinkers contributing to the knowledge of an academic field.

Moreover, the claim that student authors need "protection" becomes more difficult to defend when we reconsider it in light of the acknowledgment by Howard and Connors that even *members of the discourse community* need protection from potential criticism. Recall that one of the functions of citation is to "act as a protective

garment” (Howard), “battering any potential critics into silence” (Connors, “Rhetoric,” Part 1 11). Thus, while Harris points to the differences in control over text as a primary reason for keeping student authors anonymous, the notion that even established scholars need “protection” from potential criticism suggests that there are additional reasons for refusing to name students in our work. These reasons, I suggest, are affective.

Composition studies is a field that prides itself on its relationship to pedagogy, to learning, to students and their writing. We believe that writing can be empowering, and we’ve spent decades gathering pedagogical support for such claims. Because of this particular relationship that the field has established with students, I’ve divided the functions of citing student writing into two permeable categories. Where scholarly citation in general functions as a form of cultural capital for both the cited author and the citing author, scholarly citation of student work in composition studies can function as a form of capital for the cited author—the student—and for the field more generally.

For students, composition scholars’ complete citation of their writing functions to

1. Give credit where credit is due.
2. Establish the cited author—and not just the group to which that cited author belongs, in this case “students”—as a legitimate contributor to a discourse community.
3. Engender relationships among citing author(s) and cited authors(s) that move beyond the exemplary, teacher-student relationship fostered by the pedagogical imperative and toward what Rose calls generative, coordinate, and consequential relationships. As Goleman’s work with Ahmed demonstrates, citing students by their full names offers composition scholars a concrete method of documenting the ways teachers learn from their students.

For the academic field of composition studies, scholars’ complete citation of student writing functions to

1. Resist appropriation of student writing.
2. Challenge the commonplace argument that students require a kind of protection from response that published scholars do not.
3. Carve a space for published student response to scholars’ interpretations of student work. Carra Leah Hood recently argued that journals that accept scholarship reliant on student writing should provide space for students’ written responses to scholars’ interpretations of their work (66), and I agree. Grobman, faculty editor of *Young Scholars in Writing*, recently announced that the journal “seeks Comments & Responses written by undergraduates that engage in intellectual dialogue with previously published articles in the journal.” Three “Comment and Response” essays will appear in the journal’s third volume. I applaud this move, though I do not believe that such responses should be restricted to *Young Scholars in Writing*.

With the publication of *Young Scholars in Writing*, individual teachers have little cultural capital to accrue because the journal presents student writing as scholarship rather than as an instantiation of a particular pedagogy for which a teacher can take credit. Instead, the *field* is faced with a challenge to its practices of citing student work.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE WITH DEEP ACTING

The authors whose work we choose to cite are those authors whose work we as members of this discourse community choose to legitimate, respect, acknowledge, and affirm—even when we vigorously disagree with their claims. The students whose work we choose to cite are those students whose work we believe is in need of protection from a disciplinary economy that approaches living, breathing, material people as abstractions, as author-functions. Composition scholars are trained to read student writing in particular ways—as instantiations of particular pedagogies that might be replicated in different classrooms rather than as writing that might contribute to “the on-going formation of this disciplinary community” (Grobman and Spigelman 5). Until the publication of *Young Scholars in Writing*, readers have been able to distinguish between the work of scholars and that of students by simply noting whose work is identified by full name rather than by first name or anonymously.

I believe that Lindquist’s most recent work provides one possibility for approaching the challenge that *Young Scholars in Writing* poses to composition studies’ citation practices. In her article, “Class Affects, Classroom Affectations,” Lindquist draws on the work of cultural ethnographer Laura Grindstaff to argue for the value of teachers’ performing strategic empathy in the writing classroom with working-class students. Grindstaff draws on Arlie Russell Hochschild to distinguish between “surface acting” and “deep acting.” Lindquist explains the difference between surface acting and deep acting in terms of control:

When you’re surface acting, you remain in control of your emotions by consciously structuring the impressions you produce. When you’re deep acting, you relinquish the possibility of emotional control. When you deep act, in other words, you work, through acts of will and imagination, to open yourself to the possibility that you might *persuade yourself* that the emotions you are presenting are real. You risk *becoming* the thing you are performing. Deep acting is, paradoxically, the process of exerting control in order to relinquish control. (197)

