Zeitschrift Schreiben
Schreiben in Schule, Hochschule und Beruf
www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu

The Historical Roots of Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities

Judith Kearns

University of Winnipeg, Canada

Brian Turner

University of Winnipeg, Canada

Abstract

The writing culture of Canadian universities is rooted in 19th century British philosophies and educational models, particularly the belles lettres tradition and Matthew Arnold's view that higher education must aim to develop critical appreciation of «the best that has been thought and written.» The strength of this connection has resulted in an approach very different from that of the U.S.A. Whereas the American «first-year comp» tradition suggests a broad, cross-disciplinary emphasis on writing, Canadian universities have since the late 19th century assigned writing a narrow, intra-disciplinary status. Most undergraduate students receive writing instruction only in a first-year literature course, and even then it is often minimal, basic, and discipline-centric, the genres and styles appropriate to writing about literature being treated as transferable to other disciplines. Fortunately, alternative sites of and approaches to writing instruction have begun to emerge in Canadian universities.

Despite the obvious geographic, socio-cultural, and historical differences among our respective research sites, Canadian teachers of academic writing have much in common with their European counterparts. Participation in four EATAW conferences has made two of these similarities particularly striking to the authors. One is the relative novelty of the work we do as writing teachers and of our place in higher education. In Canadian universities before the late 1980s, writing instruction had limited curricular presence (Brooks 2006); writing mattered, of course, but it was a skill to be demonstrated rather than learned, and it was addressed largely through comments on student papers or through one-size-fits-all advice in courses whose real business was subject matter. What the editors of *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education* (2003) say of continental Europe could therefore be said verbatim about Canada: «the teaching of academic writing as a separate entity of higher education is rather new» (Björk, Bräuer, Rienecker, and Jörgensen 7). The new, of course, arouses suspicion. Like our European colleagues, Canadian teachers of academic writing still face misperceptions about we do and why it is valuable.

The other similarity is American influence. Our European readers may be surprised, however, by the complex nature of this influence on Canadian higher education. Certainly, writing teachers in the contemporary Canadian university are indebted to American practices and research of the past few decades, as all contemporary

teachers of academic writing, regardless of their research sites, inevitably must be. In this respect, the words of Björk, Bräuer, Rienecker, and Jörgensen could once again represent the Canadian position, *mutatis mutandis*: «it is doubtful whether any writing project in Europe would exist today» without «the American writing movement,» which has provided both «powerful inspiration» and practical «models to point to when asking administrators for funding» (Björk, Brauer, Rienecker, and Jörgensen 9). Where Canadians differ from the Europeans is in our relationship with U.S. higher education prior to the «American writing movement.» *Before* the movement, *before* writing instruction existed as a separate entity in Canada, *before* there were Canadian writing specialists to petition their institutions to take a more enlightened approach, Anglo-Canadian universities regarded their U.S. counterparts less as an inspiration than as an anti-model. «We» emphasized a liberal education, the object of which was «knowledge unattached to any particular end» (Hubert 37); «they» appeared – ever more increasingly as the nineteenth century drew to a close – to emphasize a more practical, utilitarian education. To institutions of higher education in Canada, the American way was to be avoided at all costs.

Our main goals in this paper are to describe this opposition more fully and to explain its consequences for writing instruction in Canada, historically and currently. In our view, these consequences have been almost entirely negative, though one might argue – as we will in our concluding remarks – that recent, more positive developments in the Canadian scene can be read as inadvertent benefits of our universities' having distanced themselves from American models of writing instruction.

