

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9417520

The development of discursive strategies in peer revision writing groups

Zuss, Mark Laurence, Ph.D.
City University of New York, 1994

Copyright ©1994 by Zuss, Mark Laurence. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES
IN PEER REVISION WRITING GROUPS

by

MARK ZUSS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the City University
of New York

1994

© 1994

MARK LAWRENCE ZUSS

All Rights Reserved

Approval Page

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 21, 1994
Date

Robert M. Glick
Chair of Examining Committee

January 25, 1994
Date

Kay Deary
Executive Officer
Joseph Glick

Vincent Crapanzano

Pam Reid
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. Introduction	1
Literature Review	5
II. Methods and Design	61
III. Analysis of the Data: Case Studies:	
First Drafts, Peer Group Sessions,	
Revised Drafts	78
Non-Peer Mediated Groups	218
IV. Summary of Case Study Findings; Court	
Framers and Social Lanscapers	245
Recontextualization	259
Utterances, Speech Genres and	
Discursive Strategies	261
V. Development of Local Discursive Fields	275
Revision and Peer Group Environments	283
APPENDICES	
A Frames, Strategies, Marking	307
B Coding Manual for Discursive Strategies	319
BIBLIOGRAPHY	328

Introduction

This study was an inquiry into the social mediation of writing development. Features of the social mediation of writing were examined within the context of interactive peer revision sessions. Aspects of the developmental emergence of various discursive strategies, and their specific, situated articulation, were the central concerns of this study. This inquiry was based on observation of the selective use of forms of discourse termed reenvoicements (Bakhtin, 1986) as well as authorial point of view devices and strategies. The differential employment of these features within distinctive interactive contexts were investigated.

This investigation was premised in a social constructivist and cultural practice view of writing as a cognitive activity. This study posited that writing is an inherently social process mediated by specific contexts of interaction. This study was also an inquiry into the social facilitation of authorial discursive strategies. In particular, it investigated agentive and intersubjective aspects of writing within a social

practice framework of peer revision contexts.

Retellings, as forms of revisions within social milieux, reflected the salient linguistic strategies and resources available for use by individuals within a specific sociohistorical signifying practice. It was a hypothesis of this investigation that specific organizations of social contexts, instantiated within interactive revision contexts, would facilitate the development of authorial strategies. In particular, it was a premise of this project that social writing contexts significantly affect the selection of specific forms of language use. Contextualized revisions, or retellings, allowed for reflection on the process of composing, audience and adaptability of text; they permitted the elaboration of meaning and a concern for the expressive 'code' or, in Jakobson's (1971) terms, 'poetic' function of language. As such, the resources available to a speaker or writer became repertoires from which an author, as agent, could select and reconsider in response to context, genre and audience.

Revisions were considered here to be linguistically marked by interactive, agentive and

audience specific strategic interventions by writers. It was hypothesized that changes made by these strategic interventions would be marked by both an increased distinctness and quantity of discourse features. For example, social revision contexts such as the peer groups of this study, acted to facilitate perspective taking and boundary marking in discourse, in both oral and written modes. These strategic interventions may also have also facilitated the use of figurative language. A hypothesis of this study was that figurative and focalization strategies would be more evident in contextually salient and collaborative writing contexts than in initial and solitary ones.

This study predicted that social revision contexts which explicitly involve interaction and dialogue would afford individual writers opportunity to focus on the nature of their relation to their texts. It was assumed that within the revision process of the interactive genre of letter writing a progression of relations between authors and texts would emerge. In such interactive genre, influenced by social revision contexts, this study questioned whether variations in

types of agentive activity and specific discursive forms would become more pronounced and evident. The development of authorial strategies by individuals within interactive revision contexts was considered to be an effect of the mediation of subjectivity, allowing for externalization and expression of a narrative 'voice'. Differences between oral and written reenvoicements were probed within this framework, particularly with regard to differentiations of aspects of written and oral expressions of subjectivity. Among these were included forms of expressivity, linguistic strategies and the framing of topics and themes.

Literature Review

In order to delineate the elements that comprise authorial strategy the role of interlocutors must be addressed. Even within the most solitary and monologic forms of writing and recondite texts, aspects of a narrative's production can be discerned. As Bakhtin (1986) notes with regard to addressivity, "language as a system has an immense supply of purely linguistic means for expressing formal addresses. But they acquire addressivity only in the whole of a concrete utterance. And the expression of this actual addressivity is never exhausted, of course, by these special language (grammatical) means. They can even be completely lacking, and the utterance can still reflect very clearly the influence of the addressee and his anticipated responsive reaction" (Bakhtin, 1986, p.99).

In establishing criteria for this study's inquiry into the development of discursive strategies within peer revision contexts, it is necessary to initially delineate the components of an author's repertoire. I

wish to demonstrate the interconnections between these components as the necessary conditions for the development of authorial discourse. The components of an author's repertoire include the role of audience, features, linkages and use of oral and written discourse schema, and the complex of factors comprising the frequently invoked but idealized notion of 'voice'. In addition, I wish to situate this inquiry into the development of discursive strategies within a particular social constructivist and cultural practice model best exemplified by recent social semiotic investigations.

Audience

A general measure of the maturation of writing skills is reflected in the ability to negotiate specific and varied audiences as potential or actual readers-recipients. Nystrand (1982) defines the quality of audience in terms of identifiable rhetorical features. Audience awareness is considered to be constituted by an understanding of the "writer's goals and plans, taking into account the ways in which

writers locate all available means for achieving particular effects on readers" (Nystrand, 1982, p.1). Nystrand's definition of audience involves a conception of the dynamics of text composition. Texts are conceived of as mediums for the expression of shared or imparted knowledge toward specific or general audiences "whom the writer hopes to influence" (p.2).

Audience awareness is a central developmental aspect of the perspective taking or discursive strategies examined in this study. From a developmental view audience awareness emerges from the necessity to internalize the perspectives of others in order to effectively communicate. Flavell (1975) examines the sequence of role taking skills through which a child "cognizes, apprehends, grasps certain attributes of another individual" (Flavell, 1975, p.5). Flavell regards role taking as a developmental capacity to infer the intentions, opinions, beliefs, emotions and ideas of another. The processes by which an individual gathers these factors about an other is called the 'discrimination of role attributes'. Flavell's work extends Piaget's seminal work on egocentrism utilizing

a coding-encoding schematization of communication and its facilitation through discrimination and role taking capacities. For Flavell egocentrism affects perception and discrimination abilities as well as the use and understanding of language. He claims that "to the extent that the child does take an accurate measure of the other's listener role attributes, and then actively uses his knowledge to shape and adapt his message accordingly, to that extent ought the communication to be an effective, nonegocentric one" (p.9).

Mead (1947) conceives of the establishment of communicative interactions and meaning as a socially constructed process involving the "taking of the role of the other, a tendency to act as the other acts" (1947, p.183). Beginning with an ability to organize the perspectives of particular others the child acquires a capacity to internalize a 'generalized other'. For Mead cognitive maturation is traceable to an "internalized conversation of gestures", a process that involves the development of reciprocal role taking in communicative contexts. Development progresses to include an active and linguistic awareness of both the

generalized other as well as an 'internalization of audience'.

Britton (1975) adopts Mead's premise that communicative competence requires an internalization of audience, applying it to an analysis of writing contexts. Britton surveys writing development in terms of decentration and enumerates several factors contributing to effective written communication. Among these are "self editing, arresting, reorganizing and adjusting his message for his absent audience" (Britton, 1975, p.62). For Britton internalization of audience is the central factor determining writing development, defining writing as a performance of a 'social act'. The development of audience awareness, occurring first with the internalization of particular others and later of a generalized other, determines the course and effectiveness of writing as a socially meaningful act. Social decentration is made possible insofar as a "writer's capacity to adjust his audience is dependent on the degree to which he can internalize his audience" (p.60). Britton lists several commonly recurring writing audiences observed in his

longitudinal surveys of London schools. The most common audiences are categorized as 'self', 'child to adult', 'child to trusted adult', 'teacher-pupil dialogue', 'expert to layman'. and 'child to peer group'.

The internalization of the audience is a signal development affording the capacity to specify communicative intents appropriately to divergent contexts and addressees. This process involves an interdependence of subject and object in the activity of specific communicative frameworks, genre and salient cultural practices. Internalization of audience involves increasing participation in a linguistic community which Nystrand (1982) defines as any "group sharing knowledge and rules-of-use of a common language" (p.1).

Oral-Written Continuum

Observations regarding the qualities of oral and written discourse generally focus on their distinctions rather than on their commonalities. While such oral forms like dialogue are considered ontogenetic precursors to various literate forms, such as written

monologue (Scinto, 1985), their interdependence, mutual influence and the specific continuities between them, require close empirical studies attending to the features of particular genre.

An overview of observations of the features of oral and written forms discloses that a tradition has been sustained that, in large measure, articulates a fundamental dichotomy rather than convergence between them. Chafe (1985) describes several general differences between oral and written discourse. In particular, Chafe attends to the degrees of detachment and involvement afforded by oral and written forms of communication. Chafe characterizes writing as a detached medium in terms of the involvement between a writer and audience, between a writer with self as well as between a writer and the content or subject matter of composition. The lack of face to face encounters and the gestural, contexted and paralinguistic cues available in speech settings, forces writing to rely upon internalized representations of situations. The development of writing ability requires acquisition of schemas for abstracting and contextualizing within

language events and experiences that are, for oral forms, located in specific and contextualized agents, times and places.

In terms of linguistic features, Chafe points to the emphasis on coordinating conjunctions as a cohesive device in spoken discourse as contrasted to the dependent clauses typically introduced by subordinating conjunctions in written forms. While speech often involves usage of second person pronouns, writing allows for and tends toward the use of abstract subjects. In addition, writing maintains cohesion through complex forms generally unavailable to speech. Chains of co-reference, particularly the employment of anaphoric and cataphoric cohesion as elements of text-bound or endophoric deictic devices attending to the details of time, place and subject, constitute what Halliday calls the 'texture' of written texts.

Vygotsky's studies examining the development of written language (1978) present a strong position with regard to the question of dichotomy. For Vygotsky early written presentation manifests a realization by children that they 'draw speech.' Amorphous pencil mark

were observed to serve as a basis for children's storytelling. Central to Vygotsky's analysis is an appreciation of the cultural origins of writing, a semiotic system developing from earlier, social and communicative functions. For Vygotsky, written symbols denote verbal and speech symbols, progressing to exist autonomously without reference to speech.

The transitions Vygotsky observed indicate stages in the acquisition of the semiotic function that lead to a use of writing in which writing itself becomes self-referential, acting and serving to situate meaning and reference through its own forms of textual cohesion. Writing, considered as an autonomous, decontextualized and mediational system, is internalized and self-reflective, capable of elaborations and organization that do not have parallels in spoken discourse. In Vygotsky's formulation, inner speech precedes written speech with the "act of writing implying a translation from inner speech" (Vygotsky, 1962, p.99). Even at its inception this process is marked by a high degree of abstractness and detachment from specific situational contexts.

Images of words substitute for the role of words in speech. Vygotsky considers writing a distinct system from speech, requiring writers to "create the situation, to represent it to ourselves" (p.99).

Vygotsky defines and distinguishes writing as "speech without an interlocutor, addressed to an abstract or imaginary person" (p.99).

Luria (1981) undertakes an analysis from a similar perspective in characterizing the increased autonomy of written language. He stresses the lack of "extralinguistic expressive devices" (Luria, 1981, p.165) such as gesture, mimicry and intonation patterns in writing. Luria also regards writing as a social act facilitating reference to new information, a function deriving from the planning nature of inner speech. In formulating and referring to the new, inner speech, preceding the writing activity emerging from it, structures the 'rhemic', as opposed to the thematic or given, functions of discourse. In addition, Luria enumerates four functional types of language: oral dialogic, oral monologic, written dialogic and written monologic forms.

Distinctions between child acquisition and adult literacy development are crucial to an appreciation of the complex mediations evidenced in student authored texts. Distinctions may be premised on concept development competence and performativity. Vygotsky's (1978) investigations attended to the 'prehistory of written forms', the spatial nature of gestural activity as signifying activity, and the drawing of speech. These studies were described as providing the ground for the emergence of higher mental functions from prior functions. Earlier functions are always founded for Vygotsky on interpsychological, social networks before, and during the transition to, intrapsychological functional processes. For Luria (1982) and Vygotsky (1987), writing or 'written speech', the "algebra of speech" (p.203), is an expression and externalization of the anterior function served by inner speech.

Both Vygotsky and Luria emphasized the predicative character of inner speech. Their work paralleled investigations of 'functional sentence perspective' developed by Mathesius (1942) working within the Prague School of Linguistics (Vachek, 1966). These

investigations centered on pragmatic communication events (Nystrand, 1986). Authors within this tradition, such as Danes (1966) have developed theories regarding the nature and structure of the utterance. Prague School inquiries have attempted to disclose the structuring of discourse level communicative contexts. Nystrand claims that, in distinction from studies generated by syntactic and semantic units of analysis, such as Bloomfield's (1933), the Prague linguists "have not viewed linguistic performance as a set of confounding variables, nor have they viewed issues of pragmatics and language use as ripe for investigation only after securing advances in syntax and semantics. Rather, they have sought-in principle, theory and method- to investigate language at the level of use and interpret the significance of language variable accordingly" (Nystrand, p. 67).

In this form of analysis, textual embeddedness becomes a central concern. Texts situate the linguistic features of semantics and syntax. Words and their utterance forms are investigated in relation to other words and texts, including preceding texts and the

context of communication. A nesting of the text is elucidated in which the text is to be seen at the central concentric circle around which the linguistic, paralinguistic and extralinguistic texts revolve.

Mathesius (1939) defined the theme and rheme distinctions that are an important component to this investigation. Working on the sentential level, Mathesius distinguished the "starting point of the utterance", 'that which is known or at least obvious in the given situation and from which the speaker proceeds' from "the core of the utterance, "what the speaker states about, or in regard to, the starting point of the utterance" (Danes, 1974). The starting point is termed the theme and the statements made about that known context is considered the enunciation. Thematic statements are understood to precede enunciative statements in most sentence structures. Authors within this tradition, following in this line of inquiry, including Firbas (1964) and Glatt (1982) have termed these distinctions as theme and rheme. Outside of the Prague School they have been discussed as topic and comment features.

For Luria the predicative feature, reduced to the 'rhemic' rather than 'theme' structure of utterances, in the absence of an interlocutor, was regarded as the basis for the conversion of inner speech and thinking into expanded, structured speech utterances- an expansion maximized in writing genre.

Adult cognition is marked by distinct features that are not realized during childhood. These include specific domains ('literacies') of cognitive functioning through both qualitative and quantitative extensions of existing psychological systems. These include 'externalizations', i.e. the development of continuities and restructuring of the existing repertoires of oral discursive strategies. In addition, an ongoing translation from inner speech occurs, stimulated during salient linguistic practices to become an object of reflection in the continuing literate development of intentionality. A 'translation' process is described by Vygotsky in the externalization of inner speech from an essentially predicative or rhemic form into the maximally expressive and explicit form required for written literacy.

For adults, cognitive development in the context of literacy acquisition involves a freeing of oral forms and context bound knowledge. The extension of knowledge made possible by writing is a result of its social, frequently formalizing or depersonalizing function as an important, though not unique, amplifier of decontextualization and processes of abstraction of knowledge.

The distinction between intensional and extensional linguistic forms of knowledge and performance is a valuable one. Extensional elements according to Scholes and Willis (1990) are the features of a language that make reference to extralinguistic realities. Children rely in great measure on their extensional knowledge of context cues, including gesture and intonation, through direct contact in the negotiation of oral exchanges. Literacy acquisition during early childhood is generally marked by the increasing use of deixis and the development of plurifunctional forms of reference in speech, including anaphor and cataphor. Later acquisitions, more usually observed in adolescent and adult literacy practices,

include such forms of intralinguistic or intensional reflectiveness, including awareness of word and sentence units, intratextual reference, figuration, perspective taking and a rhetorical attunement to difference in audience.

Intensional-extensional continuum distinctions, parallelling Luria's (1983) delineation of 'sympractical' and 'synsemantic' vs 'sympractical' features of linguistic activity, are global features of linguistic performance evident across the spectrum of literate activities. They are as diffuse distinctions requiring specificity and salience when considering their larger role and embedded significance in shifts between oral and written performances. They represent a major class designating reflectiveness and knowledge of language as structure as well as a subject's repertoire of linguistic functions, including the phatic, referential and poetic, designated by Jakobson. Intensional mastery, by degree, is a metalinguistic and metapragmatic facility in both the selection of the registers and functions of language in context, as well as to the specific phonemic, lexical and syntactic

structures especially necessary, for written literacy.

Werner and Kaplan (1984) posit a primordial and undifferentiated matrix in which affect and cognition, subjectivity and objectivity, self and other, have not begun to be differentiated. This primordial state is the point of origin for the emergence of external and inner speech through a process of polarization and differentiation. Werner and Kaplan delineate some of the semantic and syntactic forms utilized in the realization of autotomized language. Among these are degrees of objectification of 'communal' and 'idiomatic' referents, descriptive of social or conventional characteristics of language as contrasted to personal symbol constructions. Werner and Kaplan detect a developmental trend in the distancing achieved in communication. "One of the basic principles of organismic-developmental theory pertains to increasing differentiation or 'distancing' between the self and the world of objects. In terms of this principle, we have contended that representation for oneself ('inner speech') involves a lesser degree of distance between self and others than does representation for others

(Werner and Kaplan, 1984, p.298). Werner and Kaplan observe the developmental use of certain linguistic features such as the employment of what they term specifications and modifications in which descriptive clauses follow or precede the primary nouns they elaborate upon. These linguistic features as well as the use of communal as opposed to idiomatic referents, characterized by a greater degree of objectification, demarcate the social nature of autonomous language use. Werner's experiments studying the transitions between inner and external speech gave general evidence of a "shift towards specifications reflecting higher degrees of objectification" (p.299).

Werner and Kaplan's experiments measured different forms of expression by adults in communicating when relating a written message to a generalized other as compared to self-directed or inner speech. One sentence written descriptions were addressed to an accomplice or to themselves. Subjects were requested to make a coherent expression allowing an accomplice to correctly identify one of three forms of stimuli material. Kaplan observed differences in degrees of explicitness between

messages directed to an other as compared to those directed to self.' Kaplan found a tendency to use relatively less words in self-directed communications than in other-directed descriptions. From a developmental perspective, Werner's work charts the gradual differentiation of external speech from inner speech.

Another study of the development of writing skills utilizes the concept of the 'given-new' contract and pertains to the oral written continuum. Glatt (1982) defines the given-new contract as an "implicit agreement between two people whereby each identifies information that is known and unknown. The more accurately the speaker (writer) judges or evaluates the previous knowledge of his listener (audience) the more precisely he can express the terms of his contract with respect to given and new expectations" (Glatt, 1982, p.88). The given-new contract is equivalent to the facilitation of the rhemic nature of inner speech noted by Luria and the Prague School of Linguistics discussed above. Glatt identifies specific linguistic markers that indicate new and given material. These include

cleft constructions, use of the passive voice and anaphors in which new information is provided by repeated reference. This distinction recalls Werner and Kaplan's distinction as well between specifications and modifications as qualifying processes. In the cases of anaphors, the given-new contract functions as a referential link between what is given information, almost always placed at the beginnings of English sentences and utterances, with what is being said about it or new information, usually placed at the end of verbal and written utterances. Bartlett (1982) found marked variation in strategies of referencing with more skilled writers using pronouns and nouns in relation to contexts and theme. Less skilled writers were found to be more reliant upon one referential form (usually pronouns) in all texts. For Bartlett anaphors and the deixis they provide are essential devices for the coordination of meaning and the linkage of segments of oral or written text into coherent unity.

Similar positions are taken by a number of other authors, most notably Olson (1977) who distinguishes oral forms as those in which "the meaning is in the

context" as opposed to written forms in which "the meaning is in the text" (Olson, 1977, p.261). Kay (1977) also focuses on the autonomy of writing as typified by its lack of dependence on paralinguistic and gestural channels as well as on the "contribution of background information on the part of the hearer" (Kay, 1977, p. 21). Scinto (1985) contrasts the productive aspects of both forms. Citing Holman (1976), Scinto focuses on the bidirectional nature of spoken communication and its organization as largely determined by its function of conveying relatively non-complex information in interactive contexts. Holman links structural organization then with function, claiming that writing, as a complexly organized structural system, results from its functional purpose in serving to communicate relatively detailed information. Holman also claims that in the actual transmission of written communication "the factor of spatial contiguity is of little importance ... the factor of psychological contiguity assumes a crucial role" (Scinto, p.210). Scinto takes the same position, claiming that writing "in its production demands the conscious organization

of ensembles of propositions" (p. 211). Scinto also views writers as the locus of control in communication, in contrast to oral discourse where two or more individuals share and negotiate meaning.

Tannen (1982) and Biber (1988) argue against a strictly dichotomous position, taking the perspective that difference between oral and written forms are of relative value. Tannen directs attention to the interpersonal issue raised by other authors and views writing as involving only minimal social influence and shared knowledge in distinction with oral forms. Writing is regarded as primarily a medium for the exchange of information rather than interpersonal relations. Her argument against a dichotomous position is equivocal, mitigated by emphasis on the 'one way' versus 'two way' communicative facets of the two media. In addition, Tannen observes that cohesion is accomplished in speech through paralinguistic and prosodic cues, whereas in writing cohesion is accomplished is attained essentially by lexical means. Requiring less audience participation, writing is to be understood as being driven toward autonomous

organization, including complex syntactic constructions, diverse word selection and a high degree of explicitness.

In general, the dichotomy between oral and written discourse has been overstated. As Rader (1982) points out, development does not proceed uniformly and unidirectionally toward increased autonomy and decontextualization. Tannen's concern for the interpersonal, as opposed to content oriented, character of both speech and writing, expresses an appreciation for the functional overlapping between them. Writing can not be considered a replacement or a replication of speech forms. Tannen points out that when "literacy is introduced, the two are superimposed upon and intertwined with each other" (Tannen, 1982, p.3). Decontextualization is a relative state pertinent to the uses, settings and genres to which it is applied. This is especially relevant to the construction of narratives and the interdependency of the two modes. Oral forms are capable of decontextualization, adopting features of literate, written discourse. Writing, on the other hand,

frequently utilizes expressive and interpersonal qualities and forms of organization usually associated with orality. Speeches and the reading of lecture notes are an example of the first, and poetry readings or the reading or telling of folk tales of the second.

Decontextualization is an ideal that no functional form of discourse, oral or written, ever completely attains. While writing advances processes that begin in earlier, oral, gestural and symbolic play activities, extending them to an internalized plane of mediated activity, it remains bound in all cases to functional contexts. As Tannen points out, complete decontextualization is an implausibility in that no discourse form could be comprehensible "without prior knowledge or many kinds of contexts" (Tannen, p.90, in Olson, 1985).

Divergences and continua between oral and written genre, particularly through specific audience sensitive, perspective taking strategies which include focalizations and figuration markings, allow for examination of the processes by which authorial and narrating practices develop.

Social Semiotics

The analysis of discursive and agentive authorial strategies in this study is premised on social constructivist and social semiotic (Hodge, Kress, 1988), (Thibault, 1990) lines of inquiry in the social sciences. Bruffee (1986) defines the social constructivist view succinctly in ascribing to it the assumption "that the matrix of thought is not the individual self but some community of knowledgeable peers and the vernacular knowledge of that community. That is, social construction understands knowledge and the authority of knowledge as community-generated, community-maintaining symbolic artifacts" (p.777).

As Scribner and Cole (1984) have argued, an approach that concerns itself with 'cultural practice' is invaluable in any attempt to ascertain the specific constellation of social and cognitive factors present within particular settings. From a cultural practice model analysis of social dynamics as well as individual cognition must be addressed. Some of the questions are ones that necessitate "considerations of value, philosophy and ideology" (Scribner, 1981, p.8). Among

the questions that Scribner advances relevant to my analysis are those that examine the specific activities, motives and constitution of literacy practices. These include: "What activities are carried out with written symbols? What significance is attached to them, and what status is conferred on those who engage in them? Is literacy a social right or a private power?" (p.8).

A social semiotic perspective (Thibault, 1990), (Hodge and Kress, 1988), privileges the social meaning making function of sign systems in specific sociohistorical contexts. For Hodge and Kress this approach necessitates an appreciation of the relations and distinctions to be made between discourse and texts. In their social semiotic analysis, discourse refers to the "social processes in which texts are embedded", and texts themselves as the "structure of messages or message traces which has a socially ascribed unity" (1988, p.6). This permits exploration of the diachronic elements within cultural practices and their structures. Attention to the social function of sign systems as embedded practices allows for a non-

formalist analysis, as found in many contemporary semiotic investigations. Formal structures are foregrounded in work derived from de Saussure by writers like Charles Bally (1965), Greimas (1986) and Banfield (1982), constitutive of what has been considered, in Banfield's work, delimitations of forms of a linguistic Cartesianism, or in Volosinov's terms (1973) expressions of an 'abstract objectivism' (p. 55). Thibault's perspective concentrates on "the systems of meaning making resources, their patterns of use in texts and social occasions of discourse, and the social practices of the social formations in and through which these textual meanings are made, remade, imposed, contested, and changed from one textual production or occasion of discourse to another" (1990, p.6).