If citations are affective (and I think they are), then I believe we stand to gain by applying Lindquist’s deep-acting approach to the context of scholarly citations. Lindquist believes that “the idea of deep acting as a pedagogical stance gets us into a place where we can begin to imagine how students’ experiences of class can have

heuristic potential” (205), and I believe that the idea of deep acting as an approach to citing students in composition scholarship has the potential to better show the ways students have shared their work with us (Robbins 168). While Lindquist’s argument is, as she says, “a case for relinquishing certain forms of control,” it is also—and this is significant—“a case for controlling other things presumed not to be subject to, or appropriate for, control” (205). To name is to control. To withhold a student’s name is a form of that control. In his work on the rhetoric of citations systems, Connors notes that “citation rhetorics only occasionally seem like anything individual authors can control” (“Rhetoric,” Part 2 242). Goleman is certainly not the only individual in composition studies to resist the dominant patterns of citing students. I believe, though, that when one performs a kind of “deep acting” with respect to reading the work of scholars like Goleman, one opens up the possibility of *becoming* the reader who acknowledges the significance of the work of writers like Sahra Ahmed. Further, to perform a kind of deep acting when *citing students ourselves* in our scholarship is to alter the conditions of production of that scholarship. We open ourselves to the possibility of *becoming* writers who acknowledge the contributions of student work to our own work, thereby engendering the possibility that readers will develop belief in the value of the texts we cite—whether we label them student texts or not.

There are, of course, important differences between a conception of deep acting as a performance in the classroom for students to see and a conception of deep acting as a performance in the relative isolation of reading and writing with student scholarship. In the classroom, performing what Lindquist calls strategic empathy as a teacher is working to convince both oneself and one’s students that one feels a certain way in order to facilitate students’ emotional learning. Performing such strategic affect as a scholar involves convincing oneself and one’s readers that *all* of the authors one cites are legitimate, valued members of this discourse community with knowledge to contribute. Teacher-scholars can no longer appropriate the writing that their pedagogy has helped to produce; there is no exchange value for teachers themselves when they perform deep acting with citation practices. As a reader of such scholarship, one works to control one’s professional desire for the pedagogical apparatus that has historically accompanied the publication of student writing. Scholars do this in order to facilitate a disciplinary recognition of composition studies’ indebtedness to students’ perspectives and, now, to their contributions to the knowledge of the field.

In her recent essay, “Distributed Authorship: A Feminist Case-Study Framework for Studying Intellectual Property,” Robbins notes that while composition teachers have recently begun acknowledging their appreciation for writing by students and “other marginalized groups” as “forms of authorship,” the emphasis in discussions of intellectual property has been on “protecting *producers* who are potentially vulnerable to appropriation and/or misuse, in large part because their status as au-

thors is tenuous" (155). With the publication of *Young Scholars in Writing*, students' status as authors is decidedly less tenuous. In enacting a form of Lindquist's strategic empathy, composition scholars make possible relationships to student writing that move beyond protection and instantiation of pedagogical theories. Individually, teacher-scholars have less to gain as they cannot claim responsibility for the pedagogy that "produced" student writing. Disciplinarily, though, composition scholars stand to gain a more productive, respectful, and legitimate relationship to students and their writing when we work to demonstrate the ways they have and continue to share their work and their knowledge with us.

NOTES

1. Connors's point here is obviously an echo of Michel Foucault's notion of the "author-function," and an extension of Barthes's declaration of the author's death. Indeed, had I simply mentioned in this note that Connors's point here is an extension of Foucault and Barthes, most readers would need no more than a quick reference to these "nametags."

2. The practice, however, of citing "unpublished manuscripts" or even "forthcoming" works would seem to negate this function at the same time that it indicates a particular kind of relationship between citing author and cited author. If I'm citing the unpublished work of a student, the relationship between citing author and cited author is relatively straightforward. If I'm citing the unpublished work of a colleague, however, the very fact that I have *access* to this unpublished work suggests a great deal about personal relationships, allegiances, and, I argue, affect.

3. Since the publication of Harris's statement, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) has issued its position statement, "Guidelines for the Ethical Treatment of Students and Student Writing in Composition Studies." The statement asks that teacher-scholars cite student work—written or spoken—"without including the students' names or identifying information unless they have the students' permission to identify them." The default for students is anonymity, presumably because students need to be protected.