The first section of the paper begins with a brief, generalized, and admittedly selective contrast between Canadian and American approaches to academic writing over the last few decades. The point is to identify where we are before explaining how we got here – a departure from strict chronology that seemed sensible to us, given the likelihood that European readers will be unfamiliar with Canadian practices. The sections following then trace the history of Canadian writing instruction in stages. In the first stage, stretching roughly from the establishment of Canada's first universities, in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, to the 1870s, the study of rhetoric dominated; from the perspective of the contemporary writing teacher, this was a period of considerable promise, insofar as the curricular emphasis was on the production rather than the reception of discourse. In the second stage, stretching from the late 1870s until about the late 1980s, the study of English literature dominated, and Canadians began with increasing frequency to define themselves in opposition to Americans; the emphasis, in short, shifted to reading and the transmission of cultural values. These sections also make it clear that attitudes and approaches to writing in Anglo-Canadian universities are rooted in deep, long-standing connections between Anglo-Canada and the ancestral homelands of its most influential educators, and more specifically, in nineteenth-century British ideas and models, particularly the *belles lettres* tradition (Johnson 2006) and philosophical idealism (Hubert 1994). Finally, in our conclusion, we briefly describe the most recent stage of writing instruction in Canadian universities, which is characterized by a greater variety of writing sites and approaches, and we speculate on the reasons for these developments.[1]

Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities: An Overview

The most striking difference between American and Canadian approaches to writing at university has been in the respective positions taken on first-year requirements. Whereas a required first-year composition course (fyc, as it is often called in the U.S.) has been a staple of university education in America for well over a century (Crowley 1998, 1; Russell 1991, 56), it has never taken hold in Canada. Rather than fyc, the course with which writing is associated in Canadian universities is the first-year English course. Often, this course divides its attention between literature and writing, in some cases allotting as much as two-thirds of course time to the latter. Nan Johnson refers to this «literature and composition» course as Canada's «distinctive legacy» (55). At many universities it provides the only encounter with writing instruction that students have during their undergraduate degree.

It follows, then, that responsibility for writing instruction in Canadian universities has traditionally been located almost solely in English departments, i.e., in departments whose primary task is to teach

1 There are few historical studies of writing at Canadian universities. Our paper is therefore heavily indebted to Graves (1994) and Hubert (1994), as well as the essays by Brooks, Johnson, and Smith, all of which appear in Graves and Graves (2006).

literature in English. In this respect, our universities have resembled their American counterparts. But within this broad similarity there are importance differences.
One such difference has been the Canadian focus on writing *about* literature. Writing instruction in the U.S. has served various purposes, among them to improve students' disciplinary performance and to help them function as active citizens. By contrast, professors charged with writing instruction in Canadian universities have aimed almost exclusively at developing students' critical abilities, and more specifically their ability to analyze and appreciate literature. This they have done without apparent regard for the importance of writing in other disciplines or discipline-specific variations (Graves 1994, 56). These first-year literature-composition courses are, in a sense, a-rhetorical – not taking into account the varying exigencies of audience, genre, disciplinary modes of argumentation, and so on. They tend to treat writing as what David Russell calls a «generalizable» skill (7). And since their singular focus is literature and their main goal is appreciation of such literature, it is hardly surprising that this skill includes qualities that might be called belletristic. An engaging style may be just as important as analytic acuity. The graceful phrase and balanced sentence are what counts; common academic devices such as explicit forecasting and nominalization may be considered awkward, even gauche. Such assumptions have reigned for decades in universities across the country. At the University of New Brunswick in the 1940s, engineering students were reading Hemingway to improve their writing (Graves 1998); forty years later at the other end of the country, engineering students at the University of Alberta were still reading belletristic essays (by Woolf, Orwell and E.B. White, for example), as one of the authors (then a graduate teaching assistant) knows first-hand.
A-rhetorical assumptions have also determined attitudes towards weaker writers. The general view has been that any student granted admission to university ought to need little if any writing instruction, writing being a skill that one learns in high school. Students who appear to lack this skill are usually offered «remedial» lessons on grammar, sentence construction, punctuation, and such matters. The entire university, it must be added, has been complicit in these attitudes, since almost everyone has assumed that writing instruction is solely the responsibility of the English Department (though one that English professors have accepted very reluctantly). The idea that English Profs are «the experts» and therefore know best what to do about writing remains deeply entrenched at many Canadian universities.