A social semiotic approach is distinctive in its foregrounding the constitutive features of historically specific signifying practices which collectively embody the values, meanings and forms of their salient interpretation within a given cultural or subcultural structure. These values, meanings and forms of

interpretation are constitutive, as well as constituted, in reciprocal relations between individual subjects and their social structures. Social semiotic theory and practice attempt to delineate the ways in which meanings within particular and sociohistorically contexted signifying practices like writing, or visual or plastic media, are constructed and exchanged.

Subjectivity and Subject Positions

The basis for this discussion on subjectivity stems from work by Foucault (1976), Spivak (1988, 1989) and others in which the self is considered "without ontological foundations" and as a "full nexus of forces" (Lentricchia 1980, p.201). With the notion of 'subject positions,' Smith (1988) offers a description of the multiple and complex constitution of the self. The notion of subject positions is useful in locating the discontinuous nature, or non-identical, quality of subjects, distinguished from the sense of individuation of ego as a discrete, autonomous or stationary entity. In the social semiotic perspective adopted here, subjectivity is considered to be linguistically and

socially constructed knowledge of self in systemic, regulated and patterned relations. In Bakhtin's terms (1984) this perspective is an appreciation of the 'non-coincidence' of the subject.

Gumperz (1982) corroborates this point with regard to identity in noting that ethnic, class and gender distinctions are not constants. They do not provide an accurate delineation of individual communicative abilities, nor do descriptions of these categories fully afford the 'parameters' of how individuals participate and interact within and between various linguistic registers and economies. It is the task of analysts of discourse to begin to identify how identities are 'communicatively produced'. Giroux suggests that educational researchers concerned with identity formation be "attentive to the contradictory nature of student experience and voice" (1987, p.20). This requires careful appreciation of the complexities of both cultural diversity and linguistic use as well as recognition that each member of any given ethnic and cultural group is placed within a specific regional and national and linguistic economy that provides for a

certain latitude or field of subjectivity to emerge. Within the cultural, linguistic and individual constellation of plurality and difference, identities are maintained and internalized that afford certain relative, and often unequal, degrees of freedom for development and expression.

Subjectivity is viewed in this study as an inherently interactive relation by systemic positioning. In this systemic feature it both parallels and reproduces the identities and differences that constitute the value granted to the signifier in Saussurean linguistics. Subjectivity is distinguished from a 'centered', Cartesian notion of the self. This traditional ascription of the self as rational, self-present being, has served much of modernist and neo-positivist assumptions and methodology in the social sciences as an ontological core underwriting theory and research production. Subjectivity is considered for the purposes of this investigation to be immanent to, or, internally related and mediated by social and discursive practices. Positioning is a term useful for the identifying and describing the relations within the

contextual structuration of the linguistic practices of specific subjects, as well as a particular contextualized articulation of both discursive and social relations.

A subject as a mediated determinate site and position within a social and discursive nexus is identifiable by specific signifying practices, codes and registers, as well as patterns and strategies of articulation and stylization. These enable empirical recognition of 'subject positions'. These strategies are elements of the varied, contextualized and unevenly available authorial productive repertoires that this study identifies as instances of agentive discourse. These interactions are discursively manifest or, in Hjelmslev's (1963) term, 'realized', by specific patterning of lexico-grammatical formations and 'wordings' that embody forms of reenvoicement and dialogism.

Agency and Discursive Strategy

The need for investigation on the role of agency, central to this investigation, is based on the the work

of Bourdieu (1977) , Mauss (1985), Abrams (1982), Giddens (1979), Giroux (1987) and Taylor (1985). Mauss' (1985) seminal discussion provides core distinctions (1985) between such generic and diffuse terms as subject, person and individual pivotal to the provision of a terminology appropriate for a crosscultural discussion of subjectivity and agency.

Abrams (1982) places inquiries into human agency in historical context. Berger and Luckmann (1966), adopting the social ontology of Schutz, attempt to apply notions of agency to current social theory, particularly to the mechanisms by which social practices and identities are internalized. For Abrams (1982) "the problem of agency is the problem of finding a way of accounting for human experience which recognizes simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant and more or less purposeful individual action and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society" (p.xiii). One of the issues a concern for agency confronts is how individual "active subjects make a world of objects which then become subjects

making us their objects" (p.xiii).

Giddens considers agency to involve a "reciprocal entailment of action and structure" (1979, p.53) that avoids either a reductionist or dichotomous analysis of contextualized social activities. He defines agency in terms of the potential for intervention, in that "at any point in time the agent could have acted otherwise, either positively in terms of attempted intervention in the process of events in the world, or negatively in terms of forbearance" (p.56). Giddens premises his understanding of agency in terms of temporal and spatial relations, arguing for an appreciation of agency as a concept useful to research and theory only when considered in terms of 'time-space conjunctures' and "regularized acts as situated practices" (p.56).

This study is premised, in part, on Taylor's (1989) delineation of agency as the ability of individuals to articulate the distinctions that qualify as 'strong evaluations'. Taylor considers strong evaluation to involve both articulation and reflection on the choices an individual makes in a situation. These choices are marked and distinct from contingent

decisions. Taylor's strong evaluator characterizes an individual whose "reflection also examines the different possible modes of being an agent. Motivations or desires do not only count in virtue of the attraction of the consummations but also in virtue of the kind of life and kind of subject that these desires properly belong to" (1985, p. 25). While useful to this inquiry, Taylor's notion of agency is insufficiently grounded in either a social constructivist or social semiotic perspective, situating the strong evaluator in an ahistorical and atemporal frame that does not provide the basis for analysis of contextual linguistic practice. Central situational and temporally positioned aspects of subjectivity such as gender and ethnicity are ignored as are such features as linguistic register, code and discourse communities addressed in the sociohistorical and ethnopsychological tradition by Luria (1971), Scribner (1981) and Wertsch (1985) as well as within sociolinguistics by (1982) and Heath (1983). Though Taylor does emphasize articulatory competence as a prerequisite for strong evaluation as agency, he fails to delineate or acknowledge the role

of such factors. A hypostatized agency is thereby profiled, one that characterizes an idealized epistemic subject. It is necessary to situate and observe the strong evaluator empirically in specific contextualized cultural practices such as the peer revision context of this study.

The value in the notion of agency is that it allows one to describe and discern discursive activities such as the peer revision writing of this study in a non-dualistic and non-reductive light. For Bruner (1991), working primarily with autobiographical narrative strategies, analysis necessarily anticipates "that some measure of agency is always present" and that "agency presupposes choice" (Bruner, 1991, p.7).

Agency can be understood as reflective activity or mediated subjectivity that is reducible neither to innate or social determination. Agency is observable only within specific contextualized activities in which such strong evaluations and their articulations are made. The peer revision group contexts allow for evaluations and their articulation through a range of discursive strategies.

Subject positions, as discussed above, can be charted along a continuum of conscious reflective practice of agency and dialogism that includes specific articulations of these strategies. Thibault (1990) considers these to include rearticulating and disarticulating practices rather than merely instances of a discursive appropriation in which one 'voice' supersedes or imposes itself over its source utterance or prompt. In Bakhtinian terms (1984), these strategies can be usefully be regarded as particular forms of rejoinder or reenvoicement, specific manifestations of stylization and parodic practice. For Bakhtin utterances are marked by their constantly interactive nature, observable through the "change of speaking subjects" (1986, p.71).

There are several forms of recurrent relations which generate rejoinders and the possible strategies available to a speaker or writer. Bakhtin is explicit in stating that these relations are characteristic of discourse through utterances and their exchanges. He specifies these recurrent relations as those that exist between "question and answer, assertion and objection,

assertion and agreement, suggestion and acceptance, order and acceptance" (p.72). They are to be regarded as immanently linked to one another and irreducible to grammatical features.

In terms parallel to Jakobson's (1971) distinction of linguistic functions, Bakhtin distinguishes referential from expressive aspects of discourse. While he asserts that each "utterance is characterized primarily by a particular referentially semantic aspect" (p. 84), it is the second, expressive aspect, "the speaker's subjective emotional evaluation of the referentially semantic content of his utterance" (p.84), that allows for the articulation of agentive strategies in discourse. For Bakhtin an "absolutely neutral utterance" (p.84) is an impossibility. Varying degrees of evaluation and expressivity are present, at least implicitly, across the span of utterances that constitute any given discourse.

Bakhtin (1984) observes the quality of all verbal discourse being "full of other people's words", even, at time, interwoven to such an extent that they "completely merge [with] our own voice, forgetting

whose they are" (1984, p.195). Bakhtin defines stylization by its feature as an "intention on the part of the author to make use of someone else's discourse in the direction of its own particular aspirations" (p. 193). Stylization in authorial discourse contrasts with that of parody in that the latter "introduces into that discourse a semantic intention that is directly opposed to the original one", while it, like stylization, "speaks in someone else's discourse" (p.191). He points out that parody can not express the "fusion of voices" as stylizations, which are also discursive authorial strategies. Crapanzano (1991) illustrates out how these stylizations and parodic strategies function in discourse. A gradient from stylizations that accept and align utterance rejoinders in a discursive setting to parodic reenvoicements and disarticulations can be disclosed. This study utilized a gradient of discursive strategies to code and distinguish featural markings of discourse. Both stylization and parodic reenvoicements were observed as specific and regular forms of discursive strategy in the socially mediated revision contexts investigated here.

Production of 'Voice'

The development of authorial strategies and competence must be placed within the larger framework of linguistic functions of both oral and written discourse. Jakobson's (1971) delineation of the six primary functional manifestations of language as instances of message or parole usage provides the basis for analyzing the development of authorial strategies. Under the rubric of 'voice', various recurrent structural features of authorial discourse can be identified and which this study codes as discursive strategies. Within the analysis of literary texts from which these features have been adapted, this study concentrates in particular on the use of focalization and figuration strategies. Both focalization and figuration, described below, are aspects of point of view or perspective taking strategies on the part of authors and their agentive selection of these strategies.

Voice is described by Genette (1980) in terms of how narrating is implicated in the narrative. Genette

examines the relations between narrator and audience, including implied narrators and audiences. Voice emerges from a narrative matrix that includes multiple levels of context and purposive communication. Among these are the temporal, spatial, sociocultural and ideological forms available to a writer and from which any possible narrative statement will be configured.

In distinguishing narrating and narratives Genette (1980) presents a binary opposition between subject centered, figural discourses on the one hand, and authorial or story-centered, objective narratives. At the other end of this polarity are narratives, which for Genette erase the instance of enunciation and are marked by an absence of reference to a narrator. Narratives are further marked as a mode by 'exclusions' and various restrictive conditions including the constant employment of the third person and an objective stance. The narrating instance involves the historical circumstances of producing texts but also includes the possible, variable fictional situations in which action takes place. Situatedness is the key to the narrating aspect.

With Benevise (1971), Genette considers discourse as generative of subjectivity; it is the experiential process by which the dialectics of narrating create the subject and object awareness that is a primary grounding of all situated language use. Discourse is contextualized narrating, the production and maintenance of intersubjectivity. In this study narrative production will focus on variations in the use of discursive strategies, particularly on forms of agentive reenvoicement.

Voice variations are observable along a polarity between more objective narrative, or story centered tellings, that omit to a great extent the presence of the teller and the contextual circumstances of its production, and at the other pole, the more subjective, discursive elements of the contexted and audience oriented narrating act.

Degrees of distancing and engagement, while in part a function of genre, open up a way of looking at the perspective taking and use of voice along the subjective/objective and narrating- narrational axes. Genette notes that the more objective edge of

narrativity attempts to exclude 'authorial intrusions' and is a form marked by exclusions and restrictions in which "no one speaks."

Focalization

Focalization is the term used by Genette to describe the structuring of point of view of texts through the specific perspective of particular narrating agents. Focalization involves 'restrictions of the field' of awareness in the production and telling of a narrative. Authors and narrators are separable, permitting distinctions and variations in the quantitative and qualitative nature of the knowledge, awareness and organization of a narrative. Divergences in the narrator, including the possibility of multiple narrators, provides an opportunity to observe how individuals choose to narrate in context.

Restrictions of field involve a "selection of narrative information with respect to what has traditionally been called omniscience". These restrictions can be observed to span from a 'zero degree', omniscient focus through internal and external

focalizations. Internal focalizations, as one situated focus, coincide with a character who becomes the fictive subject of all the perceptual activity of a narrative. Internal focalization is further defined as 'vision with', or narrative with a point of view, an identifiable 'reflector' or selective restriction of field. External focalization is a narrative field existing outside any character, excluding expression of any character's subjectivity. The latter is sometimes considered a behaviorist form of focalization.

In Jakobson the poetic function, in which attention is focused on the message itself as a linguistic process characterized by prosodic and imagistic properties, manifests a higher degree of elaboration than messages addressing the referential or conative and phatic functions primarily, becoming qualitatively developed in terms of verbal play, the use of tropes, proverb, alliteration, assonance, repetitions and descriptive power. The poetic function, relational as are all the others, encompasses the conveying of language as a medium in itself, frequently relying on the verbal features mentioned in their own

right. The poetic function only emerges within a hierarchy among the other functions and does not exist in isolation from them. The poetic function can be considered a global level of description encompassing the entire range of features inherent to the use of figuration in textual construction. Attention to the use of genre and their varying degrees of divergence across and within both oral and written modes allows for documentation of the development of the specific means for the poetic function's emergence as well as the utilization of focalization and figuration as negotiations of a perspective taking authorial 'voice'.

The concern for focalization as a strategy evidencing authorial control should be framed both within a more generic understanding of the multiplicity of the functions and their relations; this study, also requires a grounding in the historical study of perspective taking in composition, arising largely from formal and structuralist literary theory. Studies by diverse writers, including Uspensky (1973), Banfield (1982), Cohn (1978), Chatman (1978), Barthes (1988), Genette (1980; 1988), Bal (1977), Todorov (1981),

Prince (1973) and Martin (1986), situate specific technical negotiations in the construction of narrative meaning and relations within usually structural and ahistorical textual architectures. Concern for enunciation, or the production of texts and the narrating, as opposed to both the material text (when written) and the signified and related story itself, is a primary element that most of the diverse theorists mentioned, loosely coalescing into the narratological movement begun in the 1960s, would all accept. The divergences that concern a developmental study can best be subsumed under categories of point of view, perspective taking and the enunciation or productive and contextualized narrating of any form of discourse. It is in the latter context of concern for the act of narrating or enunciation that opens an opportunity to examine the usage of focalization and figuration.

Figuration

Appearing to some extent in all linguistic functions, figuration may be more evident in the poetic function and made evident in narrative production

within certain genre. Figuration is marked by prosodic features, including the tropes of metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony, which can be categorized themselves by featural attributes. Fredericksen (1986) places trope usage in discourse into the imagistic, modal, analogic, expansive and condensing categories, expressive of their role and qualitative nature within a text.

Figuration features are a primary expressive aspect of all discourse allowing for affective and situational emphasis, coloring and orientation between narrators and audiences. Usage of syntactically marked forms such as part-whole parallelism, proverbs, enigma, gist abstractions is common as is the employment of such prosodic features as alliteration, repetition, rhyme and tropic usage which can indicate reliance and interdependencies between oral and written genre.

The wealth of spoken discourse conventions and pre-given formulaic organizations within a cultural practice offers a speaker or writer abundant choices for modulation and reorganization. Selection and reformulations across genre and mode may result from

reflection on context salient features. Dual voiced or reenvoiced productions, concerns central to the approach first formulated by Bakhtin, allow for multiple levels of reference and response, expressive of dialogized discourse production. Even for non-reflective or self-conscious users, a vast array of rhetorical constructs are available within English's conversational resources.

Figuration selections, across the intersection and dynamics of oral and written modes, as well as linguistic function, can be examined as aspects of the deployment or development of 'voice'. The interdependence of functions as well as of modes situates the complex possibilities of figural and focalizing strategies. The relations between the latter will be one of the concerns of this study in attempting to objectify both processes and features of discursive strategy development.

Point of View

Focalization and figuration together can be viewed as mutual and complementary materializations of

'voice'. As strategic choices reflective of some degree of conscious narrative production and negotiation, focalization and figuration strategies provide a description of what can be considered ways of telling narratives. Focalization controls the means of narrating by varying the point of view and perspective of a given text through the choice of narrator, as well as allowing for a range of intensities and depth for the expression of subjectivity and awareness. Genette's (1988) delineation of a spectrum, spanning from zero degree to both internal and external focalizations, provides a means of describing modulations and genre or context sensitive refinements of 'voice' as comprised by point of view and focalization strategies. The examination of figuration in discourse and narrative production offers a qualitative and message centered method, attending to use and awareness of register, tone, explicitness, styles of discourse and aesthetic value in narrative production.

Scholes and Kellogg (1966) define point of view as the process and mechanism that "controls the reader's impression of everything else that in the relationship

between the teller and the tale, and between the teller and the audience", and which evinces the "essence of narrative art". Lanser (1981) provides a pragmatic and general definition of point of view that is utilitarian as well as representative of the concerns that narrative analyses have often made. Lanser distinguishes point of view from other narrative elements such as character, plot or imagery, in that point of view is "essentially a relationship rather than a concrete entity" (p.13). Due to its elusive nature it "tends to evade stabilization into the language of things, and it has been difficult to grasp or codify" (p.13). Lanser states that point of view "subsumes those aspects of narrative structure that concern the mode of presenting and representing speech, perception and event: the identities of those who speak and perceive; their relationships with one another and with the recipients of their discourses, their attitudes, statuses, personalities and beliefs" (p.14).

Lanser critiques a narrow and common reduction of point of view by its being "conceived in terms of a single, surface structure relationship between narrator

and narrated event. Such a notion leaves no room for exploring the relationships of narrator to audience or narrator to authorial voice" requiring study of a "complex network of interactions between author, narrator(s), characters, and audiences, both real and implied" (p.14).

It is within this general framework that focalization and its demarcations must be placed. The performative aspect of narration, or enunciation, as a site of contextualized and purposeful textual, discursive usages and retellings, provides a basis for examining authorial strategy.

A premise of this study was that the application of the principles and analytic tools of narratologists could accommodate examination of the developmental sequence of processes leading to the attainment of 'voice' as evidenced through the use of specific discursive strategies like figuration, focalization and the employment of varying types of audience sensitive point of view. The concerns of these analysts, primarily literary art and its structures, are applicable to non-professional writers. They are

relevant to instances of discourse production because of a basic unity of linguistic and textual elements. Literature as a verbal activity should be situated within the productive nature of language use in general. For Lanser fiction is a "particular type of linguistic act" that can not be radically differentiated from other uses insofar as it "shares with all verbal production a conventional structure which is realized in a particular context" (p. 64). Lanser points out that literary production, like other linguistic 'acts', is communicative in both 'usage and intent' and that the distinctions traditionally drawn between it and ordinary language has not been supported by analyses. She specifies that studies of "natural narrative confirm that literary narratives and ordinary conventional ones or stories resemble one another strikingly in structure and style; they differ primarily in the context of their use and the generic expectations which that context entails."

One premise of this study was that, in order for an effective capacity for flexibility and conscious choice in point of view and perspective taking to

become evident and through which focalization and figuration strategies develop, individuals must rely on oral schema. The use of everyday narrative techniques, inclusive of differences dependent upon culturally salient signifying practices, are the primary ground upon which writers reorganize their written narratives. The development of authorial and narrative 'voice' can be seen to follow increased reflection and reliance on oral schema features such as self-cuing, topic and boundary marking, as well as forms of reenvoicement.

Peer Groups

Attention by researchers has been directed in the last twenty years to the processes by which writers compose, organize and develop texts. Di Pardo and Warshauer (1987) survey a general 'paradigm shift' by educational researchers, psychologists and English departments regarding some of the key issues in writing research. This shift involves the careful analysis of the developmental, cognitive and process features of writing in various genre and away from the traditional concern for formal expository writing products. One of

the central concerns of the general trend toward 'writing process' has been the attention granted to audience (Britton, 1975; Corbett; 1971; Flower and Hayes, 1979).

Peer group writing interactions have served as a context for observation of the development of writing processes. As audience sensitive contexts of activity for writers, they are valuable in attending to the ways in which writers orient and adjust their texts. Shifts in perspective, figurative language, focalization and discursive strategies are observable among some writers who have learned to 'internalize audience'. Peer groups provide settings in which revision and reflection on the features of a genre's ways of saying, and ways of persuading, influencing or conveying a message can be expressed to meet the intention of the author and the anticipated response of the audience.

Close investigation of the dynamics of peer groups has not been systematically conducted. Observational reports are generally supportive of the peer groups' facilitation of revision, reflection and audience awareness (Moffett, 1968; Murray, 1968; Elbow, 1973,

1981; Hawkins, 1976; Bruffee, 1978; Macrorie, 1979; Healy, 1980). Actual research provides conflicting reports on the outcomes of peer groups. Negative effects from peer groups were observed by both Berkenkotter (1984) and Newkirk (1984), whereas Nystrand (1986), Gere and Abbott (1985) and Gere and Stevens (1985) disclosed markedly positive effects. Freedman (1985) surveyed 560 peer group contexts that present consistent support for their ability to mediate aspects of writing processes.

Bruffee (1973) argues for peer groups on epistemological grounds. Citing Rorty and Kuhn, Bruffee regards knowledge as 'socially justified' rather than static and ahistorical. Bruffee views knowledge to evolve within communities of meaning. An appreciation of discourse community generated meaning informs his premise that 'knowledgeable peers' are the creators and crafters of socially salient forms of interpretation. Knowledgeable peers then serve as models for the intellectual activity that academic settings could provide as contexts of expression, the "space and emotional foundation upon which intellectual work

rests" (p. 462).

Bruffee's work relies on studies that indicate the centrality of peer dynamics on students. Newcomb and Wilson (1966) claimed that peer group relations and their impact is "the single most powerful force in undergraduate education" (p.449). During the early years of schooling, Corsaro (1985) and Dyson (1987) also stress the primacy of peer group influences. Within subcultural urban environments and the negotiation of linguistic registers, Labov's (1982) work focuses on the significance of peer groups on adolescents.

With regard to the facilitation of teaching, studies by Newman, Griffin and Cole (1984), Steinberg and Cazden (1979) and Wilkinson (1982) point out the value of reorganizing learning environments in order to allow students to teach and collaborate. Group work facilitates and helps solve problems that are difficult for individuals working alone. Among even young children, Michaels and Foster (1985) have found that first grade 'sharing time' sessions provide evidence for the role of peer groups in language use and

interaction. Lopate (1978) draws attention to writing, demonstrating the role that peer groups serve in negotiating the transfer of skills and knowledge between oral and written modes.

Research Methods and Design

This study was designed to explore the relationships between contextualized social mediation and writing production. A central premise of this investigation was that across the course of text revision, discursive development would be marked by variances in the strategies employed by authors. The strategies authors selected and utilized in the contingent circumstances of the production of a given text revealed the expression of what this study typified as discursive strategy. These strategies represented shifts in the locus of activity between authors and texts.

The three specific research questions that this study addressed were:

1. Do distinctive interactional peer revisions groups mediate subjects reorganization of their original texts?
2. What individual differences are evident in texts

are as an effect of peer revision groups?

3. What specific discursive strategies does a student/author select in their reenvoicements?

This study was premised on the notion that reenvoicements of narratives, or the ways of telling, are always, at least implicitly, negotiable; they are flexible, varying in degrees of reference to the teller and the circumstances of its production, narrating or saying. Writing often entails significant reflection, allowing for the possibility for reorganization and contextually salient retellings. Writing, especially revision conducted under conditions that make explicit social aspects of its production, allows an author expression within a compass and latitude of possible rephrasing, turns of phrase, emphases, elision, stylistic nuance, reference, idiom and figure. These components give narratives unique and distinctive qualities reflective of authorial strategic intervention.

The range of authorial strategies observed in this study were classified within a continuum constituted by

both stylization and parodic reenvoicements. The strategies represented varying forms of mediation of subjectivity evident in their utilization, or relative absence of, divergent forms of discourse in relation to the originating text.

It is my contention that originary and relatively 'naive' types of subjectivity and their expression are mediated by reflective practices such as the peer context. This context served as the pivotal site for reinscription of all kinds, including revisions and reenvoicements. At this end of a continuum of authorial strategy, the shift in discursive strategy centered around subjective rearticulations, renderings of audience, genre and objective models. At this mediated and agentive pole of subjectivity students developed strategies of authorship through which they were capable of adjusting the means of distancing and closeness to self in narrative production through control of point of view, focalization and usage of figurative or idiomatic registers.

Subjects

Students were selected to participate from two freshman English composition classes, located at Long Island University and one Psychology of Women course located at Lehman College, City University of New York. Participants ranged in age from eighteen to fifty seven. Their socioeconomic status was predominantly working class. The majority of participants were African-Americans and Latinos. Country of birth and upbringing varied, including a number of West Indian African-Americans and Latinos of South and Central American provenance. Of the total number of fifty-nine participants, comprising the population of the three classes, thirty eight were female.

Procedure

The peer context allowed for scrutiny of the social mediation of writing and reenvoicment. Students grouped according to the above forms of typification were traced through a within-subject examination. It was predicted that the social facilitation of peer revision contexts would function to facilitate the

linguistic expression of subjectivity and positionality in revised texts.

After the completion of an initial revision of their own letters students were sorted into the three peer revision contexts.

Peer Revision Contexts: Court and Social Landscape Frames

Student texts were identified on the basis of the forms of reference established in their initial texts. These forms of reference functioned to establish placing students in peer revision pairs. The two broad categories included social landscapers (SL) and court framers (CF). Each of these groups were paired on the basis of their first draft constructions of reference.

Court frames, constituting nearly half of the first drafts, established a reference within a legalistic and testimony based frame of reference. Writers that employed court frames appeared to be functioning within perceived generic constraints- often within a fairly monologic letter to the editor that did not clearly anticipate a response or acceptance.