WORKS CITED

- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image, Music, Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Noonday, 1977. 142–48.
- Bastian, Heather, and Lindsey Harkness. "When Peer Tutors Write about Writing: Literacy Narratives and Self Reflection." *Young Scholars in Writing* 1 (2003): 77–94.
- Bawarshi, Anis. "The Genre Function." *College English* 62 (2000): 335–60.
- Beech, Jennifer. "Redneck and Hillbilly Discourse in the Writing Classroom: Classifying Critical Pedagogies of Whiteness." *College English* 67 (2004): 172–86.
- Bowden, Darsie. "The Limits of Containment: Text-as-Container in Composition Studies." *CCC* 44 (1993): 364–79.
- CCCC Ad Hoc Committee on the Ethical Use of Students and Student Writing in Composition Studies. "Guidelines for the Ethical Treatment of Students and Student Writing in Composition Studies." *CCC* 52 (2001): 485–90.
- Connors, Robert J. "The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part 1: The Development of Annotation Structures from the Renaissance to 1900." *Rhetoric Review* 17 (1998): 6–47.
- . "The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part 2: Competing Epistemic Values in Citation." *Rhetoric*

- Review* 17 (1999): 219–45.
- DeJoy, Nancy. *Process This: Undergraduate Writing in Composition Studies*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2005.
- Downs, Doug. “Re: Comp Theory in FYC.” Online posting. 17 May 2004. WPA-L listserv. 17 May 2004 <http://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0405&L=wpa-l&D=1&O=A&P=36123>.
- Emig, Janet. “Writing as a Mode of Learning.” *CCC* 28 (1977): 122–28.
- Fisanick, Christina. “Re: Comp Theory in FYC.” Online posting. 16 May 2004. WPA-L listserv. 16 May 2004 <http://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0405&L=wpa-l&D=1&O=A&P=33768>.
- Foucault, Michel. “What Is an Author?” *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. Donald Bouchard. Trans. Donald Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977. 124–27.
- Gilfus, Jonna. “Students and Authors in Introductory Composition Textbooks.” *Authorship in Composition Studies*. Ed. Tracy Hamler Carrick and Rebecca Moore Howard. Boston: Thomson, 2006. 57–74.
- Goleman, Judith. “An ‘Immensely Simplified Task’: Form in Modern Composition-Rhetoric.” *CCC* 56 (2004): 51–71.
- . “Writing the Act, Reading the Act: A Response to Thomas Rickert.” *JAC* 21 (2001): 654–62.
- Greene, Stuart. “Making Sense of My Own Ideas: The Problems of Authorship in a Beginning Writing Classroom.” *Written Communication* 12 (1995): 186–218.
- Grobman, Laurie, and Candace Spigelman. “Editors’ Introduction.” *Young Scholars in Writing* 1 (2003): 1–5.
- Harris, Joseph. “From the Editor: The Work of Others.” *CCC* 45 (1994): 439–41.
- Hindman, Jane E. “Writing an Important Body of Scholarship: A Proposal for an Embodied Rhetoric of Professional Practice.” *JAC* 22 (2002): 93–118.
- Hood, Carra Leah. “The Ethics of Researching Composition Students and Their Work.” *Writing on the Edge* 13 (2003): 56–66.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore. “The Citation Mambo: Preserving the Modernist Subject.” Unpublished manuscript, 2002.
- Lindquist, Julie. “Class Affects, Classroom Affectations.” *College English* 67 (2004): 187–209.
- Robbins, Sarah. “Distributed Authorship: A Feminist Case-Study Framework for Studying Intellectual Property.” *College English* 66 (2003): 155–71.
- Rose, Shirley K. “The Role of Scholarly Citations in Disciplinary Economies.” *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. Ed. Lisa Buranen and Alice M. Roy. Albany: SUNY P, 1999. 241–49.
- Steedman, Carolyn Kay. *Landscape for a Good Woman: A Story of Two Lives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1987.
- Stygall, Gail. “Resisting Privilege: Basic Writing and Foucault’s Author Function.” *CCC* 45 (1994): 320–41.
- Trimbur, John. “Changing the Question: Should Writing Be Studied?” *Composition Studies* 31.1 (2003): 15–24.
- Wardle, Elizabeth. “Re: Comp Theory in FYC.” Online posting. 17 May 2004. WPA-L listserv. 17 May 2004 <http://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0405&L=wpa-l&D=1&O=A&P=38555>.