Writing and Rhetoric in 19th Century Anglo-Canadian Universities

The Canadian treatment of academic writing as a quasi-literary practice – taught by literature specialists, learned (apparently by osmosis) through the reading of fine prose, and valuable as a means of developing and demonstrating critical appreciation – did not emerge in an historical vacuum. It is rooted in a strong English presence in nineteenth-century Canada and in concerns about the U.S. among English-Canada's politicians and educators.
Canada's earliest universities were established in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Most were English or Scottish in their approach. Those established by the Church of England tended to be elitist, as were the English models on which their approach was based. In England, instruction was in Latin, texts were classical, and the emphasis was on helping students acquire taste and knowledge of the great ideas (Hubert 1994). Universities provided an education aimed at gentle*men,* particularly those who would enter the clergy (Hubert 18). By contrast, the Scottish university system offered a practical education in the vernacular (Hubert 9), and it stressed universal access – a policy that resulted in more graduates than Scotland could employ, many emigrating to Canada, where they influenced the curricula at major universities (e.g. Dalhousie, McGill, New Brunswick, and Toronto) (Hubert 20).
For all these differences, the larger curricular context for writing at both Scottish- and English-based universities in Canada before the mid-19th century was similar: rhetoric. And the study of rhetoric was important. As Nan Johnson has remarked, «A college or university education in the rhetorical arts was considered mandatory for any Canadian hoping to take up a profession or aspiring to a position of influence in community, religious, or political affairs» (44). Indeed, formal study of classical theory in rhetoric (especially Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian) at Anglo-Canadian universities was «markedly more significant» than at American universities; the «modern» theories of Campbell, Blair and Whately were also emphasized (Johnson 2006, 45). The main goal was improved oratorical skills; many of the exercises and assignments – debates, recitations, and declamations – used

writing as a preparatory step, but they bore little resemblance to what we now associate with university writing (Graves 1994, 22; Hubert 1994, 27; Russell 1991, 38-45). Nevertheless, from the perspective of the contemporary writing teacher, what seems most important about these exercises – and more generally about this period's emphasis on rhetoric – is that performance was still king. Text production was at least as important as text reception; the main goal was to make students better writers and speakers, not better readers.

That would gradually change over the course of the century, especially in English-based universities. «Elegance» and «propriety» became the goals in speech and writing, terms that suggest an already emerging emphasis on style (Johnson 2006). By the 1870s, the curricular emphasis in Canadian universities had markedly shifted towards the study of literature, especially English literature. This reflected developments in Scotland and England, where influential public intellectuals such as Matthew Arnold were arguing that the study of literature provided a defense against materialism, a way of training the mind, and a means of transmitting culture (Hubert 1994). In Arnold's famous phrase, the task of universities was to teach the «best that has been thought and written.» «English» began to emerge as a discipline in its own right. Even in Scottish universities, departments that had traditionally emphasized rhetoric embraced *belles lettres*, concentrating on style analysis rather rhetorical performance. This turn towards philosophical idealism and the study of English literature was soon imported to Canada, not surprisingly, given our strong colonial attachment to Britain. Almost all the faculty at major universities – Windsor, Fredericton, and Toronto, for example – were graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, or Trinity College Dublin (referred to by Hubert as «the Irish daughter of Oxford» [1994, 36]). Poetry, especially, began to be treated as the quintessential means of teaching mental discipline and appreciation of English culture, an emphasis that tended to push the study of rhetoric, with its focus on performance and persuasion, even further to the perimeter. Somewhere around the end of the 19th century (Hubert 1994, 83; Johnson 2006, 54), rhetoric was effectively gone from the curriculum, and there began nearly a century-long reign of literature, in which instruction aimed at improving communicative performance would be minimal and limited almost exclusively to the first-year English literature-composition course.