Students assessed the veracity of statements and usually supplemented them through a very wide diversity of character evaluations which seemed to serve as supports for their positioning with regard to the statements, testimony, allegations and facts pertaining to the Senate Confirmation Hearings for Clarence Thomas's selection as a candidate as a Justice to the Supreme Court.

Court situated frames were contextualized and oriented toward specific details constitutive of an argument in defense or in rebuttal to statements and charges against a protagonist- often employing characterization assessments, evaluations, to build arguments. Co-occurring character evaluations- included evaluative terms, i.e., honest, sincere, firm, liar, nervous, educated, professional, jealous, vengeful, deceitful, exaggerating, brave.

Social landscape frame letter writing evinced participation in a larger discursive framework. Social landscapers situated themselves variously by taking recognizable positions and points of view on public issues of race, gender, prestige, class, as well as

media and political debate. In social landscapes the use of specific discursive strategies, in particular, disarticulations of prior utterances, may have had their referent established within a wider discourse on gender, race, media or politics. Recontextualization within a wider discursive field that usually utilized the Senate Confirmation Hearings and/or Anita Hill's allegations were a vehicle for expressive and evaluative commentary on one or a combination of the themes of race, class, prestige, gender and media.

The social revision context that was examined in this study was the peer context. Students were paired into the following peer revision groups:

Seven recurrent thematic genre were evident in the first drafts. These included the following:

Court frame and character evaluation statements were observed to co-occur within the broader court frame reference.

Gender, prestige, race, class and media themes were observed to recur within the broader social landscape frame.

These themes were considered the referential basis

of (see Typology of Functions) authorship. They served as the referential semantic context in which evaluations, commentary and discursive agency were deployed in the letter genre.

Texts which utilized the thematic genre of testimony or evidence and character evaluation were placed with the Court Frame. Prestige themes were placed within both the Court and Social landscape frames. Those utilizing themes of gender, race and media were categorized within the social landscape frame.

Writers were provided with a critique sheet that asked them to discuss aspects of each other's first draft letters. These suggestions and questions included:

1. Phrases, words, sentences they thought to be particularly effective or ineffective.
2. Features that they thought would strengthen the impact of the letter on the intended audience.
3. Whether the hearings would have an impact on the future of gender relations in America.
4. Whether or not the allegations and subsequent

testimony of the hearings might have been taken out of its original context.

The peer revision settings consisted of the following pairs:

Court framers/Court framers CF/CF

Social landscapers/Court framers CF/SL

Social landscapers/Social landscapers SL/SL

These contexts served as the specific interactive settings in which subjects exchanged constructive criticism of their compositions and suggestions for further development.

Following these revisions, a series of case studies were selected out of the total sample. Students were selected for the analysis for case studies of this research to represent the diversity of linguistic strategy, frame of reference and evaluative approaches they evidenced. The case studies attempted to be representative of the variations in the total sample in terms of ethnicity and gender as well as the variations in the three forms of frame of reference employed here.

A discussion of the features and purposes of their writing activity ensued. A taping of the sessions was made with students making evaluations and comments on the effectiveness, as well as the particular authorial strategies and forms of language use their peer partners utilized. Students exchanged their versions of their first drafts, commenting directly on a separate page the means and choices they suggested in each other's work. Students then made a second and final revision draft of the letter with consideration of both their own original text and the revision context group discussions and written commentary.

A group of students was selected to participate in a non-peer mediated group. A total of ten students were selected to participate through revision without the influence or intervention of peer conversation and critique. Students chose to participate in the non-peer group and the ten subjects that were analyzed were selected in terms of representative diversity in ethnicity, gender and the discursive strategies evidenced in their texts.

Narrative Prompt

This study utilized a standardized prompt in the initial solitary revision context. Students developed and elaborated individually upon their initial texts after videocassette presentation of segments of testimony during recent Senate Confirmation hearings of Judge Clarence Thomas as a nominee for the position as a Justice on the Supreme Court.

Specifically, students were asked to write letters evaluating the video segment. Students were requested to discuss their evaluation of social roles and relations during the peer context settings. The object of all narrative productions was the provision of a context in which to address the actual participants with regard to the depictions of social roles and relations in general, and gender interaction and representation, in particular. The video prompt and accompanying verbal transcript utilized were specific segments of Congressional testimony during the confirmation hearings of Clarence Thomas. Segments of Anita Hill's testimony and Thomas' rebuttal were utilized. Students were asked to select a publication,

journal or newspaper of their choice as the intended audience of their letters. Students addressed their letters to the editors of their selected publications.

Rationale for Prompt

This study utilized the interactive, culturally salient prompt of a cultural text as represented by the Congressional hearings recorded on videotape. This served as a vehicle for students to begin to appropriate aspects of testimony for their own expression of subjectivity, or self-identity through contextualized letter writing activities.

Pilot research disclosed that this prompt was generative of themes students determine to be motivating. As such, it allowed for a more naturalistic context of activity for the peer revision activity framework of this study. In addition, this initially visual prompt, serving as primary 'text', allowed for students to inscribe their own narrative structure, evaluations and values into the initial 'text' fragments in the letter to the editor genre they were asked to utilize.

Referential Frame Analysis

In the analysis of the first drafts an observable thematic contextualization became evident. Student authors utilized particular forms of reference in order to situate their texts. The two dominant categories that have been employed in the analysis of this study were categorized as court frame and social landscape frame texts.

In order to characterize specific linguistic processes throughout the revision process, the use of the initial frame distinctions was found to be productive. The initial frame of reference allowed for characterizing the qualitative shifts and modifications in discursive strategy student authors employed. The elements of voice were analyzed within the context constructed by each author.

Typology of Functions

The referential function of all texts was defined as the situated and context of action as textually constructed by an author. These were identified as themes, identified by the recurrence of specific frames

of reference. Two dominant frames of reference, the court and social landscape encapsulated the broadest distinctions in reference.

The expressive function was considered the qualitative and evaluative commentary an author utilizes in a text. A referential frame analysis provided for a mapping of the modifications in discursive strategies. By identifying the referential ground upon which expressive and evaluative statements were constructed, assessment of peer group revision became possible. Observation of the retention and alteration of frames of reference after the peer revision setting permitted an assay of agentive discursive strategy. Following Bakhtin's premise that thematic and expressive or semantic and referential features, as well as Luria's (1971) use of the Prague School of Linguistics' distinction between theme and rheme, are always co-constituted in discourse, an empirical delineation of aspects of agency was formulated.

In the expressive category were placed all features identified as constituting the complex

discursive phenomenon commonly reduced to voice. These included the six discursive strategies defined in the coding manual (See **Appendix B**).

It was hypothesized that the following shifts would be observed over the course of the three texts:

- 1) frame shifting between court and social landscapers.
- 2) frame shifting involving changes in either or both referential and expressive functions.
- 3) frame shifters marked by changes in reference only.
- 4) frame shifters marked by changes in referential and expressive functions.

Minimal Shift

A change from court frame to social landscape or reverse with only referential frame altered. This shift involved the maintenance of all expressive functions.

Maximal Shift

A change between court frame and social landscape (or reverse) frames plus changes in any or all expressive

functions i.e., articulation--to--disarticulation strategy , register of theme (speech genre): objective media --to--intimate gender 'I', 'woman'/ to 'we'/'women' positionality.

It was also hypothesized that there would be an observable development of expressive functions over course of text revision. Inchoate themes (speech genres) in the first drafts, evidenced only by fragmentary positionality and strategy, became more fully manifest in the revised texts.

Rationale for Peer Group Types

Analysis of Data

Both oral and written modes were analyzed utilizing a delineation of discursive strategies (see Coding Manual, Appendix A).

Types of discourse, in interview sessions as well as oral and written revision modes, were characterized by subjective markings that allowed for utterances to be scrutinized within and across text segments and reconstruction. This involved addressing the construing

of themes and instances of reenvoicement over the totality of both discrete discursive contexts such as the initial letter writing session as well as the discursive space of the peer revision groups and their subsequent text productions.

Criteria for Peer Revision Contexts

These criteria served for coding peer revision contexts. They were premised on expected differences within the revision context. A general developmental trend anticipated by this study was the trend toward the parodic axis of discursive strategies. It was expected that the interactive peer revision context would facilitate reflection and mediation of text production, leading to greater and more explicit use of agentive dialogic strategies, including figurative language foregrounded through the reflection on texts.

CASE STUDIES

The following results are organized into twenty case studies. They have been selected from the total sample and gathered as representative of the variations in initial frame reference construction, as well as shifts in frame and evaluative strategies. They have also been selected in that they reflect the gender groupings of this study, including a representative number of male dyads, male female and female dyads. Ten dyads participated in peer social revision groups. Ten additional writers were not included in the peer sessions are considered to constitute the non-peer or unmediated group. This group self selected not to participate in the peer interaction and the analysis of their texts is based on the same criteria of representativeness as the peer group case studies. All letters were written in response to a request by the researcher to write a letter to an editor of a selected newspaper or magazine.

Analysis of Data

Case 1:/Angela/Renee

Angela: First Draft

Angela situates her initial letter, positioning herself through a personal voice. Her positioning functions through an utterance that disarticulates the Senate hearings:

After two years of listening to the case of Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas it doesn't surprise me that I still feel anger and resentment over this whole issue.

She begins a disarticulation of hearings:

It's rather upsetting that something as serious as this sexual harassment case was just on national tv and that at the end, nothing concrete really was done.

Television, in view of everyone and then the final analysis was one of disgust.

Raises prestige/power theme:

Here, two people were put on the stand, dismantled of everything just because he (Thomas) was up for a prestigious position in the Supreme Court.

Angela continues her disarticulation of the hearings:

It seems as though all the Judiciary Committee wanted was to clear his name and nothing else,

while the big issue of sexual harassment remained unanswered.

Uses a plural gendered voice to disarticulate the hearings:

Had there been a different ending to this 'circus' then maybe we could feel a bit of equality, but like always the man is one up on us.

Rearticulates testimony within context of prestige and gender theme:

Why should a woman of such high standards come and make such accusations if they were not true?

Why come forward if your integrity and credibility is going to be questioned?

Here we see how she exposed things that were upsetting and demeaning to her as a woman yet the outcome wasn't in favor of her.

Her credibility was far more questioned than his.

Contextualizes disarticulation within a social landscape perspective:

How does society expect women to come out and stand up for their rights, stand up for equality if in the long run no one is going to believe them?

Angela Identifies a gender>race or class vector

that apparently amplifies prior utterances to
constructs a full social landscape frame:

Sexual harassment is something that happens
everywhere regardless of your race or class.

Anita Hill, being of a high class, suffered all
the pain and further harassment by coming forward.

It took a lot of guts and courage to do what she
did and this opened many doors for other women,
yet, the fact that she was made to look like a
liar gave mixed messages to other women.

This writer is coded as having adopted a social
landscape frame of reference.

Renee

First Draft

Ms. Magazine

Dear Editor:

Author uses self-authorizing, context creating
statements:

I am a Lehman college student at CUNY.

I have just recently viewed in my psych of women
course the Hill-Thomas hearing.

Renee disarticulates the media representation of
hearings:

(minor note- Mr. Thomas' name always came first
with the media!)

Introduces character evaluation/prestige themes in
a general strategy that disarticulates the court frame:

In viewing the video on the case, I found it to
be very distressing.

Both Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas are well
educated, respected individuals.

Uses character evaluations of Anita Hill to position
her alignment with her perceived plight:

Anita Hill reported she was sexually harassed out
of duty to herself.

She was aware that by doing so she could adversely risk and quite possibly jeopardize her own career.

Renee asserts a gender voiced articulation of Hill:

In Anita Hill's article 'The Nature of the Beast,' I was happy to see that Ms. Hill was able to rechannel her experience to help educate other women through articles, data, etc and inform the women in the workforce not to be 'quiet woman.'

Rearticulates testimony to continue positioning her alignment with Hill:

Ms. Hill stated she had no vendetta against Mr. Thomas.

"Clarence Thomas denied all allegations as was expected.

Would a man who was being appointed to the highest court resign to agree as being the accused?

Author articulates a gender position definitively:

The main issue that needs to be focused is on sexual harassment.

The article presented in your Jan/Feb 92 issue written by Anita Hill describes the gender issue and it's underlying problems within the workforce.

Rearticulates testimony and hearings through power and media representation themes:

The notoriety that Ms. Hill received only occurred because of the high ranking status of the individuals involved.

Moreover, if she was just a 'regular sec'y' and he the 'boss, the media attention would not have been as vast.

Author was coded as having adopted a social landscape frame marked by the presence and expression of clear gender themes.

Angela responds to the first question asked by Renee regarding the possibility that either Anita Hill or Clarence Thomas both were deluding the American public. After stating:

well from what you have in your paper and I know what I have in my paper, I don't think either of them were really trying to delude the public or lie about the issues.

she contradicts this with a disarticulation:

Just that one was a liar and the other was life.

The discussion centers on who may have been the truth with Angela reading Renee's letter indicating that Renee takes a court frame position with regard to Thomas' guilt. After reading Renee's letter Angela states:

And it was pretty evident even in the video that we saw for the second time after the two years since this had taken place we still saw her. He

just seemed like he wasn't even in there.
Visibility/absence theme established for Angela and serves to disarticulate Thomas' testimony. Statement also serves as probe or partial question seeking response. Renee, after having established an court frame reference and position before, maintains it:

I'm looking at your paper right now and I also think that you felt the same way, that is, that somebody had to be lying.

This is in part a response to Angela's probe. She continues through gender articulation utterances within the court frame:

I think that most women do believe Anita Hill, as opposed to Clarence Thomas.

Renee is in agreement with Angela, quoting her with regard to 'why would a woman of such high standards come and make such accusations?' and then asks Angela what she thinks happened.

Angela uses character evaluations of Thomas that focus on prestige and power themes:

he wanted nothing that would tarnish or interrupt the position, the big step of his life. Not every man gets that opportunity.

Angela uses her disarticulating strategy, as in the above character evaluation, but contextualized and functioning within a social landscape reference that includes family and race. This strategy is deployed through the use of specific questions:

How could he face his children, how could he face the world that knew that he was a black to fit that position? But then he just disregarded the fact that Anita Hill knew and faced the world after she came public with all this information?

Renee rearticulates issue of race contextualized in court frame:

I don't think it's true what people say about the black issue". I think that it was just a matter that he went for this high position and she must have been harassed by Thomas at some point in her working career with him. And maybe at some point it just got so out of hand.

Angela rearticulates Renee's evidence perspective into a definitively social landscape/race context:

Well I agree with all that but I regard it as a black issue. Had it been a white man and a white woman with the same problem, it might have been more hush-hushed that what it was.

Renee maneuvers race vs. court frame discussion by establishing an analogy which allows her to position herself again:

Remember when what's his face, Kennedy, the

William Kennedy trial ... that the younger nephew or son or whoever the hell it was, he raped that girl, then they did all this thing, and they blew that up too.

Angela agrees:

Yeah, that also happened about the same time this happened. And it wasn't really blown up.

Renee attempted to draw the conversation toward media attention in general by using the Kennedy case analogy, validating her argument that the case was only about harassment and not race but does not continue to develop it after conceding that the Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas case did receive more attention. Angela develops her argument framed in social landscape/race supported by the prior utterance exchange. She continues her social landscape rearticulation by using the theme of media representation:

Because they smothered every scene, everything that happened in the world during that time. This was like a national television...everybody was watching. And I really think that it was something that could have been settled elsewhere. Why put it in the view of the public eye?

Angela then uses a character evaluation with strong identification to build her overall rearticulating strategy contexted in a social landscape frame:

Even though he was guilty it was still something that destroyed him. Yes, he destroyed her as a woman ... I really feel sorry for her ... and here she did something thinking that something good was going to come out of it. Maybe some good things did come out of it. But now women are afraid to stand up because they are going to be humiliated.

Angela's rearticulation strategy includes her depiction of gender relations remaining essentially unchanged:

I mean the woman sat there in front of the cameras and in front of the world talking about something that happened to her that was so demeaning and yet nothing came out of it. Because in reality he got the decision he wanted and what else happened?

This social landscape rearticulation, while negative in its evaluation of 'impact,' prompts Renee to venture into the social landscape frame:

Well, I mean if anything ... well, what America has gotten out of it is maybe Anita Hill has made more women aware, has brought it more to the public.

while retaining some of her basic court frame through articulation strategies:

I mean even though the favorable vote was against her and Clarence Thomas still got appointed, maybe women today won't be as bashful or afraid to come out.

and in response, Angela takes an court frame using testimony and 'evidence' and character evaluations:

Also for another thing this brings out is how can you even think that for once that she was lying looking at this thing? I mean there was no money in it for her, there was nothing that she would really, what retribution does she get precisely? And if anything, she'd worm into a little corner because it was so humiliating and embarrassing.

Renee returns to her basic framework in response:

but she had already come out with everything so what is that she had to lose. I mean if anything she's getting the public eye and [everybody's like saying this is for a reason] even though the courts thought that she was a liar. I mean she's still going for it.

In these utterances, she is rearticulating public image produced of Hill during and after the hearings as a woman who was personally motivated to make charges for personal gain or revenge. Angela responds returning to her basic rearticulation in a social landscape frame that resituates the courtroom testimony:

It's true that he might have and his children might have been embarrassed but he still got the position. And he's sitting there on a bench making decisions for the nation.

Renee proceeds to ask the question about whether the original dialogue may have been taken out of context. She answers before Angela has a chance to respond, stating:

Mr. Thomas had to have said something derogatory ... because why take it to the circus media if

something wasn't said.

This is an articulation of Angela's use of 'circus' in her first draft. Angela responds by rearticulating statements made during the testimony:

Well there was a point in the case where AH said that he went and knocked at her door with some champagne or something during the night to speak with her. And then the pieces of the tape we saw last week he kept asking 'what could I have said to make her think?'. I was saying why does he keep asking himself 'what could I have said?' He knows he had to have said something. If she misinterpreted his behavior or whatever he said to her, then why did he go to her apartment late at night to knock on her door?

Renee articulates statements made by Hill:

Yeah, you know what else is true that I had taken note? The fact she was so graphic and so specific with the coke bottle and he was saying something about 'who's pubic hair is that on the coca cola bottle?' That's really descriptive and so either this woman has a great imagination or... she is telling the truth.

Angela responds by commenting on how Hill spoke:

And at no time was there any difference in her speech, any stress or anything that you could say, well, look at that 'I think she's lying, because you can see how emotional she got.

Disarticulates the position of those who say that Hill was lying because of the absence of affect. Renee picks this theme up but disarticulates those who would disclaim emotional testimony:

yes, but sometimes emotions can show she's telling the truth- 'Oh, she's so emotional.' I don't know, maybe not.

Conversation moves to a critique of their own writing:

Renee: You know, it's true, you did have a different style than me. Like you write out of, as if you were talking to someone, I think.

Angela: I think that I tried to make it a little personal, just letting the editor know how I felt without really getting into it. Because I think that I was just disgusted by the whole case.

Renee: Yeah, it shows ... I'm looking at your letter...here, like you're questioning the editor, or whoever is reading the paper, 'why would a woman of such high standards come and make such accusations if they were not true?' You are addressing that question to someone, whereas I did not ever question my reader.

Angela: You were just giving, you were very informative and you were just giving them a lot of information as opposed to me, I had questions and I was..I think I need more to just hear the thing again. I needed a lot of answers.

Discussion then focusses on impact of letters on editor or audience. Renee is concerned with finessing the letter:

I guess grammatically we might want to make this correct, we want it done properly, we want to rewrite it correctly, because it's going to an editor-we don't want to sound stupid.

whereas Angela maintains her central social landscape focus by saying:

It has to be rewritten but I think I'm just writing to the editor because I have questions that need to be answered ...because like myself I'm sure there are a lot of women out there who feel that nothing really came about with this case, although, yes, women have been able to come out of their closets with this issue but at the same time, others are going to feel 'why should I?'

Renee says that she relied on sources:

I mean I don't even know what I wrote. I have to reread it. I tended to quote a lot from the handouts and articles, also from the conversations and transcripts and you don't.

Renee questions her own method:

I don't know if that's more helpful or not. I mean I should also try to verbalize the way you did as opposed to talking directly.

The peer critique ends with focus on positioning when Angela then questions Renee about what she really felt about the case:

Angela: What are your true feelings about this piece? What are your true feelings about this case?

Renee: My true feelings?

Angela: I mean are there things you aren't telling?

Renee: No, I don't like it. You think it didn't come across, that I was happy, unhappy with the turn of events?

Angela: No, not really. I can't see that.

Renee: "Okay, now I'm going to have to read this letter all over again... I need to say more I guess what my feelings are, let that come across a little more strongly in there. I mean what did I write 'would a man who is being appointed wouldn't obviously,' oh yeah, I'm the person who is being accused'. I thought I wrote that. I don't know how I wrote that 'Clarence Thomas denied all allegations as was expected. Would a man who was being appointed to the highest court resign to agree to being the accused'. I mean to me, alright, so what is he going to say 'yes, you know that was me, I did that'. He's not going to say that. That's what I meant by that paragraph, but I guess I never specifically stated like I was unhappy or whatever.

Angela: Well, Renee, rewrite. Let's do revisions. I need to quote more things from the paper and the conversations and make it less a questionnaire type of letter. Give more information.

Renee: I guess the main thing for us is the language. You stated a lot of questions to the reader and I need to express more. I guess my feelings, my sentiments.

Angela

Revised Draft

First sentence same as first draft except "the whole issue" is changed to "the sexual harassment issue". Paragraph two reorganization apparent, reflective of a shift in emphasis. Angela starts her revised text:

Here two people who held very good positions and who were highly educated were put in front of national television to discuss something that was stressful for both and whose end results were really nothing.

combines material from first paragraph and drops out 'dismantled of everything just because he (Thomas) was up for a prestigious position, adding:

very good positions and who were highly educated.

The big issue which was sexual harassment was left unanswered, unresolved.

reversing clause order of original and adds 'unresolved'. Angela rearticulates a tape prompt question and public discussion:

One of the issues that sticks in my mind is that people question whether AH blew this all out of context, yet, why would a woman of such high standards come and make such accusations if they weren't true.

Dialogic aspects of the negotiation of topics and

their respective positions is evident in utterances and her own first draft:

She exposed things that were upsetting and demeaning to her as a woman and yet the outcome was not in her favor.

same except 'here' drops out and 'her credibility was far more questioned than his' dropped. She adds:

how does society expect women to come out and stand for their rights.

Angela then introduces an articulation of a gender focused voice:

She helped many to be able to speak up about sexual harassment, yet there are many who would still be afraid to come forth as a result of the lack of vindication that the Judiciary Committee gave this particular woman.

In paragraph five 'something as serious' changes to 'something of such importance to this woman' and 'concrete' drops out in favor of 'then the final outcome was one of disgust, as is also " had the results' instead of 'had there been a different ending'. 'Media circus' in first draft is also deleted.

Renee

Revised Draft

Renee's revised contextualization of the issues formulates a social landscape text. The author alters and modifies small features, including the fourth sentence of first paragraph from 'in viewing the video on the case, I found it to be very distressing' to

in viewing, I became angry at the 'media circus' the country was being exposed to.

This utterance is a clear reenvoicement of peer discussion with Angela about the need to express her feelings about the case. It is simultaneously an example of a reenvoiced articulation of Angela's use of 'circus' in first draft as well as textualizing image she adopted in oral text. She adds another social landscape sentence here:

America became divided- who was the liar and who was the victim.

Author restructures entire second paragraph court frame/character evaluations:

It seemed that the courts ruled in the direction which they sought fit- against Ms. Hill!

added with no paragraph break, linking more social

landscape positions used above.

Renee also deletes sentence about Hill's taking a risk and jeopardizing her career. She also drops sentence about Hill stating that she had no vendetta against Thomas and adds:

In my opinion, Ms. Hill was not lying. Both Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas are well educated respected individuals.

In the ninth sentence of this paragraph 'she' replaces 'Anita' and adds 'out of duty to herself and to other women in our society', and adds :

Why would a woman of her stature lie when she was risking her own career?

Something had to occur within the walls of her their offices.

In revised second paragraph reenvoices statement in peer tape discussion about 'vivid imagination':

Ms Hill had to have a vivid imagination to recall certain details mentioned in the case hearings, obviously they were not heard by the court, not enough to be valid.

Alters statement from first draft structured as a question:

would a man who was being appointed to the highest court resign to agree as being the accused?

to the following utterance:

Just to note, a man who was being appointed to the highest possible seat in the court would not confirm to the world that he ever said a derogatory comment.

Introduces a new analogy serving to rearticulate Thomas in her original court frame:

In the same respect, Clinton would never admit- while a Presidential candidate that he inhaled pot. Needless to say, I don't think that he would be President today. Thomas had to deny all allegations- he would not have been appointed either.

In the third paragraph 'Ms. Hill received' is changed to 'that occurred' and 'media attention would not have been as vast' is changed to 'media would not have been as attentive.'

The author develops a gender marked social landscape position, as indicated by altering the sentence "I was happy to note that Ms. Hill was able to rechannel", and modifies the utterance "to help educate other women through articles, data, etc. and inform the women in the workforce not to be a 'quiet woman' to :

negative' experience into something positive, quite possibly helping other women in the same precarious position.

Renee adds a further articulation of plural gender voice:

In closing, more women should become 'conscious' of their role as being a New Woman- one who is strong, confident, intelligent and well voiced.