The demotion of rhetoric in higher education – not only in Canada but in Europe as well – was the result of many factors, too numerous to discuss here. But one factor, peculiar to Canada, is worth mentioning: the concerns of the conservative English power-base that a rhetorical education in the vernacular was imprudent. And it is in this regard that the impact of the U.S. on Canadian higher education is first seen. To a country where the Church of England still had strong influence in politics and education, the American presence represented a twin threat: to religion, because it had severed the connection between church and state; and to state, because of its revolutionary history and opposition to England. As one prominent Canadian educator remarked in arguing for the establishment of McGill University (in Montreal), having more universities in Canada would keep young men from seeking their education in America, which breathes «hatred to everything English» (John Strachan, qtd. in Hubert 38). The threat may have been exaggerated, but it had real effects; when populist uprisings occurred in Upper and Lower Canada in the late 1830s, even the staunchest proponent of a practical, rhetorical education began to rethink his position. With the prospect of spreading American attitudes, a curriculum that emphasized rhetorical practice, thereby strengthening – potentially, at least – the voice of dissent, seemed foolhardy.[2]

Writing Instruction in the Twentieth Century

For much of the twentieth century, literary studies continued to dominate university English departments, pushing rhetoric and writing instruction to the periphery. Between 1900 and 1920, for instance, Canadian universities offered «no courses concentrating solely or primarily on problems of oral and written communication» (Harris, qtd in Brooks 2006, 675-76). Hubert and Garrett-Petts go so far as to claim that

2 The «staunchest proponent» is John Strachan, a «seminal figure in Anglo-Canadian higher education» (Hubert 22) and eventually Archdeacon of Toronto. As a graduate of Aberdeen, he was committed in his early teaching to universal access and practical training; but by 1843 he had done an about-face, his views on education becoming «conservative, consistent with the Anglican emphasis on an elitist, classical education rather than [a] practical, rhetorical [one]» (37). This transformation of attitude in such a strong proponent of the Scottish approach provides a measure of how potent was the English influence and the American threat in the early nineteenth century. See Hubert (32-38), on which the preceding paragraph draws extensively.

English studies in Canada over the course of the 20th century reveal an «agonizingly extended effort to teach reading without writing» (62). Perhaps more surprising is the fact that for decades, students continued to read and write primarily about *British* literature – even as a sense of Canadian autonomy was emerging from the shadows of our colonial past. This persistence reflects an interesting paradox in Canadian cultural life: even as ties to Britain were loosened in one respect, traditional allegiances were nevertheless sustained as a feature that distinguished Canada from the United States, regardless of the increasingly multicultural nature of the country.

Several historical events weakened the colonial legacy and encouraged Canadians to think of their country as an entity independent of Britain. Patterns of immigration, for instance, produced greater diversity in the population; whereas in 1871, 84% of the foreign-born had been born in the United Kingdom, the proportion had dropped to 36% a century later (Kalback 1999, 1869). World War I was also a factor in encouraging national self-definition. Though Canadians initially fought in the War as colonial troops, their battle experiences forged a sense of independent nationhood that hadn't existed before. One might expect that such developments would encourage closer ties with the United States, where independence from Britain had been achieved much earlier, but in fact one dimension of Canada's newfound sense of identity was a love-hate relationship with our southern neighbours. As the new century began, a sense that we were in competition with the U.S. was hinted at by Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier in a 1904 speech to the Ottawa Canadian Club: «as the 19th century was that of the United States, so I think the 20th century shall be filled by Canada» («How About It?»). Seventy years after this naïve prediction, Canadians were still worrying about American influence and a distinct «Canadian identity.» As Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau famously commented in 1969, «Living next to [the U.S.] is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly and even-tempered the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt» (*Pierre Trudeau*). A consequence of this proximity has been cultural protectionism. Time and again, governments have tried to limit the effects of foreign culture – especially American culture – on the domestic audience, for instance by regulating a high proportion of Canadian content in both television and radio broadcasting and by establishing organizations to promote Canadian culture.

Seeking to explain the resistance to writing instruction that dominated Canadian higher education for most of the century, Kevin Brooks reads these developments in terms of a «left-nationalist» Canadian discourse that set up binary oppositions between high and low culture, public and private ownership, the liberal arts and practical education. In this reading, American values and practices (including the American model of first-year composition) are identified with practicality, popular culture, mass media, and «communication» in its most instrumental sense. This discourse continued to dominate public debate over issues considered here – higher education, the place of «English studies,» and the teaching of writing – into the 1950s and beyond. Thus while postwar prosperity and increased university attendance throughout North America led in the US to the founding of College Composition and Communication in 1951, Canada's Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences of 1949-1951 reinforced the values of «cultivation and learning» that it felt were being crowded out of the curriculum by «the mechanical and utilitarian tendencies of the past generation or two» (*Report*, Section 138).

What the Commission proposed was a renewed Arnoldianism: the study of the humanities, and of literature in particular, to encourage mental discipline and a breadth of view that was thought to enrich people in all professions. This philosophy was used to justify a required English course for all university students, but it was a program of study in which disdain for the practical and applied extended to writing instruction. The attitude that professors brought to this course may be gauged by the remarks of two prominent scholars at the University of Toronto: in 1952, S.P. Woodhouse argued that «the primary concern of English at the university level» is its contribution to «the life of the student not as an engineer, dentist (or whatever may be), but as a civilized human being» (qtd. in Hubert and Garrett-Petts 2006, 63); and in 1957, Northrop Frye declared in an address to a national conference of English professors that «The English teacher's ideal is the exact opposite of 'effective communication,' or learning to become audible in the marketplace. What he has to teach is the verbal expression of truth, beauty, and wisdom; in short, the disinterested use of words» (qtd. in Brooks 2006, 101). The principles Frye upholds are congruent with the New Critical approach

– an a-rhetorical analysis of the text as a series of inter-related parts – that would dominate the study of literature over the next few decades.
That the study of great literature led to improved writing was a widespread belief in English departments. Yet this ability to express oneself was apparently expected to occur by a kind of osmosis, since explicit instruction in writing was not only neglected but overtly criticized as having no place in English education at the post-secondary level. Indeed, a slim 1958 publication of the University of Toronto Press, entitled *The Undergraduate Essay*, opens with the assertion that «It is not possible to teach a student to write a good essay. It is possible for a student to learn how to achieve this result. All that the teacher can do is, first, to provide the materials needed for the student to educate himself and, second, to demonstrate a likely approach» (ix). The authors present a collection of seven model essays by students and scholars, followed by chapters that analyze their «Principles and Methods». But while principles of effective prose are identified, methods are generally neglected in favour of evaluative analysis. Nor are disciplinary differences considered significant in the kinds of writing found effective. In the authors' view, the student assigned a topic on *Antony and Cleopatra* can learn precise expression and good planning just as effectively from Dr. Roberts' «A New Disease» as from Dr. Knox's «Recent Shakespearean Criticism.» In keeping with the discursive alignments identified above – traditional versus popular culture, the liberal arts versus practical education – it is not surprising that the authors present themselves as «return[ing] to the approach which governed the teaching of English composition at the time of its beginnings in the sixteenth century and for three hundred years thereafter» (65) and include an essay on the relationship between «The Universities and the State» that argues the universities must not «compromise and go under in the utilitarian flood» (27).
Such hyperbolic warnings reflected a general concern about declining literacy. Dissatisfaction with students' poor skills, a recurrent theme in public discourse, no doubt arose in Canada for the same reasons as it did in the United States; a dramatic increase in full-time university enrolment – from less than 100,000 in 1956 to almost half a million in 1993 (Graves 1994, 7) – meant a change in the make-up of the undergraduate population and led to complaints that students were unprepared and in need of remedial help. Yet the reaction in the two countries has been strikingly dissimilar. Thriving scholarly organizations like NCTE and the 4Cs provide a forum for examining complex issues (such as access or writing-across-the-curriculum) and support the work of writing instructors in American English departments. Though their status is not always assured, these instructors work within a tradition that has ensured a place for their scholarly and pedagogical concerns. In Canada, by contrast, English departments have resisted change in their approach to writing instruction, seeing such work as «service» rather than a legitimate academic pursuit. Impulses to modernize English Studies have mostly taken the form of expanding the canon to include Canadian literature (in the 1970s) and women's writing (in the 1980s), of turning from practical criticism to theory, and most recently, of moving towards cultural studies. In each case, English departments continued to focus on interpretation rather than production of text. Even in the standard Canadian first-year «Literature and Composition» course, as we explained earlier, explicit writing instruction might consist of little more than grammar lessons and models of prose style to be imitated.