Renee drops 'quiet woman' articulation from the Anita Hill article she cites to mark her usage of the phrase 'New Woman', an agentive gender signifier.

CASE STUDY 2

Laurie/Tracy

Tracy

First draft

The author contextualizes subsequent disarticulation of the Senate Confirmation Hearings. Tracy's rearticulations serve to pivot and build the strategies and argument that follow:

While watching the Hill and Thomas hearing there were two questions that came to mind. First, both Thomas and Hill are telling two completely different stories. Secondly, why were these people asked to reveal their personal business for the world to see?

The writer organizes a disarticulation of Thomas' testimony within overall court frame:

In my opinion, it is not easy for a person to create a story like the one Ms. Hill was said to have made up unless she wanted to get back at Judge Thomas.

His word meant more, 'carried more weight' than hers. This sent a message to women.

Tracy uses a repetition of Thomas' testimony:

This can also be questioned because Judge Thomas said that he knew of no reason for her to bring such charges; therefore, I feel that there was some truth to the story.

A race/class vector is expressed to support overall

disarticulation:

There is that question of why these people were placed in this position.

She also employs a rearticulation of others' opinions:

Many might say that the position Thomas was applying for was one of great importance- therefore, we must be careful about who is placed there. I agree with this, however, would the same treatment have been given to them if they were white or Ms. Hill was of a lesser class? My opinion is that if the situation was turned none of this would have taken place.

The very notion of the semantic value of 'placed there' is put into question, giving voice to the author's rearticulation of the course of events in terms of racial manipulation. This first draft reflects the author's formulation of a court frame text in which disarticulating and rearticulating strategies dominate.

Laurie

First draft

This author uses aspects of an intimate gender speech genre. Affect and identification with protagonist is marked in the text:

I was left with a mixture of feelings.

Anger was the strongest feeling of all.

... anger that Clarence Thomas got away with sexual harassment.

For any woman, sexual harassment is a traumatic experience, and one that is not easily talked about, especially when it can cost you your job, your career and your name to be dragged into a mess.

Uses both disarticulation and rearticulations in building a gendered position. Her overall court frame utilizes character evaluation statements:

Anita Hill as role model for women who were sexually harassed and too scared to talk about it.

My question is why would a woman like AH make up a lie such as this?

Anita Hill was questioned, accused, doubted, humiliated and embarrassed by the press and people who favored Judge Thomas.

What would happen if Judge Thomas accused Anita Hill of past sexual harassment? There would not be the same reaction from society.

and adds further questions as a device to disarticulate existing gender disparities, including the following utterance concerning whether men would be as

scared or embarrassed to report sex harassment.

Her disarticulating strategy, including the above use

of character evaluations, remains predominantly within a court frame:

The more I think about this case the more I question the fairness of this case.

It is obvious that she is telling the truth.

It is to Judge Thomas' advantage to deny the whole thing.

It was to Anita Hill's disadvantage to report the sexual harassment.

She had too much to lose but yet she chose to report it.

It is obvious that she is the victim in this case.

She is a victim because she was sexually harassed and now she became a victim for coming forward. Where is justice?

Peer Session

After reading one another's letters, the court frame based on construction of 'evidence' is established through consideration of the 'two conflicting' stories told by the protagonists in the case. Both agree that both Hill and Thomas were lying and only saying partial truths. Tracy claims that:

yes, had to be some truth to each.

which leads to Laurie's rearticulation of Hill's testimony:

maybe I believe more Anita Hill's story. There must be some truth to what she said.

She places the case within a social landscape framework, responding to the prompt question asking what potential impact the hearings may have on gender relations:

I think it's going to be easier for men to harass women and get away with it. Nothing came out of the case except that it sent a message to the public that it took him to do this kind of stuff, meaning that a man in power could get away with it.

The motif of 'message' may derive from Tracy's first draft. Tracy picks this up but turns it around saying that:

maybe it made women more aware what is happening to them. Because how Anita Hill continued to be there.

Tracy and Laurie negotiate this issue, focusing on gender dynamics in the aftermath of the hearings:

Laurie's position is ambivalent:

it's bad and it's good in away because it made it easier for women to come forward.

Tracy claims that:

well, now it makes it easier...it surely opened their eyes so that they can cut it sharp and say what happened to her, she kept on with him instead of breaking the connection.

Tracy may be reenvoicing Laurie's statement (1st draft) about Anita Hill serving as a model for other women, even if a negative one at first in remaining within a harassing situation- 'she still came forward at great personal risk.' Laurie repeats message motif:

OK, but it makes it ... it sends the wrong message to the public as far as him getting away with it.

Tracy agrees and Laurie marks the issue in expressing her concern in terms of a class/ prestige vector:

He got away with it because ... it's like now men in higher positions could do this and get away with it.

Tracy picks up on Laurie's positioning and marks the issue in terms of class:

to me it was ... a class ... Because of their class. People in her class will.

Laurie retains class, prestige marking and adds media the theme of media representation:

I don't know ... had it happened to me, I wouldn't have been on the media side, right? So I think it had a lot to do with the fact that she is an important person and so is he.

switching the topic framework to issues of whether statements were taken out of context:

She was saying bits and pieces and he was saying bits and pieces.. once you retell a something it changes a little bit.

but Tracy questions whether it was a racially motivated event:

what about a racial kind of thing. Do you think it would have been different if it had been a different kind of situation, say, if it was two blacks or a black and a white or two whites?

Laurie accepts it as a possibility, but thinks that the hearings would have been conducted in the same manner regardless of the racial composition, whereas Tracy does think that the hearings were racially motivated and that things would have been represented differently:

This is the first time that something like this happened. Given another group it might not have been done this way.

Laurie asks whether another minority group would have been treated differently, and Tracy responds:

Not in particular, because it could have been another minority group and they might have been treated the same way.

They both agree that the way things were 'conducted ' was wrong and inappropriate. Laurie agrees that race

was at least partly an issue in representation:

I think because they were black that made it easy.

After agreeing that the way things were 'conducted' wasn't 'necessary,' the discussion moved to the issue of private/ public revelations and the barrage of media images, especially of Anita Hill. Laurie quotes her letter. Then discussion returns to testimony and statements during the hearings. Tracy takes a position that Laurie voiced at the beginning of their discussion:

I think that I believe her story more than I believe him.

Laurie agrees by saying:

She went into a little more detail than he did. Well, I don't know, maybe I'm biased because I'm a woman. And I know how men are.

Discussion goes on to character evaluation of Thomas climbing and jockeying for a position of power and prestige. Laurie brings this to focus in saying:

For a man in his position to admit to sex harassment, I mean.. he's not stupid like that.

Then Tracy and Laurie discuss the effectiveness of their letters. Neither thinks they will have a impact because the issue is 'very un-new'. it's 'like dead'

for Tracy, and a 'waste of time' for Laurie, but Tracy thinks that if people have an open attitude they could be influenced. Laurie repeats her earlier position that the issue is essentially unresolvable, based on the vicissitudes of interpretation:

It's just like an ocean, this thing. There is really like no way of knowing. It is open for debate. Can't agree, can't disagree, because not everything is clear.

Discussion ends on making minor grammatical changes. Tracy saying she might "use some stronger ones" and Laurie responds:

yeah, well still it's going to have more of an impact.

Tracy Revised Draft

Use of 'I' as opposed to questions in first draft in an overall disarticulation of the media representation of the case. This draft is focalized through the perspective of a personal and gendered subject position.

Author uses rearticulation in expressing her analysis of a private/public dichotomy within the social presentation of the hearings to mark position in a

gendered social landscape frame:

I strongly feel that the Senate has step over the line drawn between what is public and what should be private.

I personally did not side with Judge Thomas but what was done reflects on me as a woman.

Author drops first question from first draft about difference in stories told and uses a disarticulating strategy with regard to the hearings:

I feel' that it was necessary to have J.Thomas questioned, however, the way it was done was completely wrong.

In my opinion, it was done because of race and gender.

which marks a change from a more diffuse statement (articulation) in 1st draft:

if the situations was turned.

where she brought up the hypothetical instance of different ethnic and gender and class dynamics. Power theme raised for first time in the claim by the author that the case shows:

how much power women exercise.

a reversal of her own statement about how it
'sent a message' that women won't be believed.'
Differences in what could be considered the degree to
which gender determines whether statements and stories
are heard are expressed here. Author utilizes a
contrastive rearticulation strategy, pivoting on
notions of 'situations', 'turns' and 'messages.'

Laurie Revised Draft

Uses stronger perspective/affective charge than that
used to contextualize first draft:

After viewing the testimony a mixture of
feelings swept through my body.

Anger was strongest feeling of all.

I was furious at the fact that Judge Thomas was
allowed to get away with the sexual harassment
that he inflicted on Anita Hill.

Author focalizes through a more objective/distancing
voice. She builds a disarticulating argument as in
first draft, deploying character evaluation statements
again:

for any woman, sexual harassment is a traumatic experience.

deleting details about 'name being dragged into a mess'. In revision, the statement:

When Anita Hill came forward she became a model for women who had been sexually harassed.

deletes 'too scared to talk about it' in this statement:

in the future women may think about her bravery, and be inspired to come forward.

Several rearticulations used in the first draft reappear in altered phrasing and organization:

I often question whether or not men would be scared or embarrassed to report sex harassment.

stated rather than used as a direct question

Society's reaction to this case would be totally different if it had been Anita Hill being accused of sexually harassing Judge Thomas.

and adds to first draft character evaluation:

Hill was questioned, accused, doubted, humiliated, harassed and embarrassed for reporting sexual harassment.

the commentary that:

that's like adding insult to injury.

The author also elaborates on her commentary further:

Hill was put through an 'ordeal' after having

been the 'victim.'

Why would Anita Hill make up a lie such as this one?

Other character evaluation statements are used to support her general disarticulation of Thomas and the hearings within a court frame:

advantageous for Thomas to deny all allegations."

deletes 'also disadvantages'.

Anita Hill was being an honest person.
She had too much to lose by reporting something that isn't true, yet she suffered for being honest.

Second draft strengthens and elaborates these character evaluations, adding key words:

It is [painfully] obvious that she is saying the truth and is a [victim twice].

She was a victim because of sexual harassment and now she became a victim for [reporting the truth.]

changed from 'coming forward.'

Where is justice?

The author has selected an utterance that is a stronger, almost parodic statement, allowing portrayal of a double victimization.

An overall impact of peer revision interactions in this case study was the facilitation of positions taken in first drafts. Both authors strengthened and sharpened their initial and more diffuse discursive strategies.

Case Study 3

Mercedes/Fatema

Mercedes

First Draft

Mercedes places her evaluation explicitly in terms of a 'verdict' that situates her court frame texts. Her strategy is an intentional and careful enumeration of statements and 'facts' constituted by courtroom testimony which provide the opportunity for her to choose to disarticulate Anita Hill's charges of sexual misconduct on Clarence Thomas' part.

Her first draft is a tentative evaluation of the hearings and is largely composed of character

evaluation statements that initially begin with ambivalent support and rearticulation of the events. These include the following rearticulations that converge around prestige and power themes:

Anyone could see why she would be nervous given her statement to 98% men after being harassed by a man with clout.

The point I'm trying to make is jobs are very hard to find in this competitive country especially when you have something that could build you right up to the top.

She may have felt Thomas was her ticket to success.

Mercedes extends the analogy further by comparing the case with the rape trial of Mike Tyson:

Just like the President he wants to build his self to the same one he should show the respect, like Tyson doing the wrong thing in the line of respect.

This utterance serves as an initial implicit articulation of Thomas' testimony and, in formulating an analogy, the grounds for her specific evaluative strategies.

Mercedes

Alternate First Draft

Mercedes rejected her first and incomplete first draft and presented the following more evaluative and positioned letter:

I'd like to inform you that I had watched all the hearings. I found that in my opinion Judge Thomas was more believable in his testimony.

I also felt that the judgement that was given to Thomas was a fair one due to the fact that lack of evidence and mostly 'hearsay' was given by Professor Hill in her testimony.

These utterances function to stylize her position in alignment with Thomas' testimony. Mercedes further emphasizes an agentive agreement with Thomas and the veracity of his testimony, stating:

I feel that no one should take it away from him, so, yes, I do agree that he should be a part of the Supreme Court.

Her use of 'yes' in the above is an active stylization with prior statements, primarily the context of the Senate Confirmation Hearing sessions, made in defense of Thomas' qualifications for the position.

Fatema

First Draft

Author employs a position/context creating statement:

My name is Fatema., I attend Long Island University. I would like to give my opinion on the Thomas Confirmation.

I think that Clarence Thomas should have been confirmed. I don't know if he sexually harassed Anita Hill but my opinion is that he didn't.

Fatema disarticulates both Hill's intentions and her specific testimony:

She waited too long to bring out the charges.

I found it very strange that Hill's allegations were brought forth two days before the Senate was to vote on Clarence Thomas.

Anita Hill was phoney. Seeing her on tv proved just how much of a liar she really was. She started out by talking of her family, hometown, and all her background. I think she gave some unnecessary information.

Even when she answered the questions directed at her, she sounded as if she was lying.

The author rearticulates the Confirmation Hearings in terms of racial motives. She repeats some of Thomas' own parodic testimony:

I think that someone or some people just didn't want Thomas to be confirmed.

I saw it as a 'racial thing.' Clarence Thomas thought of this charge as a "high-tech lynching

for uppity blacks." He claimed to be a victim of racism, and I agree with him.

Fatema stylizes her position in support of Thomas and his testimony:

I believe Clarence Thomas, and I think he deserved to be confirmed.

Peer Session

Peer discussion is oriented toward testimony during the hearings. Mercedes reads from the transcripts to build her disarticulation of Hill's allegations. After reading a long section, she states:

Now that was he, Judge Thomas and Anita Hill said. She did not say in her testimony that she accompanied him to Oral Roberts University. She only said that she was offered a job there and she was trying to get away from the pressure under Judge Thomas.

Mercedes continues, clarifying for Fatema what she believes to be an important discrepancy:

You see, 'Anita Hill who is from Oklahoma accompanied me on that trip.' This is Judge Thomas' testimony. And in her testimony, see, she just said 'in the Spring of 1982 an opportunity to teach at Oral Roberts University opened up.' That's it.

Fatema thinks it is significant as well, responding:

Oh well, that's something.

Mercedes repeats her point again:

See she didn't come out about how she accompanied him there. She just came out and said she had an opportunity open for her. She didn't say she went with him.

The peer session proceeds to build further 'evidence' and supporting 'facts' to disarticulate Hill's allegations:

Fatema: I thought all that stuff still went on with her. She called him.

Mercedes: Yes. She was calling him and she was calling his secretary.

Fatema: That's why I don't believe her. I don't believe her. I think she's a liar.

They find support and build their mutual disarticulation of Hill:

Mercedes: If she wanted to get rid of him so bad, why did she accompany him in the first place?.

Fatema: Well, first of all, if he was really all around her, she wouldn't have moved with him from the Department of Education to the EEOC.

Mercedes: To the EEOC exactly.

Fatema: She could have gotten another job. She has skills. She has schooling and everything. She didn't have to go with him to EEOC.

Mercedes draws another statement from the transcript in further support of their strategy within a court framework:

Alright, here is the next one: 'on one occasion he called me at home and we had an inconsequential conversation. One occasion he called without reaching me and I returned the call without reaching him'. Now, if you're trying to get away from someone.

Fatema picks up this continuing theme:

Right, why are you trying to call him?

Mercedes moves to the next point in her pursuit of 'evidence':

In 1983 she said how she wanted to escape the pressure she felt at the EEOC due to Judge Thomas, but here in 1985, okay?, 'from my group in Tulsa, Oklahoma which wished to have a civilized conversation, wanted to have Judge Thomas as a speaker and I enlisted my assistance for this purpose'. Why did she do it? Why did she go?

Fatema brings up the next point within the same theme, but using a character evaluation statement to serve in support of the disarticulation strategy they are both employing:

You know how she felt in the beginning.. in her speech how she said that she didn't want to publicize, to cause any harm to her family, that she's trying to defend her family?

She then attributes a conspiratorial note:

I think that she was full of baloney after that leak, that supposed leak that spilled out. She was probably with it anyway.

Mercedes adds her next disarticulation, developing an

explicit attack on Hill's character and testimony:

Another thing I don't like is about how before she comes straight to the point as far as exactly what she went through...She goes around bullshitting. She wants sympathy.

Fatema picks this up, referring to her own position:

I know. That's what I said in my letter. She got a lot of unnecessary information. Too much.

to which Mercedes comments:

She ain't getting no sympathy.

Mercedes then attempts to summarize her position, using what may be a genre constrained and quasi-legalistic approach she considers appropriate:

Well, she began to believe and hope that their working relationship could be a proper one. She shouldn't have believed that from the beginning. If he so-called harassed her, she wouldn't have been believed all of that mess.

Fatema continues to respond to Mercedes's lead:

Well, when women are harassed you're supposed to tell someone...or she could have kept a diary. She could have told someone...She didn't have to keep it to herself. Even if she kept a diary. I don't think he harassed her.

Mercedes reverts to character evaluations from her first draft and ascribes motivation:

What I feel, what I said is 'in my opinion I think that she liked to get him back'. A lot. Because she lost personal interest in him because

he married a white woman. I think that she's a lying hussy. She's a two-face.

Issues of prestige and power enter into the intrapsychological states attributed to Hill:

Then she was fed up with ow he was going to a higher position and she was going to be left at the EEOC. And she knew that then how he could have brought her up with him. She was stuck by herself ... she had to do something to keep him down there with her.

Mercedes refers to Fatema's first draft race marking:

And I feel that, as you said, as you mentioned in your letter, because of racism, somebody tried to set him up.

She quotes from Fatema's letter, reenvoicing through an articulation, Thomas' statement regarding the hearings and charges as a 'high tech lynching':

I agree with that. I think that's right. Because they're trying to get him.

Fatema once again rearticulates a race position:

I know. They always do. They're always trying to put down...people when they come out of their... especially if they're black.

Her last comment is also a race marked with a character evaluation, serving as a disarticulation of Hill again:

You know she's so stupid to go against her own. She's so sick. It always has to be something.

Mercedes tersely sums up her comments squarely within

the court frame that has consistently organized her
disarticulations:

The facts are the facts, right? The facts are
still there.

Mercedes Revised Draft

Revised draft begins with a context creating statement:

I am a student at Long Island University.

inserted in first sentence. It is followed by the
following disarticulation within her overall court
frame:

I read over both transcripts on the testimony of
Judge Clarence Thomas and Professor Hill and I
found an error in Professor Hill's statement which
proved that she was lying.

Continues with textual comparison, quoting from
testimony on transcript, building support for her court
frame analysis:

lack of evidence and mostly 'hearsay' was given
by Professor Hill in her testimony.

Author repeats prestige theme of first draft adding
complexity and more emphatic and elaborated argument
invented in defense of Thomas in court frame:

I felt that Judge Thomas worked himself for many years to where he is at now, and if he deserves it, which I believe he do, I say no one should try and take it away from him, which they tried to do by pressing charges on him such as drug abuse, anti-semitism, and also wife beating, so "yes"!! I do agree that he should be part of the Supreme Court.

Fatema

Revised Draft

Author uses supporting evidence provided by Mercedes's analysis of the transcripts. She makes use of specific details discussed in the peer session. Her revised letter incorporates several of those provided by Mercedes's scrutiny of the transcripts from the hearings, such as the issue of Hill's 'accompanying' Clarence Thomas on a visit to Oklahoma:

I found it very strange for Anita Hill to be around Thomas after he so called harassed her. She moved with him from the Department of Education to the EEOC, she accompanied him on a trip to Oklahoma at Oral Roberts University, went out to dinner with him and continued to call him. If she really was harassed, she would not have taken any of these offers into consideration.

I'm starting to think, maybe something was going on between them.

The author rearticulates her position in claiming that a racial motivation was used in first draft and discussed in peer group:

I understand that it wasn't Hill who decided to make charges against Thomas, but a leak. I also think that whoever spilled this leak didn't want Thomas to become a Senate because he was black.

Case Study 4

Sayeed/Ken

Sayeed

First Draft

Author composes audience sensitive letter to the editor:

Sheryl McCarthy makes some valuable points in 'Watch Them Pass the Buck' about the reality of sexual harassment in public life.

He quotes a sentence from McCarthy's article in Newsday regarding qualifications for office:

Public officials should not appoint people to office who are unqualified, either for lack of credentials, experience or character.

He uses this quote as a basis for rearticulating the discourse of the hearings:

But in both cases, the debate centered around not qualifications, but rather alleged misconduct. Even though the allegations leveled against both Thomas and Randy Daniels are very serious and should be investigated, they are secondary to the central issue of public appointment: experience.

Sayeed's central concern is with experience. He draws a parallel between the Senate Confirmation Hearings and the more recent case involving charges of sexual misconduct at the workplace involving New York City

government employees Randy Daniels and Barbara Wood:

In both the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas cases and the recent issues surrounding Daniels and Wood, the central issue should be the experience of those seeking high level policy appointments.

He uses a disarticulating character evaluation to support his concern for experience:

"Clarence Thomas had some serious 'blots on his record' as McCarthy correctly points out. He was relatively inexperienced, and, even worse, he consistently denied that he harbors extremist conservative views.

Sayeed

Revised Draft

Revised draft is identical with first draft except that the author adds a final paragraph, drawing an analogy of misconduct and inexperience between Clarence Thomas and Randy Daniels:

Likewise, Daniels came fresh from a checkered past as a publicity director for Bahamian Prime Minister Lynden Pindling. He was also set to assume a \$112,000 a year job to, by his own admission, 'work as hard as I can to get David Dinkins re-elected.' Why should our taxes pay for his job? Now that's a scandal.

Ken

First Draft

Author addresses editor using 'we' position of students, redefining and setting into context his purpose for writing:

We were asked to reflect on what we saw in the Thomas-Hill trial and on the veracity of their statements of the gender role in politics or implications on a more 'intimate' field.

In this case, the author rearticulates the purpose of writing, focusing in on an alternate aspect he finds critical:

The intimate playing field is where I would start, on, first of all, the ramifications that the trial would have on gender politics would again depend on the veracity of both Thomas' and Hill's statements.

Ken rearticulates the significance of the case and its discussion within the classroom:

Taking into consideration the possible and many influences that led Hill to bring to light, part circumstances, the impartial, the 'sensible' listener, I think, would surmise that the truth is something that will be carried to the grave on this issue. For me the case ends right here.

This rearticulation of the issues emerging from viewing and discussing the Senate Hearing is considered to be a

question of placing emphasis:

However, this does not dismiss the issue of sexual harassment, a theme which our class has been working of avidly; sadly though, with something of a closed mind, as I fought out when I tried to 'coax' the class into a deeper perspective within the issue of sexual harassment by writing a paper on the 'Male State of Mind.'

This position is used to index the class' negative reaction to the paper. Ken disarticulates the class' perception and conversation about his writing:

In this paper, I deliberately tried to avoid any justification for male behavior but in doing so I found that the class ingested a completely misinterpreted message, finding my work to be a lengthy form of 'pardon me.

Gender negotiation through definitions and interpretation appears to be at play in this letter, providing the basis for a dual rearticulation of both the significance and interpretation of the hearings and the reception of Ken's paper in class.

Peer Session

Sayeed and Ken

Discussion is initiated by articulation of positions taken by authors in their first drafts:

Ken: I had a problem with this first of all because I started on a theme on sexual harassment. Reading about it for the two papers made me start a long reflection on it. And it kind of carries over to gender politics. But it's all based on male behavior and so particularly writing to the editor, addressing is a question of who is right and who is wrong. I'm not dealing with that issue. Obviously there's foul play here and there's a male dominance. I kind of reached a dead end here about what you want me to say. Is it wrong? Yes. So are you suggesting that we as students do something about it? I think that before you do anything you have to have a better understanding of male behavior. The majority knows. That's pretty much what I addressed.

Sayeed asks specific questions about Ken's letter, focusing on Ken's questioning of 'appropriate behavior.'

Ken: So I wrote this... make a little apology for my very racist remarks. 'On the subject of sexual harassment and violence', (reads letter)... I think that maybe the first page is structured because it's kind of just preparation. Maybe the preparation is long but I think it is necessary for what I'm trying to do.

Sayeed questions the relevance of Ken's frame of reference in adapting and rearticulating the focus on

male behavior:

Sayeed: What about keeping to the theme?

Ken: I think it's all about male sexuality. (Reads from notes).

Sayeed: So you're trying to link together all these thoughts in both a paper and in your letter?

Ken: No. It's not the kind of thing any editor really wants to hear. I think it's a larger theme. I just want your thoughts on it.

Sayeed: Here is mine-
(Reads first draft letter.) I was about to finish this and kind of tie it in it with a little ... saying the public shouldn't be paying somebody that much money just to get somebody elected.

Ken: I wanted to ask you a question. Is it a government criteria to hire people based on experience? Or is his criteria people who fit the position very nicely and politically. Is that okay? Is it important that perhaps the tricky part of the criterion ... not being part of the criteria.

Sayeed: And those cases, with all the allegations, those points, I feel, at least, are the most major points. We are looking beyond the character which is the experience and qualifications and the background- they are going to be the determining factors of whether or not the person is going to be able to do their job. The character is going to be important but, you know, to be Deputy Mayor of New York City or to be even Supreme Court justice, you have to have, there have to certain qualifications you must have. And in both these cases- and I can even- it would be a circular argument, but I can even make the argument that with so little experience and such character traits, such character traits most people will be susceptible to, one, not doing the job, and to

committing the same kinds of mistakes that led to the allegations.

Ken: That's right. But individuals are faced with a moral issue. Does the government care?