Recent Developments

Writing instruction in Canadian universities has become more diverse in the last two decades, both in classroom practices and in scholarship. And it is certainly less opposed to American practices than it was before the 1980s. Indeed, some of our advances are directly indebted to the inspiration and models provided by the American writing movement.
The area in which Canadian universities have been most like their American counterparts has been in establishing Writing Centres. A Spring 2006 survey listed twenty-two of them – a significant number, given that a national magazine survey puts the total number of Canadian universities at forty-seven (Kraglund-Gauthier 2006). This is, of course, good news, but it is only a beginning. Though Canadian writing teachers recognize the value of American influence in this area, we still work within institutions deeply rooted in the cultural assumptions described earlier. Consequently, our writing centres are often under-funded, located in Student Services or libraries, operating without departmental status or tenured faculty, and misunderstood by faculty and students. In many universities, the belief remains that writing instruction is necessary only for those who

have arrived with inadequate skills. As one recent task force report suggests, initiatives to address writing at university still tend to be driven by faculty «concern with student competencies and capabilities in the areas of reading and writing» (*Meeting the Challenge* 2004). Though American influence is less clear in this case, change has also been occurring in English departments. In the last fifteen years, some have developed streams in professional writing or rhetoric within their programs of study, expanding the study of literature to include a broader range of texts and attending to production as well. Our own university's writing program, which began in the English department in the late 1980s (and was certainly influenced by American models), achieved independence, then the opportunity to offer a Major in Rhetoric and Communication, and finally, departmental status in 2006 (Turner and Kearns 2006). But ours is a very unusual story in the Canadian context. More often, even as the field of Rhetoric and Composition was rapidly professionalizing in the United States, Canadian scholars interested in writing pedagogy and research into related issues failed to find a congenial home in the English departments where they might themselves have been educated.

And so they went elsewhere. One of the distinctive features of writing instruction in Canadian universities today is its frequent location in «disciplinary and interdisciplinary academic units … much more welcoming to academic and professional writing instruction than traditional English departments» (Smith 325), units such as the College of Engineering at the University of Saskatchewan, which houses a Chair in Technical and Professional Communication. In such locations, the link to a belletristic approach has been severed decisively, and the field has been free to develop as an endeavour that often extends beyond interdisciplinarity into workplace and professional partnerships. Canadian scholars have begun to make distinguished contributions to the study of the university-workplace transition, of professional writing, and of genre (see, for instance, Freedman and Medway 1994; Dias, Freedman, Medway, and Paré 1999; Dias and Paré 2000; Coe, Lingard, and Teslenko 2002; Artemeva and Freedman 2006).