Sayed: No.

Ken: And should a government care about moral issues before politics?

Sayed: Ideally it should. Definitely.

Ken: Should. Ideology is great but in fact that it works...

Sayed: Should work. In fact it should work if you have honest people in government..

The disarticulation strategy that Ken has been utilizing in questioning Sayeed has also drawn into his discursive net the uses of race, class and gender as ideological tools:

Ken: Would the honest people in government have the criteria... even for when we could certainly go on the basis of experience so we could put our token whatever into this position...because in this case perhaps equally important, if not more so, but we have a certain race, a certain gender and a certain position to get the things we want done.

Sayed: Yes. That's all part of the political agenda. The political game.

Ken: People have no conscience about this kind of thing. It's supposed to work this way. It's like, what do you if they agree on it. But what do you say, it's wrong to be this way. Just because it's an ideology, it doesn't mean it isn't very sound.

Well ideologies might not work.

Sayeed: Not necessarily an ideology but also the fact..

Ken: But it is ideology. The practicality of it is, if I'm a practical politician that's the way to go.

Ken: That's ideology, it's something you learn when you're very young. 'City Hall is supposed to serve and everything is supposed to be for the public good.' Well, sure, is everything going to work like clockwork and it's going to be like taking the good and evil in order to make things work better? Why is that people are in public office based on their gender or race and not on their expertise is the big question. Or it that because the people are crying out to see a black man in this position for what he could do? But you say we got to get somebody, but I say we don't have anybody with enough experience.

Ken raises the issue used in his first draft concerning the ambiguities of appropriate male behavior:

Ken: The issue is really what is socially acceptable. What are the terms of what is socially acceptable and what is the popular idea of appropriate behavior in the case of men especially in our society?

Sayeed: That's really interesting because its probably not that well defined.

Ken: Perhaps what helps better define it is what is appropriate behavior in the male mind? And what are the conflicts? And when it comes to conscience and urge and desire what conflicts with it and what doesn't? Is the viewpoint that men behave just like father just like son and behave just how they are brought up? Is it solely this is it that it at all?

Ken

Revised Draft

Revised draft is presented as an 'excerpt' from the paper mentioned in the first draft. Entitled 'Our Naturalistic Heritage', the letter is marked by a first person male voice that is used to disarticulate male privilege, power and socialization:

What concerns us most, I think, is that underlying element, that entrenched causation which was seen in the Thomas/Hill hearings, as well as in many other disturbing instances. I am speaking about male behavior, or rather misbehavior.

An attempt to delve the 'enigma' and 'problem' of male behavior is made through a broad social landscape frame. Ambivalently positioned, Ken's position is contradictory, revolving, in part, around causes and effects the author rearticulates a male voice that he also articulates:

As a man, I find myself very indifferent to the popular opinion that male behavior is, in the strictest sense, a social construct.

Ken's social landscape frame includes a consideration of structures of power and divisiveness that are drawn into his account and create some of the tension in his

rearticulation of nature/nurture discussions:

I think that before any problem can be solved, it is important to realize not just where the problem stems from, but to try and understand the intricateness [sic] that the underlying has to be confronted (the racism, the sexism, the violence, the harassment).

Though it is true, I believe, that much of what motivates 'our' actions comes from growth and development, I do not however see this as the sole cause, or even the overwhelming constituent.

As a man, who has had, and who has shared many experiences with other men, of multifarious quality, I think I can say confidently that male behavior is as every bit intrinsic as it is communicable.

Ken attempts to portray an interpersonal problem generated by gender dynamics, that include both social and 'intrinsic' aspects:

I would like to summarize what I would rather deliver in a more lengthy supposition... my view on the male predicament. A tricky word, predicament, no doubt, when seeing the relationships between men and women, one wonders who's predicament is it anyway?

'Predicament' is suspended as a signifier, placed in an ironic context, allowing for a dialogic expression of the gender based perceptions and tensions:

I see both men and women as being in something of a 'bind' in our society; for women, it is society's obstacles; for men, they are the inner.

Though man's conscience will often play a

definite role, admonishing him to tame his pride, and behave appropriately in the modern world, even for such an individual, he is behaving in a way to him that for the most part is adverse.

Ken switches to a 'we' voice when he continues this neo-nativist attempt to delineate his own history of sexual relations:

Formerly, the relationship between men and women was not a problem, for men, but now that we live in a society where new relationships should be established, we are still confronted with the 'old world man', who, if he were to behave himself and act in accordance to the modern wave...be acting in ways that are for him, adverse.

Ken returns to the thematic reference of the hearings and the classroom debate that he consistently disarticulates through his own analysis:

This (male nature) is an issue that is very hard to address, but key, when dealing with the issue of sexual harassment in and outside the workplace, and consequently when looking for the validity of statements from either Thomas or Hill.

This involves an ironic use of 'we' to indicate the class' attempt to arrive at an answer to the issues of 'veracity.' Ken rearticulates the court frame:

When we search for the validity of statements presented in a hearing, it is quite clear that we are looking for justification. Since seeking justification in the inherent and/or developed make-up of a gender is itself a non-solution, I think that we perhaps we need another approach.

Case Study 5

Tyrone and Sally

Tyrone First Draft

Sets personal focus of voice as a way to situate
evaluation of 'facts':

My reaction is that Thomas committed the acts.

Establishes a male positionality:

In my opinion, the tactics described by Hill
that Thomas used seemed to me like the strategies
used by any mens where I am employed.

which indicates a switch in voice to a more objective
and analytic framing of the evidence within an
analogous male gender (personal) context. Building from
the first sentence's subjective stance, an analytic, an
objective framing is marked by the use of
distancing terms such as 'tactics', and 'strategies'
which parlay the previous sense of intentionality
implicated by use of 'acts' in the first sentence.
'that Thomas used' - conviction that Thomas committed
harassment. The evaluative term, 'strategies', is
repeated to continue analogous context. An analogy
which attempts to rearticulate the events (court frame
evidence referent) as ordinary occurrences and

practices amongst men in the everyday work world.

This is further developed in the subsequent utterances:

Clarence Thomas was employing the 'wear the woman down tactic.'

This 'tactic' is defined as one form of a genre of male activity and relation toward women. It is a tactic in addressing women that:

a great many men think is effective.

Tyrone, in effect, analyzes male intentions and forms of communication directed to women with the explicit purpose of asking and demanding sexual favors, and, in doing so, he disarticulates these male practices.

Author simultaneously articulates Hill's description in terms of the application of this 'tactic' to make her submit to his sexual advances and pressure:

This is what Thomas had in mind.

Here the author attributes an internal state and character evaluation that is sustained in his general portrayal of Thomas as schemer, deliberately applying a strategy and tactic, 'wearing the woman down' (within

the male repertoire) to force her submission to his sexual pursuit.

Tyrone's first draft establishes and maintains a court frame with gender marking analogy and articulation strategies comprising an overall rearticulation strategy across texts. Rearticulation governs the first draft structure and motivation. He redefines and naturalizes the 'evidence' by using an interpretive stance that brings the context (through the use of analogy) into familiar, acceptable terms.

Sally First draft

Author positions herself explicitly in a gendered voice using 'women', 'we', and 'our' consistently:

We are accustomed to having men write our stories, using their language and creating their picture of us.

She establishes a gender voiced social landscape and prepares for first person evaluative 'I' voice to emerge from prior situating in gendered voice and its history of being supplanted by male retellings:

I believe some harassment took place.

Author takes the position that women's accounts are constantly being disregarded. She characterizes Hill, stating that even though she is 'highly educated', as a woman she is not

immune from the fear and shame to come forward and tell her story.

building of first two sentences about women's stories not being told or believed and their usually being recast by male versions.

Anita Hill, by this account, is similar to less

educated women, i.e., fearful of telling her story:

men tend to put great emphasis on their sexual energy', which is 'tolerated' by society, and which 'distorts reality.

The author is claiming and disarticulating a double standard that allows men to tell other stories than women and that they are both believed and accepted. These involve men's persistence in pursuing women despite their resistance and create conditions of inequality, and fear at workplaces. The author claims that telling stories of harassment rarely occurs because women are afraid to further antagonize already biased male employers.

Sally states that Hill told her story anyway, but only after being prodded to do so. She depicts this as significant as a character trait:

This is a sign of her education and prudence.

Sally's assessment is one that recognizes explicit differences in gender voices. Her focus on the double meaning implicit in the word 'story' carries the ironic weight of double-voicedness and her own disarticulation of male privilege succinctly.

Peer Session

Begins with accord and restatements of positions in letters both agree that Thomas must be lying. Both agree that Thomas might not even think that he's lying because it is so much a part of ingrained male behavior that is natural and essential to them. Sally's claim that it is a 'normal tendency' of men is supported by Tyrone's evaluation:

Men do it so often they begin to think it's normal.

which serves as a restatement (articulation) of Sally's as well as of his placement of harassment in his first draft as merely a 'tactic' or 'strategy' like 'wearing the woman down' that rearticulated harassment charges into a natural (non-criminal) activity of men. Tyrone continues by saying they (men) don't think

they've done anything wrong. that could have been what he was doing when he was testifying against the charges.

and Sally picks this up and injects a race marked comment about men being accustomed to acting in these ways:

Men in general- or maybe you can say black men as opposed to white men.

Tyrone rejects race marking in relation to harassment:

I think it happens across races.
rearticulating Sally's race comment but turns instead to issue of public airing of 'dirty laundry', an issue he didn't mention in his first draft and that appears in his second draft.

Sally agrees with this concern and continues by voicing concerns expressed in her first draft but giving a racial coding to what she said about women's stories not being told or believed:

you know how blacks is little believed', and that the hearings should have been held in another place to give a different picture.

Tyrone supports Sally and goes on to mention the problem of the image of African-Americans, 'advance the race'. Sally questions what would have happened if races were reversed.

Tyrone says that this never happens, that whites are never exposed in the same way, that there has never been a harassment case of this kind given this publicity.

Sally is convinced it is racial- that the issue should not have come out of the black community:

It's a black issue-we should support Anita Hill
and go on.

Tyrone agrees, goes on to social landscape discussion
of the impact of the hearings. Sally moves back to a
'we= women voice and Tyrone switches to talking about
men's feelings, implicitly countering and complementing
Sally's gender marked voice and then discusses male
sentiments, fears, how men talk and need to control.
Sally picks up on Tyrone and rearticulates male
perspective, distinguishing between men's perception of
women as objects to one in which women are objects for
men to exercise their need to control.

Tyrone rearticulates Sally's appropriation of
male perspective by using the generic term 'power play'
in terms of male behavior. Sally reverses roles again-
questioning what would have occurred if Hill was
Thomas' superior.

Tape ends with brief discussion of public images
of women in terms of sexual aggressiveness and whether
it would have been an issue if she was harassed by him
as his employer. Sally seems concerned with
representation and the telling of stories. Her focus is
on image, whether individual or group, in terms of

women in general, black women in particular or in terms of racial representation in a white male dominated society.

Tyrone Revised Draft

Second draft focuses and strengthens evaluative positions. This is evident in some minor rephrasing. Author changes 'committed the acts' in first to 'committed the sexual harassment'. Alters mention of male genre of behavior of first draft:

these strategies are things that are discussed freely among men sitting around or while work is in operation.

to:

Besides the act that took place between Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill, a major concern among African-American people were the effects such an airing out of 'dirty laundry' in public will have on our progression as a race in this society.

which is explicit in its male (gender) marking and race marking, Evidence is presumed and recontextualized within larger frame of race relations, including the intragroup reference made to 'dirty laundry,' which is rearticulated clearly when he writes:

the point being that race should have come first.

This is a clear rearticulation of both Sally's concerns and of the purported purpose of the hearings. Despite gender relations as depicted and specific to this case, the author takes the race marked position that they should not have been made public and could have been handled privately. It also constitutes the vector relationship she perceives between race and gender. Author then qualifies this evaluation, an articulation of Sally:

Although it is hard to put down what happened to Anita Hill, after all she is a human being and no one should be subjected to any foul behavior.

Case Study: 6
Maude/Vera

Maude First draft

Author utilizes character evaluations in support of
court frame reference using interpretations of
testimony:

I am still of the opinion that Anita Hill was
telling the truth.

She cites specific details on specific occasions.
In rearticulating her interpretation of the hearings,
the author draws upon prestige themes as well as
attributions of internal psychological states:

I can't see how anyone, especially in her
position of prestige, would come out in front of
the world and make such an allegation.

You would have to be crazy.

She never told anyone because she was afraid to
lose her job or to demeaned in some way.

She clearly disarticulates statements by Thomas:

Thomas is just plain unbelievable under the
facade that he didn't know what he possibly could
have done, and if there was anything that he might
have said-it had to be misconstrued by Hill.

This includes use of free indirect speech strategies:

This tells me comments said by him are just him saying 'Oh, she didn't know what I meant', making it look like she took it the wrong way.

For example, a comment on her appearance meant according to him you look nice today, not 'I want to sleep with you.'

Maude uses a rearticulation strategy to position her interpretation of events:

I can understand that to a point. However, I do feel she was wrong in this one area. She should have told someone.

The outcome of the case really saddened and angered me. I truly believe it should been the opposite verdict.

Vera First Draft

Author begins by using a context creating statement to define her point of view and position:

After viewing and listening to the taped Senate Hearings, I was compelled' to share my [observations] as a student of psychology.

Vera rearticulates and recontextualizes the hearings within a social landscape frame:

whether of not either Hill or Thomas was being truthful or lying is not discernible by me, and for that matter, is not important to the larger issue : sex harassment on the job.

Vera uses an analytic and objective voice to enumerate factors:

which do not make sex harassment prohibitive.
including "differential treatment of gender and differential treatment of employees." This objective voice is sustained in a series of character evaluations in which she attributes definite internal states to Anita Hill:

It would appear that Hill felt powerless as a woman and as an employee.

I emphasize the word powerless as a reflection of her desire for power.

She felt further 'trapped' in her position as a victim' because of fear of jeopardizing her career.

Maude's rearticulation centers on differences in testimony, reflecting an interpersonal miscommunication which she claims:

is not unusual. It is the result of a conflict in communication between Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas.

Had Hill felt able to communicate the events would not have continued.

Maude actively revoices Thomas' position, but is focusing on a rearticulation of Hill's position rather than stylizing her argument on Thomas's testimony:

Thomas describes his role in the working relationship as no less than 'supportive, helpful and respectful' of Hill's goals. He emphasizes his contempt for such misconduct.

Thomas' position of denial remains watertight - no communication to Hill is doing no harm to her - and so the burden remains on her.

This draft manifests a general rearticulation strategy. The author's orientation is toward the creation of a different context into which the issues are framed. In this case, the writer redirects attention toward the discourse of interpersonal communication. She neither affirms or denies allegations, nor does she focus on

evidence. Rearticulation is evident in the use of statements without a marked difference in enunciation.

Peer Session

After Vera asks Maude about who may be telling the truth or lying in this case, Maude says 'that's a good one' and Vera articulates her own first draft position:

I really don't know who is lying or telling the truth. Because I'm not good at that anyway. Could never sit on a jury.

and uses her own letter:

In my letter I'm saying that it really doesn't matter who, whether they are or not but the issue that they are involved in. That's what concerns me.

Vera thinks that Maude gave good reasons for taking a position in terms of her court frame arguments and Maude appreciates Vera's reticence, saying that:

I could understand the real need for that, having a real hard time deciding whether or not who's telling the truth. How do we really know? But it's hard. And I could agree with you on that.

and switches to an court frame and evidence based position:

but if I had to pick someone I guess I would say that Thomas looked more like a liar than she did.

Vera agrees and for the first time disarticulates some of Thomas' language, including:

and just some of the statements he came out with too. Like 'if I did do something, I'm so sorry'. I can't imagine what he's saying. Yeah that stuff he said.

Vera and Maude decide they can't really decide even though they do agree and acknowledge their trusting Hill's testimony over that of Thomas. They move on to the second question they used concerning the possible impact of the hearings. Vera states that the hearings already have had an impact as is evident in classroom discussion and general awareness and willingness to discuss it. Maude switches discussion to issue of whether original dialogue may have been taken out of context. She uses personal experience to explain what may have happened in this case. She brings up the theme of a possible 'communication breakdown' between the protagonists, an issue that appears in both of Vera's letters. Vera agrees saying that :

as I was saying it could have started off so innocently, like 'you look so nice this morning' or 'your hair looks nice.'

Vera uses imaginary dialogue to situate her

rearticulating and recontextualizing strategy. Issue of role changes arises. Vera believes that it is a question of power roles, that:

people in high positions are at least more aware even if they don't change their behavior.

When Maude questions this, Vera modifies her position:

You're probably right. It's probably the victims that are more aware now.

Discussion moves to analysis of the actual language of their individual letters. They find agreement in their concern that Hill saw her career in jeopardy, but do not find any criticisms of their writing at this point. At the end of the tape they discuss whether or not their letters should or shouldn't have a personal voice. At this point they move to the question of the effectiveness of their letters. Vera agrees with Maude that it is easier to critique her own letter than Maude's because

I know what I wanted to say and I haven't really said it clearly yet.

Vera then finds a part of Maude's letter that she thinks could be altered in order to be more effective:

Okay, in the end of yours you say that you think that the outcome really saddened and angered you.

And that you think that it should have been the opposite verdict. That might be stronger maybe if you expressed, if you cited an example of, if it were reversed.

She also questions:

What would be the impact of both verdicts...if it went the other way...That would strengthen it, just to give an example, something.

Maude accepts the criticism indirectly by confiding to Vera that her position in her letter reflected her experience:

well, actually, I may as well as say that a personal aspect of my life comes into this part down here.. like maybe a majority of women in the workplace, I too experienced sexual harassment and so, I guess that's why it made me angry.

Maude proceeds to point out that in her case, as opposed to the case of Thomas and Hill, an offender 'did not get away with it'. Maude states that the difference between herself and Anita Hill was one characterized by what she considers to be:

difference in positions and situations.

In her own case it was a matter of rank and risk:

I was just a secretary. I had nothing to lose so if I lost that job, who cares?

Vera picks up on the issue of power and position, adding an interpretation of Thomas' thinking:

yeah, I think that really is an issue when your subject to power, when you are in a more powerful position.

She says that Clarence Thomas was untouchable because of the position he held:

who was there over him?

She also makes the claim that he 'must have felt that nobody could touch him.'

Maude continues on a personal identification register, first by wondering what she would have done had she been in Anita Hill's position, and then by saying:

I guess that she realized that, felt that way anyway.

in response to Vera's statement about Thomas feeling immune to criticism.

Vera changes theme to communication which appeared in her first draft:

Right, whether he did or not. Again there was no communication between the two.

in response to Maude's personalized, internal state interpretation of events. Conversation returns to impact and influence of letters on potential readers.

Vera compliments Maude's writing saying:

Well about the language. What I like about yours, I like the way yours sounds like you are a real

person. It's very personal. Of course, I think mine is cold.

Maude says that Vera's letter is "more like a draft" and Vera agrees, commenting on her own writing process:

Mine is more like a draft. I haven't put anything much personal in it. A lot of loose words connected to other words. I think I was..it took me so long to try to put my thoughts together and I was just abbreviating them.

They then move on to find two point of agreement in the writing, one of which they already identified earlier.

Vera returns to communication theme:

That's something I wonder about. I wish she would have said something.

after Maude points out the part of Vera's letter where she speculates what, if anything, might have occurred had Hill spoken out. Two separate character evaluations ensue in questioning the motivations of Hill for remaining silent. Vera says:

especially somebody who went from a farmgirl to that position.

and Maude's comment that

such a strong minded woman, you know it just doesn't seem right.

Vera explains the social landscape of her first draft:

It is interesting. I guess in my letter, I could have gone on and on about that, and that's why I think I tried to steer clear of that and just, my point was the effects of the trial.

Maude remains within the court frame, using a disarticulating strategy using some of Thomas' actual testimony language, and what she perceives to be his falsity and hypocrisy:

It's really remarkable to me that he can say something like this 'Mr. Chairman, I am a victim of this process. My name has been harmed, my integrity has been harmed, my character has been harmed.'

Vera describes Thomas' language as

the preacher's mode, where you repeat something over and over again with a different ending.

Vera is able to objectify and contextualize the language of the hearings. Maude offers more quotation:

There is nothing this committee, this body, or this country can do to give me back my good name.

Both agree that Clarence Thomas is putting on the act and using the language of a victim. Maude wonders how he can say these things if he is not one. A few character evaluations follow, including the pressure to retain a powerful job, and moving to a position of even greater prestige.

The issue of language use and misuse returns when

Maude, still maintaining her personal identification approach, says:

just some of those things that she said. Pretty disgusting things. I can't imagine her making them up.

Vera responds by recontextualizing again into a wider social perspective referential frame:

Now, I believe, I agree with those things. He's sick. But I think it's a question of how they were said, when.

Conversation proceeds in terms of language and the context in which it was used and the possibility of its misconstrual. Yet both agree that it was inappropriate at best "even if it was taken out of context". Vera quotes Thomas' statement 'if I had done anything' that Hill might have misconstrued.' Maude answers Vera's question whether Thomas was apologizing when he made that statement and Vera disarticulates it by saying:

So that's how he's sort of covering that. He doesn't remember his saying those things. By saying this he's making light of, 'well, you know, it's such a trivial thing, I don't have to remember but if I did, I'm sorry.

Discussion returns once more to veracity and falsity of a court referent frame. Vera keeps to her social

landscape perspective, centering on communication, when she says:

I won't say I really believe them in telling the truth but it's their interpretations of what may have happened.

Maude maintains a closely identified personalized voice, focalizing through a woman's point of view:

Yeah, but for it go on for so long. I can see maybe in the beginning, 'lets stop this joking around, it's offending me'...and all of a sudden one day she felt 'why do I have to put up with all that.

Discussion of what constitutes sexual harassment follows. Utterances situating motivations based on an imputed personal relationship in which 'some people are saying she was jilted', and how what drives 'people when their passions are involved', follow.

Peer discussion ends with mutual critique. At first Vera thinks that Maude should change the line "you must be crazy" in her first draft because it doesn't sound real appropriate but changes her mind saying that it

does make it a personal letter. It makes it a human being writing this letter. It's not an English composition.

Maude defends her sentence saying:

It's just the next thought that came to me. I know it's not the smartest sentence. But it was

the thought.

She paraphrases herself saying: 'you have to be out of your mind.' They then agree Maude should retain the sentence.

The last utterances concern whether they influenced each other. Maude asks:

Do you think that I changed your opinion at all?

Vera replies:

You made me reflect more on the ... what I was really avoiding was whether the subjects were lying or telling the truth. So I might, yeah, when I'm rewriting that I might put more of that into it. I don't know we'll have to see.

Maude says that they had some disagreements on what really happened and that Vera helped her think about it more. She literally has the last word:

only God knows what really happened. Yeah. God will be the judge.

Maude

Revised Draft

Changes character evaluation statement from first draft, 'you must be crazy', that was questioned by Vera in the peer session and that they both subsequently agreed should be retained for its directness and impact and replaces it with a more objective evaluation:

Obviously something had to have happened for her to be so upset that she felt the world had to know.

Citing specific details and specific occasions in what I perceived to be an honest manner gives more evidence of the believability of her case.

Rearticulation and disarticulation strategies used in the first draft are employed again with a sharper positioned focus:

The only 'place' that she went wrong in was that she should have told someone. The more people the better.

I find it difficult to believe that someone in such a prestigious position would stand up in front of the whole world and make such an allegation.

I felt that Thomas was simply hiding behind the facade that he didn't know what could have possibly done, and if there was anything that he might have said, it had be to be misconstrued by Anita Hill.

Maude deletes her use of free indirect speech strategy

in sustaining more of the business register she expressed concern for in the peer session. Maude adds a summarizing rearticulation:

The outcome of this case surely will not be instrumental in having other women come forth in similar situations and that is what saddens me.

Vera Revised Draft

Minor lexical and grammatical changes are evident throughout draft. In the first paragraph, the context creating statement is altered:. 'compelled' remains, but 'viewing' drops out while 'listening remains. 'As a student', a qualifier, is also deleted.

'Observations', bracketed in the first draft, reappears unbracketed. Maude adds a new sentence in her gesture to recontextualize and rearticulate the issues in a broader social landscape reference:

for arguments' sake, I will assume Hill is the truthful party.

Objective tone of first draft retained, but author elaborates on evaluation used in first draft in support of general rearticulation strategy being utilized: 'differential treatment of gender and differential

treatment of employees' of first draft
changes to:

the first is obviously the existence of gender
bias-the belief that one sex is superior to the
other.

The author elaborates further on this theme with new
statements that:

The other major condition is the hierarchical
employer- employee bias.

It seems that AH seems to have been a victim of
both biases.

Internal state attributions of first draft argument
regarding Anita Hill's purported powerlessness
reorganized from first paragraph, rearticulate a gender
prestige vector within the context of developing the
theme of double victimization:

Because of Hill's position as both a woman
(inferior to man) and an employee (inferior to
'boss'), she felt powerless.

She felt further trapped in her position because
of her tremendous motivation to attain her career
goals. A woman in a 'lower' position might not
feel that her employer had such significant
control over her future career.

Author makes a minor change from first draft except
'however is added after "Thomas' position of denial,"
adding:

with his "apology" for anything that he may have misunderstood. (underlined).

Author also changes second clause from 'and so the burden again remains on her' to:

Placing the burden of "error" once again on her.

A new elaboration on the social landscape theme of sexual harassment in the public world of work appears:

The hearings have, at least, brought the issue of sexual harassment to the attention of more of the general public.