There is, of course, considerable irony in this latest development. The very fact that professional and workplace writing has become Canada's strongest arena of writing research suggests that American influence has prevailed – not just within some of the institutions which scorned it but *because of* this scorn. Had Canadian universities and English departments been less Arnoldian and less fixed to their English roots, had they been more flexible and accommodated American ideas and models of writing instruction, they might have made the kinds of little changes that, at bottom, really just maintained the status quo. Instead, their inflexibility in the face of a growing demand, from both students and faculty outside the English Department, forced practical, useful writing instruction to emerge elsewhere. There, in the very sites that Woodhouse, Frye, and other proponents of renewed Arnoldianism would have most disparaged, it is flourishing.

References

Artemeva and Freedman, Aviva. (Eds.) (2006) *Rhetorical Genre Studies and Beyond.* Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications.

Björk, Lennart; Bräuer, Gerd; Rienecker, Lotte; Jörgensen, Peter Stray. (2003) «Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education: An Introduction.» *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education.* Eds. Lennart Björk; Gerd Bräuer; Lotte Rienecker; Peter Stray Jörgensen. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publications. 1–15.

Brooks, Kevin (2006). «National Culture and the First-Year English Curriculum: An Historical Study of Composition in Canadian Universities.» *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities.* Eds. Roger Graves; Heather Graves. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications. 95–119.

«How About It, Sir Wilfrid?» (1999). *Canada World View.* Issue 6. Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/canada-magazine/issue06/6t3-en.asp

Coe, Richard; Lingard, Lorelei; Teslenko, Tatiana. (Eds.) (2002) *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change.* Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton.

Crowley, Sharon (1998). *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays.* Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Dias, Patrick; Freedman, Aviva; Medway, Peter; Paré, Antony. (1999) *Worlds Apart: Acting and Writing in Academic and Workplace Contexts.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dias, Patrick; Paré, Antony. (Eds.) (2000) *Transitions: Writing in Academic and Workplace Settings.* Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton.

Freedman, Aviva; Medway, Peter. (Eds.) (1994) *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Graves, Roger (1994). *Writing Instruction in Canadian Universities*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications.

Graves, Roger. Listserve Comment. Monday, 12 Oct 1998. http://tinyurl.com/4hmxar

Graves, Roger; Graves, Heather. (Eds.) (2006) *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Cultures: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities*. Winnipeg: Inkshed Publications.

Harris, Robin; McDougall, Robert (1958). *The Undergraduate Essay*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Hubert, Henry (1994). *Harmonious Perfection: The Development of English Studies in Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Canadian Colleges*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press.

Hubert, Henry; Garrett-Petts, Will (2006). «The Rhetoric of 'Intelligent Recreation': An Historical Narrative of English Studies in Canada.» *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities.* Eds. Roger Graves; Heather Graves. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications. 61–93.

Johnson, Nan (2006). «Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the Canadian Academic: An Historical Analysis.» *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities.* Eds. Roger Graves; Heather Graves. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications. 43–60.

Kalback, Warren (1999). «Population.» *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* Ed. James Marsh. Toronto, Ontario: McClelland and Stewart. 1867–1869.

Kraglund-Gauthier, Wendy. «So, Just How Old are Writing Centres in Canada?» Inkshed. 23:1. http://www.stthomasu.ca/inkshed/nlett606/index.htm

Meeting the Challenge: Academic Reading and Writing in the Faculty of Arts, Report of the Dean's Task Force on Reading and Writing (May 2004). University of Regina Faculty of Arts.

Pierre Trudeau Quotes. http://chatna.com/author/trudeau.htm

Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949–1951 (1951). http://www.collectioncanada.ca/massey/h5-420-e.html

Russell, David (1991). *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870–1990: A Curricular History.* Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Smith, Tania (2006) «Recent Trends in Writing Instruction and Composition Studies in Canadian Universities.» *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities*. Eds. Roger Graves; Heather Graves. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications. 319–370.

Turner, Brian; Kearns, Judith. «Into the Future: A Prairie Writing Program Extends its Traditions.» *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instruction in Anglo-Canadian Universities.* Eds. Roger Graves; Heather Graves. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications. 273–296.