At most, victims will be more likely to take action, and offenders will have thoughts about their actions before they follow through.

Adds "Sincerely, Vera" which was not signed in first.

Strong rearticulation strategies- use of quotes of key terms like "apology", "error" and reenvoicement of Thomas' rebuttal at the hearings.

Case Study: 7

Molly/Hazel

Molly First Draft

Molly begins by marking her text clearly in a race positioned speech genre:

I find generally speaking the whole episode reflects and exaggerates situations as they exist within the African-American community.

Molly's sustains this strong race marked disarticulating position throughout her text:

To me it is like a weapon used against them because I do not think this issue would have reached such heights or been given such publicity had it involved people of another race.

The author also establishes a class/prestige marked disarticulating position:

Also I find myself questioning whether it would have received the same emphasis had it involved people of lesser calibre. As I see it, these are factors which reinforce the inequality of society.

She zeroes in on the aspect of how Anita Hill had to:

say to the whole world where she came from ... generally publicize her situation, whereas Thomas never had to do that.

reflecting a gender double standard.

Character evaluation is utilized in which author takes his point of view through imagined inner speech:

'I helped her and now she's turning on me.'

Author paraphrases Thomas:

In his response he says, which seems quite casual to me in opposition to how she is forced to come across: 'I am very sorry and I wish I had known.'

serves to disarticulate Thomas' role, using a parodic statement, in building a gendered position:

According to him, God has gotten me through and He is my Judge. To me this is a play on language in his quest to portray himself as an upholder of all good things.

Statement of gendered position is explicit at end of the letter:

I am obviously approaching this from a woman's point of view and this to me is just another perpetration of the injustices suffered by women-the Other in this society.

A striking social landscape frame of gender relations, including focalizations, established. Molly utilizes a disarticulating strategy to give voice to a perspective of a woman critical of male privilege and power.

Author also uses here an intertextual reference to Simone de Beauvoir's 'Second Sex' read in class through

the signifier 'Other', through which she articulates a collective 'we' voice constituted by a gender position disarticulation of patriarchal relations.

Second draft merely edits this first draft.

Hazel First draft

Gender and power issues emerge clearly in this letter:

Men are given certain privileges which don't pertain to women and it was very clear in Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas case.

As a woman, I tip my hat to Anita Hill. She voiced her sexual harassment experience to the world, and she said loud and clear 'you, Clarence Thomas should not get away with such behavior.

Raises issue of difference in credibility criteria between them, positioning herself through use of disarticulating and parodic statements:

Yet why did Ms. Hill have to explain her personal background round to the world as if she were a criminal who was caught committing an evil act? Did Sir Thomas explain his history? No!

Parodic use of 'Sir Thomas' is continued throughout this letter and author disarticulates Thomas' claims and inferences. Gender/power evaluation position is

evaluated through figure of victimization by male

'wolves':

Once again our society will stereotype a woman who has accomplished as much as Ms. Hill. The victim must explain why she's been victimized. Thank God for a woman like Ms. Hill who held her own amongst the wolves who are in power?

Revised draft an edited version of the first.

Peer Session

Hazel starts the dialogue by questioning what she construes as evidence within a disputed topic framework of testimony that at first appears to be developing an interpretation within a court frame reference:

Do I think that the Anita Hill situation was real? Yes I do. Do I think she was lying? I don't think anyone will ever really know because only them two will know. I mean what she told us and what he told us could be true or not, I don't know but I have questions, you know, whether he did say some of things, the pubic hair on the coke, I don't know. I just find it like hard to believe that someone in his position would stoop...that's tacky. That's tacky, I mean, maybe phrased differently but to say pubic hair on a coke, I don't know much about that. I don't know the degree of the sexual harassment, put it that way. I don't know. And then I also wonder why did she wait until now to bring it up. I mean a lot of people say that the FBI approach her and they said that she really didn't think that it was going to come to this...that could have been true, but I don't know.

Hazel questions Hill's motives and appears to be disarticulating her accusations. At the same time, she appeals to the prestige and authority of Thomas, using a question to disarticulate Hill in asking why would someone in his position 'stoop' to commit these kinds of acts. A topic boundary is evident in a quick switch anticipating a larger question of gender relations:

Wait a minute. I think that the hearings have had an impact on future gender relations on America, I believe it really has made, not a difference, but I would say that men are more standoffish. Am I using the right word or so? I mean they're more cautious because after this, the scandal, and then again it all depends also on at what level. Because if you're dealing with someone, let's say at a low paying job, who really needs her job, who has, let's say, maybe six children, no husband to take care of all her kids...her boss may feel 'who the hell is going to listen to her' and she may tolerate it and not say anything because she needs the job whereas Anita Hill, she's an educated woman. She could scream at the top of her lungs and she would be hired anywhere. So you see it's really made a change in America to some degree probably, yes, maybe at higher levels where women are.

An articulation of the change in gender relations is qualified by her sense that whatever impact the hearing may have will be limited by prestige and power issues in the workplace. Molly indicates this by using the phrase 'it all depends on what level' and referring to

Hill as an 'educated woman'. Distinction in women based on prestige, and, implicitly, on class, is marked here. Hazel articulates Molly's utterances, asking whether or not women in more prestigious positions aren't "apt to be strong women?" She focalizes on Hill's internal state, while accepting the important distinction between women of different professional levels established by Molly:

She had nothing to gain. What did she have to gain by doing this? If she was a poor person or someone who didn't have. She would have been getting something out of it. She was a higher professional, a higher affluent person. So all I could say why is she doing it? Also I wanted to find out, you know, I was having a discussion with someone else, and that person, who was a male, wanted to know that, up to him, he did not hear her say that she had gone out to lunch with him. His thing was that when people are working together then it's not good for them to go out together.

Molly responds to the new topic established around work relationships which is a frame of reference from which both peers are able to articulate their positions with regard to the issues of sexual harassment at the workplace and the specific case:

But it depends, platonic of course. Because it's work related but if you're going to go with someone you work with and this person is going to make advances at you and you feel uncomfortable,

then you're talking to me as far as sexual harassment."

Hazel: But why?

Molly: Because if it got sticky, because if you wanted to advance. let's if you're ready...I'm not, what would you say, aggressive. I mean I'm not into that corporate world. I'm not into law, I'm not into medicine. Sometimes people feel they have to kiss, you know, brown nose, okay, sort of to get ahead. I mean, that might be very important to the person so if the person may make an advancement to you or whatever, you might brush it to the side because you're focused on greater and bigger things. And at that point that harassment may not be that great. Your main concern is 'I have to get from point A to point B to C and so on.

Hazel: I would guess...

Molly: He saw that he could play her. So maybe that was part of her character not to be so aggressive. Molly: Right, because even in presenting her speech she didn't seem that aggressive.

Hazel then explains an analogous personal experience that helps to support her position which rests largely on an identification and articulation of Hill's predicament:

Because like for example, I'm not that aggressive. It's funny that we happen to be mentioning this today. I work for the X Home and Hospital. And we work with a lot of doctors and we joke and we kid. And one of the doctors today, I was going to the doctors office and one of the doctors just stood there and looked at me. And I said 'what are you looking at Doctor D?,' because

we joke. And he says, he looks at me up and down. At that point I didn't like the way he looked at me and then he said 'I'm just admiring your natural beauty'. I said 'okay, thank you' and I was...I felt uncomfortable. Okay, first of all. I felt uncomfortable but I shunned it by saying 'thank you very much' looking at him in the eyes, okay, without a smirk, no giggling, no nothing and proceeded to do what I had to do.

I can now sort of like even, I can't even imagine but I have a small idea of maybe, of how maybe Anita might have felt with Clarence Thomas if you have to work side by side. Because you know, the thing about sexual harassment is sometimes it's not so, actions speak louder, greater than words and you don't have to say a damn thing.

Hazel raises the question of race. She asks whether black men appear to have supported Clarence Thomas.

Molly responds saying:

I don't think that doesn't have anything to do with that. I think it's political. You know, it's funny. I never discussed this with any of my black male friends. Never as a matter of fact.

For Hazel, the issue was only focused through women's perspectives, without regard to race:

I discussed it my female friends both black and Spanish but never with the males. They all, of course, said the bastard was guilty.

For Hazel the topic of politics brought up by Molly is an issue but only insofar as it elucidates personal motives, hypocrisy and deceit, as evidenced in other

parallel cases. Hazel's general strategy is a disarticulation of male privilege and denial of women's voices:

Okay, Thomas is a Republican. I don't follow this. The Democrats would be digging up dirt. They might be thinking 'how do we get them? They found this and they will go on it. Because this entire ordeal, I said to myself, 'now you're going to tell me none of those people that were up on the panel, you're going to tell me they don't have skeletons in their closet?' And then of all people John F. Kennedy with the Chappaqua, come on.

Molly agrees and placed the emphasis on the impact of the hearings in providing women a model for speaking out about sexual harassment:

But then you must remember that as a result of that you started to hear of a lot of a lot of cases.

Hazel responds:

Yes, it broke the barriers.

Hazel then switches the thematic reference to the media representation of the both the individuals and the issues:

Okay. And she's an educated woman now. What is that left to be said? The thing about is do you have to be in a political, how would you say, position? Then again you have to think the media thrives on this. What is left to be said for the people who don't have access... the media is not

going to be covering every case that a woman is sexually harassed. What is going to be done for the majority, for the mass majority of women, those who have low paying jobs, that are low income. I mean you get lost.

Molly counters with a larger irony:

We get lost in the system.

Hazel controls the discussion by moving back to the theme of the impact of the hearing discussed earlier:

I mean, yes, men are more aware. It's more like at the tip of the tongue. They're like more conscious now, but I don't know if they're going to stop or not.

She attributes internal states to women's willingness to respond to harassment, eluding a broader social landscape perspective:

There are some women who are just downright passive and really just don't speak up or for some reason, whatever it may be, we all have different make ups.

Hazel's analysis is a disarticulation of the media:

I think that it was taken out of context in the fact that the media made it into a ring, what is it, a Barnum and Bailey circus. For the public to see that. That was taken out of context because... I resented the fact that we saw.

Molly responds by articulating a gender position:

...the men, the way that women are debased in society and like you said she was a high society woman and yet she sat through all of this.

Hazel stylizes this utterance through a stark figure:

They stripped her down like you would strip a fish.

She refers back to the presence of Edward Kennedy in disarticulating the hearings in general and the personal hypocrisy of men on the committee:

Oh. That was horrendous. The nerve of him. I had to remember, I said, 'ma, wasn't he the one that was arrested at that Chappaqua, being that he killed someone?

Molly picks up the earlier and recurring theme of the impact of the hearings:

They're going to listen to him now, though because he's a Supreme Judge Thomas. So that's the message for women. It's like he did something wrong and we're going to put him before the law.

Hazel maintains a character evaluation stance that focalizes through the purported internal psychological state of the protagonists in the case:

Well I personally think that he must gone through a lot of heartache. He must got his family in distress.

Molly responds again by contextualizing the hearings in terms of their impact and effects:

But he got what he wanted. To be Supreme Court justice. And what does she get? Diddily. A couple of articles and couple of interviews at some university. Please.

Hazel picks up the theme of impact:

It's saying that you... it's not encouraging us because you go through all this. I glad that you brought this up, it's like they're saying to a lot of women what's the point of even bothering?

Molly evaluates and sums up her position:

That's where that leaves women.

Hazel disarticulates the hearings by drawing a parallel to the situation women are in as victims of violence, as well as being habitually blamed, for it:

So what does that mean? Going right back to square one? The kind of message it is. You'd think that somebody is going to, especially the victim is going to try but actually it doesn't happen that way. It's no different than when a woman is raped. And she goes to the police. And they look at you and 'you looked for it'.

Case Study: 8
Aaron/Jessica

Aaron First Draft

Author composes an essayist genre text entitled 'Live and Let Live' instead of a letter. He begins by utilizing a parodic, figurative strategy with regard to the concern for the issues, taking an audience sensitive position of studied indifference:

Now that the fire has simmered and the controversy has ended, I am going to play like an Elvis impersonator and bring the dead subject of Thomas and Anita Hill up again. Although I never gave the issue much thought at all, I couldn't help but hear all of the hype and opinions surrounding me all of everyday. So for all those few of you who for some reason may still be slightly interested, here are my opinions.

The author's position is a rearticulation of opinions that claim Thomas to be unqualified. Among these are disarticulations of Hill's testimony:

Judge Thomas may have said some inappropriate things to Hill, but I feel that Anita's testimony was weak and unconvincing.

I know what she had to say was very difficult to do in front of the Nation, but the judges take shivers, shakes and stuttering into account when deciding a case.

With reference to testimony and allegations, Aaron's letter maintains this rearticulating strategy by

suspending judgement with regard to both his innocence and his qualifications:

The simple fact is that nobody but Anita and Thomas know whether these allegations are true or not. There were no witnesses on either side. So since a person is innocent until proven guilty, the sexual harassment issue bears no reason as to why Thomas should not have been reappointed to the high seat.

This strategy serves his central theme. The author construes a position that rearticulates the issues not only from allegations to qualifications, but toward personal accountability of individuals in society in general:

Whether he is qualified or not is the most important issue concerning Thomas, and none of us know whether he is or not. We'll just have to wait and let time tell if he's qualified or not. In the mean time, why don't we leave Judge Thomas alone and concentrate on ourselves?

While Aaron disarticulates aspects of Thomas' alleged views, he positions himself through this concern on individuality and striving for the realization of goals. In doing this, his focalization through a plural 'we' voice, is an indexing of African American community's potential and responsibility for its own economic and social advance, implicitly

disarticulating identifications of African Americans
with Thomas:

I believe a lot of people were very upset about Thomas' appointment for no valid reason. Yes, Thomas' outlook on human life, particularly African Americans, is warped, but we shouldn't let that interfere with our own ambitions. You can be almost anything you choose to if you try hard enough and Judge Thomas can't do anything about it. I plan on being a computer scientist and a franchise owner, let Thomas try to stop me.

This position is further underscored by a cliché figuration that serves to develop the rearticulation of issues emerging from the hearings on personal and individuals' accountability within the context of a race and power vector:

This is a dog eat dog world and every man for himself. Competing and striving to be the best you can be at whatever you do should be your concern and not Thomas. It's time to stop worrying about our ethics, and start worrying about ourselves and our families. We can't help our races advance no matter what we do, it's impossible. And we'll only stop ourselves as individuals from advancing if we continue to sit around and complain. But if each person could think of advancing on an individual basis that would probably make for a stronger race.

Jessica

First Draft

Author takes a gender position that rearticulates women's right to be believed and to voice their protest against sexual abuse:

I have had a small exposure to the Thomas, Hill hearing, and have found that, as usual, when things like this are aired, the woman is made to feel as if she was the perpetrator rather than the victim.

A laudatory evaluation of Hill's character is made in this overall gender thematized parodizing of the hearings:

Ms. Hill should be applauded and commended for bringing herself into the limelight and fighting for what she believed in. There are many women out there who have put up with harassment and abuse and are afraid to say and point a finger at the individual who is doing this to them.

This evaluation, which situates Hill as a model for women who fear to speak out in their own defense against male dominance, also involves a parallel disarticulation of Thomas within the context of gender relations:

Right now, we women face legislation that will be voted on by this individual who has an obvious flaw in his character and probably in his personality too.

Parodic elements situate the discursive kernel of the

letter in building Jessica's argument:

The Senate Judiciary Committee should have gone out and committed suicide for confirming this man's seat in the Supreme Court without having a thorough and complete investigation on the charges made.

All I can say is if I ever come up into some legal problems and have to defend myself, I would like to have the individual who wrote Thomas's speech for him, write one for me.

These parodic strategies also include the contextualization of race dynamics as a manipulated strategy of the Bush administration. Jessica's parodic voice is directed to the vector of race, power and gender:

But then, of course, looking at the strategy utilized by the White House, we see that 'they' needed a 'token nigger' to sit and agree with whatever bills or legislation will be passed by the higher henchmen in the future, especially where it deals with women and minorities.

Peer Group

Jessica directs the focus of the dialogue by disarticulating Thomas testimony, particularly with regard to his claims about the continuously 'professional' nature of his relationship with Hill over their years of working together:

Like he says out of the years they have been working together, they had been in professional order. And he's saying everything was 'professional' for all that time they were together which is bullshit. It's impossible for two human beings to interact completely professionally the whole time they are working together for however many years.

Aaron rearticulates the word 'professional' and Thomas's positions by claiming:

It's more like him being a victim. If she says this happened she has to prove it. That's why I think they were badgering her more than him. She brought up something.

Jessica disarticulates Thomas' position further by contextualizing his testimony within the framework of the Senate confirmation process:

But right here, he's right away lying. God knows what else he's lying about. The Senate should have put a hold on his confirmation until they realized whether he would be completely accepted and would be completely exonerated from the charges levelled against him and they didn't do that. They just lay down like a pack of fools and just put him in.

Aaron mentions that the process involved a deliberate leak to the public. Jessica uses this comment to position herself in defense of Hill's testimony, building on disarticulating and parodic utterances that recontextualize the hearings within a gender landscape positionality:

Yeah, somebody leaked it out. So it wasn't that she came up with something, 'so wait a minute, this guy, I've got to talk to him.' She told them just what happened. Somebody else let it out. Because then she had to come up and defend herself because that is what she was doing- defending herself. She was giving information about what had transpired between her and Thomas. He wasn't. He was just bullshitting his way through.

Her parodic strategy across the three texts includes a view that incorporates the larger context of political opportunism:

Somebody wrote him a nice speech. He had to look good so they could keep him in that seat. Otherwise they would have to pick somebody else who wouldn't fit into the program from the White House. It's a crock. The whole thing was a crock of shit.

Their dialogue moves to the topic framework of the gender and racial composition of both these hearings and analogous situations. Jessica introduces this topic in stating:

I mean, how men were sitting up there.

Aaron agrees by elaborating:

All of them, it was all men.

After Jessica clarifies that the Senate Confirmation Hearings were actually comprised of "one or two females up there. It was 98 members or something like that",

Aaron brings in another case that broadens the theme:

You look at just the way you'd look at the Rodney King thing. All white- except one Oriental and one Puerto Rican. How are they going to vote when you have all the other white people?

to which Jessica adds:

Right. They had already made their little decisions.

Aaron switches the focus somewhat by analyzing the motives of the Senators during the process. He disarticulates Hill's testimony in the context of a larger strategy of rearticulating the intentions and processes that drove the Senators to make their decisions in confirming Thomas:

It just seems like there being such strong allegations against a man with such honor and promise, that they are going to bash her even though whoever leaked it out- they'll make it look like they don't want nobody up there that is going to be a sexual harasser.

This rearticulation includes imaginary internal dialogue:

Since you alleged that he did this, we're going to have to be hardcore.' You know hardcore on the witness, and that's what she's considered, a witness. To make sure she's telling the truth. She's just too shaky up there. She probably was telling the truth but she was just too shaky.

Aaron has altered his position somewhat in

acknowledging the possibility that Hill's statement were based on facts. Jessica responds through a stylization, or strong reaffirmation, of Hill's position and predicament:

You know, it's like fucking difficult for a person to go up on national TV and put out personal business-you know, that's what it was. She put out her dirty clothes on the line and shit like that in front of millions of people- that was from the capital live. I hardly would have. I would have said something but it wouldn't have come out the way I wanted it to.

Aaron continues on the theme of self presentation, rearticulating testimony in the framework of a somewhat impressionistic reading of the protagonists' images:

They want you to be an actor. Like him, he was more...stable. So he was more convincing. Even though he may have been lying. Whereas she may have been telling the truth but she was shaky. Look how she was stuttering, look how she was shaking. That's how they're going to look at it. That's one way they look at cases- how they vote.

Aaron's concerns are largely focused on court frame testimony. His evaluative strategy is one that rearticulates the issue of qualifications in the context of an undecidable 'verdict':

See the thing about it is proving there in court that he did say those things, not whether it's possible to go through ten years in a working relationship without doing that. You have to prove that he said that. You have to disprove the

allegations. And she couldn't do it.

Neither one had witnesses. So it's word against his.

Both partners agree on the manipulation of events that serve the interests of those in power. Jessica, after mentioning that there had been witnesses that were rejected due to 'rules of evidence', disarticulates this most explicitly in stating:

What kind of shit was that? Justice? Justice for them. It's what they want to do with it. It's like incredible- the more I look the more shocked I am they get away with so much crap. And who gets hurt in the end? The little ones, us little bitty humans never hurt a soul, trying to make a living and surviving in this world, you know, who gets hurt. They don't get hurt. They already got theirs.

Aaron agrees saying:

Yeah, they always do. You know that's how it is with public institutions. They stick together.

Aaron refers to his first draft:

That's why I wrote my letter the way I did. You can't worry about why he did or didn't get appointed.

Jessica rejects Aaron's position, placing and rearticulating it within a larger social landscape perspective, one that shifts the topic to politics again:

But you have to. Because he has a big impact on our everyday life. The Supreme Court is what, seven, eight? But he still sees the majority of them are Republicans. I think with him included now, they are going to go for conservative voting. It's a stronger vote.

Aaron retains the indifferent position of his first draft:

But what's the difference between now and before?

Jessica responds, using parodic and figurative strategies, continuing her placing Thomas' selection and appointment in the context of a broad political agenda:

Because it's a stronger line. A stronger defense against minorities. Whatever becomes- see, this is a lifetime situation. He is going to be a Supreme Court judge until he drops dead. When the president wants something done, he's going to shove it down the line. If Bush gets reelected again, he's going to kiss his ass. He's going to be up that white man's ass like wine on rice. Because he gave him that position. He gave it to him so that's one more vote for sure vote he got there.

Aaron questions Jessica's overall perspective, asking:

So you think we're all doomed?

Jessica thinks this is the case, particularly in light of the possible upcoming Supreme Court rehearing of the constitutionality of abortion rights:

We're fucked. I think so because when she gets in there he's going to be cautious because the spotlight is going to be on his ass especially with the Roe vs. Wade thing.

Aaron and Jessica debate the influence of the Supreme Court on everyday life with Aaron claiming that the court's influence is minimal and Jessica claiming its centrality, especially in the lives of women. Aaron believes that it doesn't have a 'lot of swing' and that the justices won't really 'go into the red as people' and Jessica stating:

They have a lot of effect. And a lot of people who are against this Thomas thing because they knew he was a conservative voter. That means a woman has no choice whether she wants to have an abortion or not. She has no choice. It's the law's right to tell her whether she can have an abortion. And he's going to be one of the deciding factors. He's going to vote against it.

This leads to the topic of abortion as a moral issue. For Aaron, it is unclear, yet he revoices anti-abortion views:

That's such a controversial issue. I wouldn't even know how to vote on it myself. A lot of people look at it like you're murdering a human.

Jessica rearticulates the issue of abortion as murder:

Yeah, you might be murdering a human. But if you go through your nine months, right, and you know you don't have a job, you know you're probably going to end up on welfare or something, or maybe

you can't go on welfare, what's going to happen to that kid?

While Aaron accepts this as a real problem he wants to place responsibility on the adults deciding whether or not to have children in the first place:

But you have to think about that even before you have intercourse. They're only thinking after they have a kid.

Jessica focuses on the child:

No they're not going to have a problem. The kid is the one who is going to have a problem. That's the one that's going to suffer in the long run. So why even bring him out to begin with? And have a suffering human being that will probably turn out to be a drug addict or a thief, a killer or something when you can prevent that right then and there?

Aaron is uncertain and equivocates his position:

I don't know. But like you say it's so controversial. I don't think that I'd want to have an impact on life itself. I don't think that the decision is going to have too much of an impact on a male.

Jessica uses this as a way to state a rearticulating summary:

No, it's not. It's the female issue. That's what we're fighting against. Because that's what it all boils down to.

The dialogue moves to an analysis of the political climate in America. Jessica maintains a critical view:

We're going back to racial strife again. It's like the old Republic again. The way it used to be in the slave days.

Aaron disagrees, claiming:

We got big people of moral stature. I don't think it's going to happen. Like Duke. How many Dukes are there. Most people, I think, are going to have to go with the flow.

Picking up on Aaron's reference to David Duke, Jessica wants to disarticulate the government's claims to be fair, focusing on its duplicity in its prosecution of human rights cases in general, and of the plight of African Americans as objects of race crimes, in particular:

That's one of the things that's controversial too because we have a knack for surviving. They are big. The Nazi movement is coming back. And don't you think the government knows all about it? Do you think they're breaking them down? Fuck no!

Aaron claims the government can't outlaw movements of this kind but that they exist underground and undercover:

Okay, it's the law that you can't discriminate, you can't murder black people, It's only going to go so far. That's why they have to go underground.

Jessica parodies both the government and Aaron's prior positions:

Yeah, but so is hell. That's what you got to think about. They can't make a law out of it. But they condone it. Because the law is a funny thing- it can defend you and can work totally against you. If you go up and shoot somebody because he shoots you got to walk around with a crippled leg.

Aaron rearticulates this position, restating his own first draft position on individuals:

That's a totally different issue. That's us against the law. I don't think we have nothing to worry about as individuals. Maybe as a race but I don't concern myself with the race.

Jessica Revised Draft

Edited version of the first draft. Jessica adds a new final paragraph that uses a familiar, audience directed register:

Ms. Hill, I believe you and I wish you every success in your future. I have been in your situation and I fully understand how you feel. Stay strong.

Jessica's parodic strategies serve to frame her support and identification with a woman who gives voice to other women like herself who have faced similar situations.

Aaron Revised Draft

Aaron's revised draft is entirely reorganized. He employs an audience sensitive letter genre rather than the essayist genre of his first draft 'Live and Let Live'. Aaron begins his letter with an appeal to audience, articulating a position that speaks in the name of human rights:

Dear Congressman:

Please help me denounce the appointment of Judge Thomas. His victory in the trial is not only a big downfall for women and minority rights, but for human rights as well.

Aaron structures this draft around disarticulations of Thomas, that appear as stylizations, in part, of positions taken by Jessica during the peer session. Aaron's disarticulations focus on Thomas' qualifications:

His experience is highly questionable by those who know of him and followed up on his career.

And because he has dumb witted views like the President's, for what social justice should be like, and proof in the package, he was appointed.

The theme of race is positioned as well as a disarticulation of his selection because he is black:

But because he is black, that would silence Black Americans from screaming racism in filling Marshall's shoes.

This disarticulation is reflective of a larger contextualization of the issues in a political analysis that incorporates the administration that selected Thomas:

The cards couldn't have fallen better for Bush. So why is he disowning David Duke as a Republican candidate? Bush wants to do the same things as Duke, but in a discrete manner.

An articulation of an appeal to human rights is repeated that focuses through a disarticulating reference to a possible future once again on the audience of the Congressional representative:

If you, like myself, want to see America change and move in the upward direction, then please include this letter in your strongest considerations and utmost priorities. Take a firm stand for our country against Nazi rulers and environment. Thank you for your valuable time.

Case Study 9

Louis/Sylvester

Louis First Draft

Louis articulates support for the appointment and
confirmation of Thomas:

Confirmation of Supreme Court nominee Thomas is
whole heartedly supported.

Judge Thomas has character.

First draft focuses primarily on disarticulations of
the hearings in general, and Hill's testimony.

The Senate Confirmation hearings were
unjustified.

To demean and humiliate him in the public eye was
wrong.

No, Mr. Hill should not hurt his tenure.

His court frame argument is supported by character
evaluations which attribute motivations and intent
behind Hill's allegations:

On reflection, Ms. Hill, a court officer may have
miscontrued signs of familiarity on work well
done, to mean affection.

Career wise, Ms. Hill advanced to many
achievements with support by Justice Thomas.

Why after a lapse of ten years, by a court officer sworn to uphold the law, Ms. Hill makes these allegations?

Character evaluations are made for both protagonists, expressive of a stylization strategy:

No man reaching the pinnacle of his career would lie under oath, impugn the reputations of his associate jurists, or place doubt on the Supreme Court.

Judge Thomas married, is entirely content with his family.

No, Mr. Editor, Justice Thomas is qualified, and the rantings of Ms. Hill should hurt his tenure.

Sylvester First Draft

Author situates himself within a court frame reference that is marked by an attributions of character. The draft is framed around a disarticulation of perceived deceit and lying that begins with a gender theme:

Balance between a man and a woman is very far away, going into another century. If a man or woman has to lie in order to achieve in life, it eliminates everything I was brought up to believe in.

The court frame is explicitly articulated, using a plural, jury like voice:

In the case of Thomas and Hill we have to decide who has committed perjury.

Sylvester's letter introduces race marking as part of his disarticulation of testimony. First Thomas' statements are disarticulated:

Mr. Thomas commented that it was high tech lynching. Well why is he so sorry?

Then Hill's motivations are scrutinized:

With Anita Hill, what does she gain out of this? A sense of justice, vengeance, noticeability, what? I believe justice and vengeance.

Peer Session

Louis initiates discussion by challenging the attempts to discredit Thomas' testimony. His is a stylization, actively reenvoicing the claims made by Thomas:

I picked up how people are trying to bullshit him. When I heard that man, Thomas, speaking on that tape that he was not lying. I honestly think that he was telling the truth.

And I wrote it down. Here, see what I wrote: 'I believe that this man would not impugn those eight jurors on the Supreme Court, lie under oath in the public eye.' I don't think he would do that. If anything, a man of lesser character would have resigned and that guilt would have still hung over his head. You understand?

Sylvester agrees with these statements and Louis proceeds to disarticulate Hill's testimony through character evaluations:

Now with this lady, Ms. Anita Hill, what the hell did she wait ten years for? Her motive, I can't understand it. And then, I mean, for ten years, must have irritated the hell out of you.

Louis takes the perspective of Thomas and Sylvester speaks for other men who also identify with Thomas:

That pissed off a lot of men. Everywhere I went, I see a lot of that. But I am saying like they said, I believe that something did happen.

Louis quotes from his letter again, citing his own claim that Hill 'misconstrued' messages for

'affection'. He elaborates by making these additional comments on this theme:

Did you see what I wrote? I put down that "maybe she misconstrued some kind of affection. They had to work together. I mean, her career zoomed up. And she might have thought maybe there would be some marriage or something out of it. I don't know how women think. But I always think sometimes they get off the track and she could have misunderstood a sign of affection.

Sylvester intervenes and rearticulates imputations of Hill's motives as well as Louis's character evaluation:

Or revenge. He might have said something, maybe she took it out of context, probably, and maybe he did say something that she didn't take out of context. She may be avenging for what he sees he did, married a white woman. They going all the way up there and she is all the way down there. Even though she is a professor over there.

Louis accepts Sylvester prior counter and the sentiment among the men he mentions that something did actually occur. Rather than rejecting Hill's testimony and allegations outright, he modifies prior attributions through a rearticulation that admits for a broader context to be broached:

No, I wouldn't dismiss her as a liar. I'm just saying that maybe at that time, at that period of time, ten years ago, things were different. Attitudes were different. Now there is a change going through the nation. Now but at that time

you could say anything you wanted to a woman as a display of affection, maybe even disrespect and it wouldn't have been.

Topic framework moves back to motivations and theme of 'miscontrual'. Sylvester claims that Hill had a lot to lose by coming forward, which Louis questions stating that:

She's a celebrity. Look at the status she's in. Louis responds by situating this case within a framework of other similar cases and their potential impact:

Yeah, that's true, too. But she opened the door for a lot of women. Even though out them are pathological liars, a lot of them, who knows? Like what's going on with Mike Jackson, all that bullshit. What I'm saying is that she has a lot to lose because Judge Thomas denounced his own family.

He uses character evaluations in that support Hill's allegations:

I'm saying is that Anita Hill is a church going woman, Baptist and all her church...don't forget the whole thing that she wouldn't lie even though I'm not too religious...

The nature of evidence and testimony is debated, keeping the session within the court frame. Louis equivocates, generally rearticulating the testimony of

both protagonists:

I'm not saying that she's lying. That's one thing I never said that she lied. I'm not saying that he lied. They just got their wires crossed.

Sylvester responds ironically:

Real crossed. Somebody got their wires.. but you are going on the side of Thomas and I'm going side of Anita Hill.

Louis supports his taking sides by reflecting on his impressions of the presentation and image of the protagonists:

Because I saw the man speak. But when I saw her speak I didn't have that much faith in her words. Honest, because, for one, the thing that kept popping in my head was ten years. Why wait ten years? Now that he was going to get confirmed.

Sylvester reflects on how he changed his mind after first taking the same position as Louis. The discussion remains within a court frame:

I was the same way as you too. I believed Judge Thomas at first. But at later hearings, I started believing- they were talking about these things he did and said and he sent a message- where the hell did she get those things from? Long Dong Silver, ... pubic hair on a coke can, now where did she get that from? That's what I'm trying to get at. How the hell did she get pubic hair on a coke can? I mean you know like a little joke, if I say, 'that man, is somebody shitting me or something like that?. Maybe a piece of somebody's hair from their hair came off. He might have made a joke like 'who put there, a pubic hair?' as a joke.

Understand what I'm saying?

The discussion moves to public issues, including that of abortion and women's rights. Sylvester tries to bring in the larger gender political perspective that may be affected by the hearings:

But think about this. If it is true what he said, true that he meant it, cause the evidence- the Judgement they pass over there when they make the law. Remember your women.

That's why I don't believe nobody should mind their own damned business. True enough there is a life in there. But we got to remember that when Judge Thomas was up Anita Hill said he sexually harassed her- whatever they consider sexual harassment is. Would that have any effect? I believe it would have an effect if he did say something. And I wouldn't mess up with a lying woman out here - especially poor women.

Louis agrees generally, citing his own experience as a father:

OK, I believe a woman's body is sacrosanct. It's hers. She has a right to do whatever she likes with it. But she has one gift that God has given her and that's the ability to procreate. Nobody else in the world, no man in the world can have a baby. The most beautiful thing that I can remember in my life is when I saw my wife give birth to my sons. Because I saw them, my sons. I'm proud of them. That was the greatest gift she could give me. So I say, what the hell, I couldn't say to her that you can't have an abortion. What if it's her life that's in danger? What if she were raped?

Their general agreement or acceptance of women's right to choose is modified by their concern for just what constitutes harassment now in the aftermath of the hearings. Louis says that:

Yeah, but now you have to be careful how you talk to women. I think it goes both ways.

Sylvester also takes this gender perspective, expressive of an ambiguous position in relation to the issue:

Boy, does it go both ways. Because I'm getting confused right now what is sexual harassment? What happens if a woman sexual harasses me? If my butt gets squeezed when I'm down. Hey, you're squeezing my butt! What do I do? What are you going to do? Sexual harassment! What you're doing right now, you're going to laugh. Because nobody is going to believe me. Nobody is going to believe me.

This woman has been squeezing my ass. Especially I be going to a club or there's a fight outside. Shit. If I were younger, I squeeze some booty. But if I was somebody at a higher level - then it didn't happen to me. Put my butt in jail, sue me for about a million goddamn dollars.

Louis reverts to disarticulations of Hill's testimony by reading from this letter again:

I just think they took too long for her to come forward. My letter speaks for itself: " I believe in the man that saw him. I remember from experience the man is telling the truth. I just didn't believe Anita Hill." Maybe she is telling the truth but I just don't believe her. Not the way the he said it- not with the sincerity that he

spoke. Can you understand?

Sylvester changes the topic framework by questioning the process of evidence and testimony, implicitly articulating Louis' prior position:

Can I tell you something? If you told me something right now- you don't think about it- and a week later I said something to the police, would you say if I told you, if I did tell you that, I'm sorry? Would you say that to me? You know you didn't say nothing wrong.

You would say sorry to me? Because I figure if I say something to you right now, and I know I didn't offend you because you haven't said no words, right? I wouldn't say I'm sorry if you come and accuse me of something. That's like what I said in the Thomas letter, why should he apologize for it? If he knows for a fact that he didn't say nothing, why should he apologize? I would never apologize to a man that I know I didn't say nothing to.

Sylvester also rearticulates Thomas' qualifications by placing his participation in other, social landscape contexts of race and family that establish a damaging character evaluation position:

It was aggravating to be told about the sexual harassment until I heard some stuff about affirmative action with Clarence Thomas. He just said forget about his family. He just forgot about them. He didn't care no more.

I used that as my lead into Anita Hill. If he did that to his friends, and he didn't care about affirmative action, he just thought Black people

should get it on their own, which is true, but how the hell did he get up there? By affirmative action. He forgot that. And I based my piece on that, if he don't care about those two, which is more important. The family is more important- because otherwise his ass wouldn't be there. That's what I based mine on.

The peer session ends discussing the issue of the period between the alleged allegations and Hill's coming forward. Louis continues to rearticulate her allegations by a making vague allusions to the different climate that existed, Sylvester focuses on gender and race tensions:

I say 'maybe he did say some things... OK, true Anita Hill did wait ten years- that's a very long time.' You have to be stupid not to come up. Man, the first time I got raped, straight to damn cops...I don't care how degrading it is, I got raped. But I forgot- you got some people that like to, cops like to intimidate the women sometimes. The confusion is too much for me. I get confused, I don't know why I wrote that.

That ten years really threw me too. At first when I first started, I said damn there goes another bitch again. Trying to put down a man. And to make it hurt so much, black. Two black upstart people.

Sylvester's position allows for the articulation of a vector comprised of race, gender and class. Though only expressed in passing at the end of their conversation,

his position is more flexible throughout, contextualizing behavioral attributions by shifting the topic framework, at times, to more social themes than Louis who for the most part remains situated within a court frame dependent on testimony and appearances.

Louis

Revised Draft

In the revision, Louis elaborates and edits primarily. The stylization expressive of his position in support of Thomas are more fully developed. In particular, the character evaluations are qualitatively stronger than in the first draft. Among these are the following:

Mr. Thomas has a great deal of character to have been put through the demeaning, and humiliation in the public eye.

Justice Thomas is the man for the job; is definitely qualified.

Consider the women whose career he has helped advance to her present position. A man whose family supported him.

The second statement is a rearticulation that makes Thomas a benefactor to women as well as a good family man. It displaces the context of allegations and aspersions against him during the hearings. After repeating the statement about Hill's 'rantings' not affecting Thomas' 'tenure', Louis adds a character evaluation statement that retains the internal, static aspect of his court frame texts:

Get serious, what's the motive? Love, hate, or revenge?

Sylvester Revised Draft

Identical with an additional paragraph that strengthens the disarticulation of Hill and may reflect incorporation of aspects of Louis's evaluations during the peer session.

In the final paragraph of the first draft, after ascribing motivations for Hill's allegations, Sylvester adds the following indicating his shift in taking sides within a court frame text:

Yes, Mr. Thomas said some of those things. But that was ten years ago.

In this utterance this is a response to a 'voice' that claimed that women often do wait, if they tell at all, before coming forward with charges of harassment. Sylvester's position, however, is one that situates Hill as motivated by vengeance and claims she was assisted in this pursuit:

I know it doesn't matter how long she took and maybe she didn't realize it then. I believe she waited until Mr. Thomas had gotten into a high position so she could lower the boom on him. With the help from others.

Mr. Thomas commented that it was high tech

lynching. Well is not that the pot calling the kettle black? Here is a man that does not believe in affirmative action and who criticized his sister. I wonder how he became a judge.

He also said he was 'sorry', if he had said anything wrong to her, but to his knowledge he did not. If he did not, then why is he so sorry?

Case Study 10
Celia/Penny

Celia First draft

Positions self in text through context creating
statements:

I am a student. I would like to give my
opinion.

Positioning incorporates race positioned articulations:

I being a black woman can relate to what she may
have been feeling.

which orients the letter to a depiction of internal
psychological states as well as:

The Puritans were casting stones showing
discrimination toward this black man.

I feel him being a black man the Puritans wanted
to find some dirt on him. A lot of people don't
want to see a black person sitting on the Supreme
Court.

Court frame argument as a 'show':

The trial turned into a show. They wanted him to
be guilty. These men and women who were there to
oversee and overhear the testimony were feuding
amongst themselves over who is supposed to talk
and how many questions were asked.

Indexes racial positioning by use of 'we all' and 'you
all', which stands in opposition to the prior use of
'Puritans', an eccentric signifier for both white race
and sexually repressive forces the author considers as

guiding forces in causing the hearings:

We all still can't be sure that he didn't do what was said.

So far as I the viewer is concerned, you all did not accomplish what you all claim to want to accomplish which is to find out the truth if there was any truth to her complaint.

Race positioned articulation ends the text:

All was done I feel now after watching the tapes very carefully was to disgrace, dishonor and discredit the black man.

Intentionality is attributed to unnamed actors working to obstruct the appointment of an African American.

Peer Session

Celia takes a strong position in opposition to Hill's testimony and character. The discussion is focused primarily on issues of black women competing in the job market. Celia expresses her position initially by saying:

I'm against her- that lady. I'm not really against her, I just feel that she's lying. I feel that the senators and the house of representatives and the people that own this scene just suck this shit up came to prove who is telling the truth. If he is guilty he should in no way in hell be sitting on the highest seat in the court.

Penny defined the issues in terms of her interpretation

of Hill's purported motives for making the allegations against Thomas on the basis being based on her personal ambition within the context of race and gender competition:

She's a woman and she's Black. She still has to compete with those kinds of degrees.

Celia chooses to situate herself within a court frame:

That's right. But she had a job, so who was she competing with? After she got out of school, she had a job then she went to the OEE with Clarence Thomas. She had a job, so there's no way you could say she had to compete.

Penny reiterates that Hill was just choosing to 'move up' the social ladder. Celia rearticulates Penny's addressing the issues of race and gender competition in the workplace and Hill's purpose:

That's what she did. And I feel cause he was moving up to the Supreme Court there was no longer room for her, that's when she started all these accusations. Because at the EOEC she was moving up right along with him. When he left for the Supreme Court where the hell is she going to go? She ain't going nowhere.

Celia also articulates perceptions of Hill's character:

She brought it out herself. And now that she said it all these people are looking at her like 'this woman must be a golddigger. She must be something. She must be another, she must have fantasized all this.' So you tell who's going to hire her now?

Penny contextualizes this statement:

That's the same thing they say about people who do rape. He should get away with this and he should... if he's going to be on the firm and everything. Imagine if he was the president. The president of the United States has got to watch everything he does.

This leads to consideration of race as a topic framework when Celia says:

But there has never been a Black president and I don't think there ever will.

Penny, who originally placed Hill's testimony and presentation in terms of race and gender striving, appears to reject a race based interpretation:

Listen it doesn't make a difference if there never will. You can't even think about it on racial terms. Because that's all you're thinking about.

Celia emphatically stresses race positioning:

That's what it is. You're talking about racial terms. Senate and all the House of Representatives and not one African-American person was there, okay? Now you could sit and watch all of them. You could see who was for Clarence Thomas and who was against him.

Penny's position is actually a rearticulation of race and gender issues focused on a concern for expectations within the context of African-American moral standards. This is evident in the analogy she makes:

They didn't like him because of his color. That's right. As a black man he should have known that before he did that to that woman. He should have known that. Just like Mike Tyson. He's a famous boxer. He got a lot of money, right? He should have known better than mess with that little girl and mess up his career like that.

Celia wants to focus on character evaluations within a court frame reference:

Are we talking about Mike Tyson or Anita Hill? In that...Mike Tyson, the girl asked for it. Okay? She should not have put herself in a situation cause I wouldn't have put myself in that situation. So all in that it was a different issue. Clarence Thomas issue is not proven. But she asked for the sex. But Clarence Thomas, man, that girl did not ask for it.

Penny continues in her rearticulation of Thomas' behavior within a broader field of race and gender standards:

Tyson had to pay. But with Clarence Thomas, he was about to move into a chair. He should have thought, okay, every thing you do, every step you take, you have to think the white man is going to bring him down.

I'm not talking about Mike Tyson. I'm talking about Clarence Thomas. Like you said nobody wanted him in this chair because he's Black. He should have thought as a Black person, I'm going to fight to get what I want and have to get.

Penny questions Celia's apparent position that Hill fabricated the allegations:

You think she made this whole thing up? Because

if she liked him? Because, you this would help him to like her if she made this accusations up?

Celia articulates this position by focusing on Thomas' social position and status:

Why would a man of that structure have to go that far with this woman? Like Mike Tyson. He could have gone out there and bought himself some.

Penny picks up Celia's statements to parodize males:

A man is a man. I don't know he could have too. A man is a man and a dog is a dog. He's going to get what he wants. And men don't think when they try to get.

A clarification of positions occurs, with Celia posing her question in terms provided by Penny, and rearticulating Thomas' statements and behavior:

So you say this intelligent Black man told her perverse things because he is a man. Because he is a dog?

Penny presses her gender disarticulation strategy:

Right. A man is a man. You think he's going to stop and think that 'hey I could go and get, I can buy a woman to do this' instead of doing this to a woman in his workplace who is really a professional woman?

Penny uses imaginary reported speech to position her disarticulation of Thomas. These statements clearly mark a prestige and class vector:

Who was she? He thought he could do this because

his mind was on that he had clout. He could do this. 'I'm already in a high position, I'm in a high skilled position. I can go just fucking deny you all I want, fuck her. I'm in the place where I want to be.

Celia challenges Penny's character evaluations, articulating her position in support of Thomas:

Why didn't he retaliate then? You trying to make him out like he's a fucking ogre. You're making out like he's a dog and he's going to go after his no matter what. She looked like a bitch to me. That's what she looked like. She looked real sneaky. Don't go accuse my man of doing something and doing politics, okay? Did he flirt with you too? One other lady came forward.. one other lady.

Discussion moves to the topic of evidence by other women that were rejected and if Hill could have possibly improved her case. After Penny says that other witnesses had offered to come forward but were rejected, including one who had been fired, Celia appears to allow for the possibility of there having been truth to her allegations, but is, in fact continuing to disarticulate Hill's testimony within her court frame discourse because of a lack of corroborating evidence:

Who said that? Anita Hill said that? Who said they wouldn't listen to her? Did the senators and the house of representatives say.. if that woman

had talked it would have stood a better chance. It would have been two people saying the same thing. And I figure a lawyer of this structure, she's a Yale graduate. Her black ass could have incriminated him. That way she could have some proof.

Celia Revised Draft

Celia begins with a context creating statement again:

I'm a student. I'm writing to express my opinion.

A disarticulation of media representation appears in support of her overall race articulation:

My opinion is that the Senators arranged these hearings as though it was a circus for Americans to watch this man and woman-both African Americans- degrade themselves.

Develops 'show' theme of first draft that supports court frame argument that characterizes intentionality:

And if you really watched to tapes closely, you could see who was for Thomas and who wasn't. I will say this- if the senators leave those charges and the guilty party free and the viewers unsure and undecided about who was telling the truth, that would be a crime.

Race articulation supplemented by gender:

An educated black woman was put on the stand was discredited, humiliated, disgraced and her testimony disregarded.

Court frame returns with focus on prestige:

This is why I say the senators should still investigate either to clear Thomas' name or to give back Anita's self-respect and her authority as a public speaker and a law professor.

Gender articulation appears:

That will also show more women in the workplaces to speak out, you have a chance. I feel if Thomas was found guilty a lot more women would come forward.

We the viewers and citizens have to pressure the government to stop these double and triple standards.

Race/gender vector is constructed and nested in a media marked theme:

As we all realize, if this was a white man being put in the highest chair in the land, there would be no show, no circus.

Internal states continue to be attributed:

The fact that this black man had by his side his white wife pissed the Senators off. Their hatred for this man came through loud and clear.

Celia's position shifts from the first draft to the second in incorporating gender into her race positioned articulation strategy that remains within a court frame. Evidence statements are central to her text organization. Expression of a race/gender vector within

the media theme can be attributed, in part, to the negotiation of these topic frameworks during peer session.

NON-PEER MEDIATED GROUPS

First writer: Carla

This writer begins by quoting from a Cheryl McCarthy article in New York Newsday.

I agree that sexual harassment is real and complaints about it should be taken seriously.

As a stylization, marking agentive alignment with prior discourse, the author positions herself within this discourse. She immediately comments on the character and qualifications of Clarence Thomas, suggesting that he does not manifest the proper 'moral standards' for a seat on the court.

As a character evaluation, the statement:

that position should be reserved for a person with a high moral standard.

is considered to be a disarticulation of Thomas' testimony and claims to innocence with regard to the charges. The writer positions herself in the second paragraph in terms of gender:

Anita's case is very important because after it some women have learned that harassment is against the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

A gendered position allows for the expression of a plural and agentive voice:

Now we are more aware of our rights.

Race positioning occurs within a vector with gender as she constructs her general critique:

As a member of a minority group, I feel that there was racism in the hearing. There was sexism, because Ms. Hill is a woman.

The vector is constituted of a multiple argument that, in addition, to race and gender, includes power:

Thomas won the hearing, however, because he is a friend of then President Ronald Reagan. Clarence Thomas has power, because he is a friend of the people in power.

The author condenses her analysis with a summary, parodic statement that clearly marks a social landscape referential frame:

I believe that in this world 'the most important things are knowledge, power, and money', it is a saying.

In this statement, the author placed quote marks around the 'saying', using it in an emphatic parodic strategy in relation to the social landscape frame of gender, race and power that she constructs throughout her text.

Carla Revised Draft

In her second draft, following no explicit peer interaction, Carla strengthens and develops her use of a disarticulating character evaluation strategy. Building on her character evaluation statement of Anita Hill in her first draft:

I believe that Ms. Hill said the truth because she felt uncomfortable during the hearing.

She adds referential material in an attempt to support an evidence based court frame theme:

She would not have lied in a serious case like that. Because as a Baptist Christian she knows that we pay on earth every evil we do. Thomas is the one who was lying. He does not deserve to be a Supreme Court Judge.

Author retains character evaluation statements of first draft regarding Thomas. 'Anita' changes to 'Doctor Hill' in her third paragraph reiteration of a gender position, and adds 'as women' in the statement:

Nowadays, we are more aware of our rights as women.

Adding to this more explicit gender position, which is considered here to be a disarticulation of prior gender positions, the author adds an expression of agency in this draft:

I have learned from this case that I can take to court any man who harasses me.

The author reiterates her first draft position in establishing a vector of race, gender and power. She alters a sentence using the quote about knowledge, power, stating:

He had power because he is a conservative while Ms. Hill is Democratic and a female.

A gender voice closes the second draft. The author takes on a role of an advocate, indexing a shift in audience to other women:

As a college senior, I hope that I can share with other women what I have learned about women issues. It is my dream that psychology classes reach high school instead of colleges only. Because young women need education to be aware of issues that concern us. An educated society is a healthy society.

Second writer: Nadine

Author begins with a disarticulation of the court frame reference she establishes:

The Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas hearings was a three day waste of time, crock of shit.

She utilizes a disarticulation strategy through her commentary within a media genre:

How dare media waste Americans precious time? If the story had to be told in one day, a Daily News headline would have been enough.

A court frame reference is maintained throughout her texts through disarticulation strategies employing aspects of race, gender and prestige genres:

The point was not who was lying or telling the truth-the point was there was no point at all.

I can't speak for others, but from day one I 'smelled a rat'

Here we had an all white male panel judging two African Americans with education and positions.

This I think was the aim because both were black and seeking positions.

A disarticulation of the discourse of race and gender relations within the African American community also occurs:

Sexual harassment happens all the time and, yes,
in the black race too.

First draft concludes by using a contrasting case:

The Kennedys did it. Who pointed them out? And
they had two Presidents in the family.

The analogous case serves to highlight and support the
author's disarticulations within a race speech genre
and positionality.

Nadine

Revised letter

Structure of a race marked speech genre employed in
first draft is made more explicit. The author
reiterates strong initial disarticulation of the
hearings and then states:

I don't believe the issue was clearly racial.

A disarticulating utterance of the media follows, in
supporting her positionality within a race marked
discourse:

The media (white media) took two African-
Americans with education and seeking positions and
pitted them against each other. 'Their' only
weapon against Thomas was Anita Hill.

Author reiterates her first draft disarticulation of
hearings and sustains use of an explicit race genre:

From day one of the hearings I 'smelled a rat'.
There we had an all white male panel judging these
two African Americans.

Included in this overall strategy is an instance of the
articulation of Thomas' own statement regarding a
public and 'high tech lynching:

What was the point? It could not have been
harassment ... The Senators on the panel knew this
was not a real harassment case. They just wanted
to give Thomas a lashing, a public spanking and
they used a black mother figure to do it.

Third writer: Bette

First draft

Author begins with a disarticulation of the hearings:

I feel deeply that the Thomas/Hill Hearings were
a gross misrepresentation of the issues which
really should be addressed.

The hearing became some sort of strange contest-
who would win. The true matter at hand was lost
behind the usual facades that cause truth over
presentation to be forgotten.

Disarticulation strategy evidenced throughout text, and
manifested within race and media discourse:

I looked at the Committee, there were only white
faces everywhere, except for the people the
hearing was about.

Even when Thomas came in, there weren't many
blacks with him (his wife is white). The most

African Americans in that room at one time were with Anita Hill.

It is painfully obvious that Hill and her witnesses were presented as 'more' Black in a way that was subtle and yet even still obvious. How could this 'white' black man be lying and the Negro be telling the truth. On the outside Thomas appeared Black, but on the inside he seems more white.

'Presentation' motif presides over text, and concludes with the statement that:

The presentation of both people greatly affected the outcome.

Image of presentation is used as the theme on which disarticulating strategy is employed.

Revised letter- Identical/Edit version

Fourth writer: Maxine

First Draft

Text initiated with rearticulation of article from Ms. Magazine that also serves as a context creating statement:

I am writing to you in response to the 'Nature of the Beast' article that was displayed in

January/February 1992. I'm sure as we all watched some or all of the hearings during that time we all came away with some feelings that affected or will affect our lives or someone we know.

The 'we' voice apparently indexes a gender perspective and grants authority to a more personal positioning within a disarticulating gender discourse:

I felt angry first of all because there were no women on the committee that could possibly feel what Anita was going through.

Author proceeds to disarticulate male judgements of Hill, focusing on the relation between gender and prestige:

As far as the opinion that some men have, I'm sure they felt that Anita wanted Thomas in the way she said he wanted her - perhaps to climb further up the ladder.

What goes on in her personal life is her business. She had the right to deny him along with any other male. No one, male or female should have to put up with this harassment. What would she have gained by doing it?

A race and media vector is established through a general social landscape reference. This vector is maintained with a return to third person voice and evaluated by disarticulations of the media's role in sustaining racial tension:

This form of harassment goes on constantly and it gets swept under. We need laws to let everyone know that you must respect other human beings rights.

Of course every we know the media does their best to pull things out of proportion. Basically to pit an African-American against another who are degraded for all of the pain and struggle they have been through.

Author qualifies race aspect of the vector in when she disarticulates Thomas statement:

As far as it being a high-tech lynching, I do not know where Thomas is coming from with that. I believe that statement was extremely far fetched.

Author concludes text positioned within a more formal gender voice that disarticulates male privilege:

Just because women have a say in the workplace does not mean that they have to share their bodies with other co-workers or bosses in order to keep their jobs. This is only done to keep women unequal. Until the day of equality arrives and all men accept this for their mothers, sisters, daughters and wives, things will never be the same.

Maxine

Revised Letter

Second drafts starts with less of a context creating statement. Letter begins with a stylization of the purported impact of the hearings:

This is my opinion of the Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas hearings and how they have affected women and society itself.

In this version the author synthesizes first and third person statements from the first draft:

I'm sure that we all came away from the hearings somewhat angry and confused no matter if we were on his side or her side.

A gender voiced disarticulation is dominant within a court frame reference. These often are marked by specific character evaluations:

Perhaps there was a tryst, however, the harassment never ended. I would like to know why a woman cannot invite a guy into their apartment without having to sleep with them or being called a slut.

The impression from seeing all the men on the committee and no woman was the sign of inequality for Anita.

She was badgered by these men who had so many skeletons in their own closets telling someone else how they should live.

Anita respected Clarence as an employer employee would.

Gender positioned disarticulations are augmented by creating a class theme:

Some men feel that Anita wanted Clarence to carry her to the top with him.

The gender race vector of the first draft recurs framed

again through disarticulations of the media's role:

This was one black woman against a black man. The media got a kick out of the world knowing how one can demean another so low.

Telling lies that no one can actually believe. His saying that it was a high tech lynching was very exaggerated. Everyone of them wanted this to be so big that Clarence would step down and Anita just totally disgraced.

A third person, formal gender positionality returns with a degree of agency, absent in the first draft, clearly expressed:

Women will continue to be in the workplace as long as they have one parent households and they will not let men harass them.

Hopefully, one day this will all behind us and people will say 'how could something like that ever happened and what took it so long to change!

Fifth writer: Samantha

First Draft

Begins text with a formal voice evaluating the social process of blaming the victim of purported crimes. In situating herself in the text, the author is utilizing a disarticulating strategy in relation to character evaluation statements made by men:

I think that in discussing a serious topic such as sexual harassment, we need to look at each character in the case to see how society views it and if there is a proper stance to take. I think that there is a tendency for society to shift blame.

She employs an interesting analogy to support her general disarticulation of the social processes in general, and the media's reproduction of dual and double gender stereotypes and standards:

In the Thomas/Hill case there was a public display of accusation against Ms. Hill. Similar to sporting games the first team is going against the second name team (ex. Mets vs. Pirates).

Samantha disarticulates and evaluates media's depiction of character, construing a media/gender vector:

Even though Hill was the accuser she inadvertently became the accused. Ms. Hill's character was challenged and picked apart by the media and the Senators. The media played a large role in feeding the public with negative charges against Hill, rarely against Thomas.

There were different societal reactions to the Thomas/Hill case based on the print media's version of the story. Hill was made to look like a jealous woman scorned. You know the saying- 'Hell hath no fury than a woman scorned.'

Court frame references appear to substantiate Samantha's position within gender genre disarticulations:

Thomas was able to come into the hearing and negate Ms. Hill's testimony. It seemed that for every situation, he had a comment contrary to hers.

Thomas said that there were other people on his staff at the EEOC, that they didn't have as close a 'working' relationship. Hill says they worked closer together.

There were comments made about the length of time-society, men and women-focus on time- as though it can heal all wounds. Men, in general are not subject to life changing incidents, incidents which stay with a person for life. Women, on the 'other' hand, are subject to incest, molestation, these incidents occurring in childhood on up and rape.

Text utilizes a parodic strategy in relation to the hearings in the summation. A race/media/gender vector is expressed, built on aspects of each of the positioned discourses realized discretely:

I feel as though attempts were made to seriously attack these issues- such as sexual harassment but that it was made to be a circus of jokers - flame throwers and clowns.

which is followed by a closing disarticulation:

I feel that although it made African Americans look confused and backstabbing that it brought to life- or brought to public realization- sexual harassment.

Revised Letter- Identical/Edit

Sixth writer: Wilma

First Draft

Positions self in text through affect and gender,
disarticulating negative character evaluations of Hill:

The anger and pain that I feel from watching the
accusations is enormous. I believe from the
moment Hill's accusations were made public, she
was on trial.

Thomas' moral character was not questioned, Anita
Hill's was. To say that she is a spurned woman,
seeking revenge is ignorant and absurd.

A strong parodic evaluation of Thomas' character is
made manifest:

It's not fucking fair, goddammit! She was a
victim and she was made a vengeful bitch. He
called himself a victim and used oppression
against African Americans like a fucking tool. He
used it and abused. Motherfucker plays off like
Jesus Christ crucified on the Cross! He's a liar
and he ruined a woman's life and career and he got
his little piece of the pie!

Author employs imaginary inner speech to develop parody
of Thomas' motivations and intentions:

'Fuck her, let her get sucked down, leave her ass
behind- Phew, glad I didn't get caught. Once again
I got away with it. Hell, it was just another
woman- and didn't I play that martyr bit up
beautifully? Ha, now she's got nothing, and I've
got a gavel over this nation.'

In disarticulating character evaluations against Hill,
she also counterposes positive ones:

Watching the pain and agony she experiences throughout the hearings is a clear indication of her truth. What woman or person would go up against such odds, set themselves up against such unbending barriers willingly?

Instead of situating her text within a court frame reference, the author uses disarticulation strategies in service of a social landscape reference. The positive character evaluation strategies and evaluations realize the text's overall disarticulation of male privilege and gender discourse based double standards:

Anita Hill knew what she was getting into. That is why her decision to come forward was so difficult, her accusations so agonizing- she knew she was going to face a system that wouldn't believe her. A system that would humiliate her attempt, to discredit her because of her race and gender.

Wilma Revised Letter

Emphasizes gender positioned disarticulation of first draft:

My anger is stronger today when I realize how little her accusations have mattered.

The 'hearings' became an opportunity for some of the men on the Senate, and Thomas' public supporters, to attack Hill's moral character, not Thomas.

Utilizes positive character evaluations in support of her social landscape framed disarticulation of dominant male and white racial discourses:

I'm thankful that she came forward and brought the horror and reality of sexual harassment smack into the faces of the American public, but this is a small accomplishment for the price she has paid.

These hearings left me, and many women angry, saddened, frustrated and frightened by the blatantly sexist decision to appoint Thomas to the Supreme Court, and the treatment of Hill. I am frustrated and frightened by the sexist and racist behavior of the men who are supposed to be fair and intelligent representatives for the people of the United States.

I live in a sexist and racist society and the Hill/Thomas case hearings are a clear example, and a clear warning that something very dangerous is going on in the midst of our lives.

These evaluations function in disarticulating gender stereotypes in general, and accusations against Anita Hill, in particular:

I have heard men and women around me question the validity of Anita Hill's accusations. They wonder if she is lying and question her motives for speaking out.

I have heard men suggest that she was seeking revenge, that she was rejected by Thomas and her accusations are the words of a spurned woman. I have heard the suggestion that her testimony was actually her erotic fantasies about Thomas. These are absurd and ignorant assumptions.

Seventh writer: Irene

First Draft

Letter establishes a court frame reference.

Author uses a stylization strategy to express her general acceptance of Thomas' statements:

After watching the Clarence Thomas Senate Confirmation Hearing, I believe in Clarence Thomas.

Irene disarticulates statements by Hill, utilizing character evaluations. These include forms of language deemed appropriate an 'educated' woman:

I believe Anita Hill's testimony may have been fabricated. There may have been some truth to her allegations but I think she took them out of proportion. For example, when she said she and Clarence Thomas were in his office and he made a statement saying 'who put pubic hairs on my coke?' That doesn't even sound right. A man of his intelligence and education should speak a better language than that.

In giving her statement, Hill was nervous and a bit confused when she was asked questions. As a professor at a university, Hill should of been able to present herself during the hearing. If she was speaking the truth, her thoughts and allegations would of been properly prepared, and she wouldn't of had a problem in telling what happened.

In my opinion, sexual harassment is not something that one forgets about, and if so, then one should have all the details in order before making an

allegation against someone.

She focuses on a number of allegations made by Hill and which she disarticulates in support of her overall stylization strategy:

Anita also said he spoke of pornographic films, how he talked of his penis and gave satisfaction to women during oral sex. She said he referred to an individual with a large penis as Long Dong Silver. It sounds as if Anita Hill has been watching pornographic films, and using what she has heard against Clarence Thomas.

Irene Revised Letter

In this revised version the author disarticulates Hill's testimony immediately, using the phrase:

...I believe Anita Hill's allegations of sexual harassment were taken out of proportion.

used in the first draft and develops the same arguments, the same allegations and makes small embellishments:

If these allegations are true, why did Anita Hill work with Clarence Thomas, job after job? I believe there were conversations on sex, but not in an obscene manner.

Character evaluations and imputed motives are used to disarticulate Hill's charges, as in the first draft:

In my overall opinion, Anita Hill decided to come forward ten years later due to jealousy. I believe there was a strong attraction between Hill and Thomas. Anita Hill was always the woman on Thomas' side and now she is no longer there, his wife is.

Author continues to disarticulate Hill's testimony through the use of gender and prestige themes:

A woman, such as Anita Hill, with a good education and job experience should not limit herself to the low standards of having to put up with sexual harassment. That's what makes it difficult to believe her story.

In support of her general textual strategy of stylization with Thomas' testimony and character, the author marshals support through her rearticulation of court frame evidence statements:

After working with Clarence Thomas at the Department of Education, where Anita Hill's claim of sexual harassment took place, she then went to work with Thomas at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Again, Anita Hill's claim of sexual harassment. Finally, Anita Hill decided to find another job, so that she wouldn't be in contact with Clarence Thomas. On her last day of work she had dinner with him. Not only did the two of them remain in contact on an on and off basis, but Hill also helped with conference materials and research for a seminar.

Eighth writer: Ted

First Draft

Rearticulates Thomas statement and builds

disarticulation of court frame process:

The confirmation process in which Clarence Thomas found himself victimized was in fact a high tech lynching.

I feel Thomas' rights were clearly violated with the leak from the FBI's file on its investigations of him and his family.

It was disgusting to see the democratic senators try to assassinate the career of this nominated justice by any means necessary.

I would like to see someone introduce a proposal to legislate strict and stringent proceedings to insure that another nominee will never be subjected to so much humiliation and ridicule based solely on an accusation.

Author disarticulates media's role:

It was made quite obvious to anyone who followed the entire hearings and media coverage. The Senate as a whole was made to look shady, unprofessional and very unethical.

Author disarticulates Hill's statements, using character evaluations:

It was Ms. Hill's contention to block the confirmation of Thomas, for whatever reason or reasons she may have had for doing so.

Ted

Revised Letter

Text is reorganized from a letter to Congressman Rangel to a more essayist genre. Revised text begins with a topic sentence:

Should Judge Clarence Thomas be appointed to the United States Supreme Court, based on the controversial charges of sexual harassment?

Author disarticulates Hill's charges in stylizing his support of Thomas for nomination:

My belief in this matter is he should be appointed. There was no concrete evidence that Judge Thomas was guilty of any charges made by Professor Hill. Should a statement of charges decide a man's innocence or guilt before proven?

The facts that were uncovered in these public hearings questions Ms. Hill's validity, not that of Judge Thomas.

Professor Hill should have made formal charges and let a court of law decide if Judge Thomas is in fact guilty or innocent of sexual harassment.

Judge Thomas has the same human rights as all American citizens. Just because Professor Hill makes a statement of charges on national TV, does not mean that Judge Thomas is guilty.

Author draws on more evidence to disarticulate Hill, continuing to build his overall stylization strategy within a court frame reference:

The fact that in 1983 Mr. Armstrong Williams of the EEOC warned Judge Thomas that Anita Hill was hostile to him- also that former Dean of Oral Roberts University said that Ms. Hill had made a request of Judge Thomas to write a letter or recommendation for her. These and other facts that were written in the New York Daily News show that Professor Hill might have some animosity toward Judge Thomas.

Ninth writer: Sharon

First draft

Begins with a context creating statement:

I am a freshman in Long Island University. In class we were watching the hearing of Judge Thomas and Anita Hill.

which initiates stylization of Thomas' statements and character:

I believe Judge Thomas should be confirmed. I don't know him personally but he seems like an honest and respectful man.

She disarticulates Hill's testimony through character evaluations:

My opinion on Anita Hill is that she is a very ignorant, stupid woman. She insults me as woman.

As Judge Thomas was developing his career she decided he was not qualified for this position.

Why ten years ago when he was not a judge was he qualified for his position?

Sharon's letter contains a strong contradictory positionality, taking on a disarticulation of male power:

If a man sexually harasses you, in my opinion, he's not qualified enough to sweep the streets of New York, let alone work right beside me for years. I have a lot of respect for myself, no job is worth the humiliation and embarrassment.

This disarticulation can be considered a tacit articulation of Hill's testimony insofar as the allegations are accepted in principle, yet rejected because of the time span from their occurrence and their reporting. This inference is substantiated in the following disarticulation of Hill within a positive character evaluation:

Professor Hill is a well educated, intelligent black woman. She should have quit or fought for her rights as a woman then. She should have stopped him before he hurts any other woman if indeed she felt strong about her accusation of sexual harassment.

This is augmented by a parodic statement:

Personally I think Professor Hill should have kept her mouth shut since that's what she seems to do best.

Sharon

Revised Letter

Repeats her own prior position within a diffuse gender disarticulation of Hill's testimony:

I still have not had a change of mind about Anita Hill. My opinion is that Hill exaggerated the harassment charges to hurt Judge Thomas' career. "I feel sorry for her if it did occur, the harassment. But to delay such an important matter and allow that awful man to get away with it and allow it to occur to somebody else is unbelievably selfish and horrifying in my opinion.

Character evaluations used prestige, race and class vector references:

She talks about being educated and coming from a good family and always being poor and working hard for what she accomplished. As an intelligent black woman she should have been setting an example, like being proud of herself and having a lot of respect for herself. I'm not saying it's easy to admit harassment but she let it go on and didn't stop it or change jobs.

Introduces a gender voice that references power theme:

As a woman in today's business world we have to be strong and smart. Smart as in knowing that men in the career world today do not want a woman for a boss or equal to them. They would like us to be below them and if we let them they will succeed and keep us there. This is nothing new. Women have been fighting for their rights for many years and Anita Hill should know that. It is common sense not college sense.

which further serves to disarticulate Hill's testimony.

An implicit rearticulation of women's struggle for

social justice is established indirectly through the course of her texts. This is further evidenced by this disarticulation of Hill as a failed paragon:

If Anita Hill, a law professor can't stand up for herself what good is she in her line of work, who will trust, respect and look up to a woman like her, not I.

Tenth writer: Simon

First draft

Simon's letter is situated from the positionality of 'a concerned voter'. A strong social landscape framework is established and maintained focusing on the political process. Author disarticulates procedure and motivations for the selection of nominees:

The recent Senate confirmation of Justice Clarence Thomas has prompted me to write you on my views. There has to be a better selection process for vacancies on the Supreme Court. When presidential nominees have been averaging less than 50% ultimate confirmation something is wrong.

Clarence Thomas may have the necessary qualifications for a federal judgeship but I don't believe he is Supreme Court material. His confirmation should remind Congress that the selection process is flawed and that an amendment deserves serious attention.

Author introduces and rearticulates race and power themes:

I can understand the pressure on the president to nominate another black person to fill the vacancy of Thurgood Marshall. It is perhaps reasonable that African Americans be racially represented on the Court as a proportional share based on the population.

and also disarticulates the political discourse that brought Clarence Thomas to nomination:

It is less reasonable that a Court with an already conservative majority be further stacked with another. This does not tend to reflect the current balance of liberal/conservative views shared by the American electorate.

In selecting Clarence Thomas even after the usual FBI check for 'skeletons in the closet' revealed a past history of sexual impropriety in the workplace, the President made, in my opinion, an error of judgement.

This disarticulation of the political discourse includes a strong male gender positionality that also articulates a feminist critique of male privilege in controlling, specifically, freedom of choice:

The whole issue of federal funding for abortions and in fact their very legality will be coming up for Court review shortly and I am repelled by having a man with such disrespect for female dignity sitting in judgement of a woman's rights with her own body.

Revised Letter- Identical edited version.

**Summary of Case Study Findings: Court Framers and
Social Landscapers**

What this study has identified and termed court situated frames have proven to constitute more than half of the total of the fifty two first drafts produced by these college writers. Writers that employ a court frame appear to be composing within perceived generic constraints. This is substantiated by their being characterized as predominantly monologic letters to the editor that do not clearly anticipate a response or acceptance. Court frame letters attempt to be based on what is considered to be factual information, generally arguing a position founded on testimony, evidence and transactions within the Senate Confirmation Hearings viewed by all students in their videotape prompt sessions.

Students evincing a court framework tend to assess the veracity of statements and usually supplement them through a very wide diversity of character evaluations of the protagonists which seem to serve as supports for their positioning with regard to what they construe as the evidence.

Court situated frames also seem to be oriented toward specific details constitutive of an argument in defense or in rebuttal to statements and charges against a protagonist- often employing psychological characterization assessments and evaluations, to build arguments. There is a co-occurrence of characterizations and evaluative statements in court frame letters. Character evaluations often support court situated frames and are usually balanced in terms of assessing both protagonists. Such character evaluations,- i.e., honest, sincere, firm, liar, nervous, educated, professional, jealous, vengeful, deceitful, exaggerating, and brave, maintain a static state as opposed to a more relational or intersubjective perspective on the part of court frame authors. As analyzed, these characterizations are representations of the author's ascription of internal states, including intentions and motivations. These characterizations are often supported through imaginary reported speech, focalizing the author's position through a projection of possible internal states and often expressed through statements by protagonists that

are considered to be likely points of view. Another important aspect of the court frames is the utilization of the more objective and distanced register of the speech genre theme employed. In the case of those court frames that focus almost exclusively on the theme of evidence, an objective style may be employed. This objective 'voice' is one that students may consider appropriate as responses in letter to the editor formats. In addition, this 'voice' may be a textual manifestation of preconceptions emerging from constraints within the use of aspects of a more generic social speech genre. It is a genre that makes reference and contextualizes evaluations and judgements regarding the truth and falseness of testimony and statements in a formal setting defined by decisions and interventions made by judges, lawyers and juries.

Court framers can be viewed as authors who especially select a more objective, neutral or 'business' speech genre and discursive strategy. Court framers often situate their writing and speaking within the context of the referential theme, the Senate Confirmation hearings, the proceedings and the various

statements made by the protagonists that are construed as 'evidence'. Subjective evaluations do emerge insofar as some authors show marked identification with one of the protagonists. In a number of cases, authors have corroborated the putative 'evidence' of a court frame testimony through support from their own experiences as gendered subjects.

Social landscapers tend to appear, in contrast to court frame authors, more dialogic in that their writing evinces participation in a larger discursive framework. Their letters are characterized by their tendency to situate themselves in a more explicitly relational, intersubjective context by taking recognizable positions and points of view on public issues of race, gender, prestige, class, as well as media and political debate.

In social landscapers the use of disarticulation strategies may have their referents in a wider discourse on gender, race, media or politics. Recontextualization of the issues and themes begins within a wider discursive field than are apparent in court frame letters. Disarticulation and rearticulation

strategies always have an object/referent in any text, but in court frame letters this disarticulation strategy makes its textual object statements of the protagonists during the hearings. The court frame letters are almost exclusively responses, perceptions and interpretations by their authors of the veracity or falseness of prior statements by one of the protagonists. Social landscape letters often utilize prior statements but are identifiable by recontextualizing and thematizing their letters within fields of reference that incorporate more than testimony, evidence and attributions of psychological motivation or intent. Social landscapers include, at the very least, reference to gender and representational themes that broaden the focus and allow for their authors to situate themselves within larger social and historical contexts.

In the social landscape pairings authors often reenvoiced their texts to an only slightly greater qualitative extent than their initial solitary efforts. In some cases the social landscape pairs may reflect a limiting effect on subjective expression. In these

cases, the social revision context may facilitate a cohesive effect constraining plural identifications and descriptions. The anomaly and discontinuity at this edge of the spectrum of subjective marking may occur as an instance of the effect of standardized language and monologism on the process of self-expression. This it may reflect a drawing inward of the dialectical processes at the margins of polyphony and dialogism toward the center of standardization and coherence.

In the social landscape pairings authors frequently reenvoiced their texts to an only slightly greater qualitative extent than their initial solitary efforts. In some cases the social landscape pairs may reflect a limiting effect on subjective expression. In these cases, the social revision context may facilitate a cohesive effect constraining plural identifications and descriptions. The anomaly and discontinuity at this edge of the spectrum of subjective marking may occur as an instance of the effect of standardized language and monologism on the process of self-expression. This it may reflect a drawing inward of the dialectical

While writers may employ a wide variety of

possible strategies within texts, the specific means they actually utilize may function only as a scaffold for an overall composite strategy and positioning across texts. This means that in a letter like that of Fatema (Case Study 3) who establishes a court frame with support of character evaluations, an overall disarticulation strategy is being deployed. In the case of this letter the writer is disarticulating the premises and statements made by one of the protagonists.

In Case Study 1 Angela focuses and maintains a social landscape frame throughout the three texts. Her initial position, primarily disarticulation of the hearings and the thematizing of a gender race vector, are reorganized and given fuller coherence. They are not significantly altered from her overall, primary strategy of rearticulation of the protagonists' utterances within a social landscape, primarily a gender and media marked perspective. Aspects of race and media speech genre markings appearing especially in the peer session are modified with only the media representation theme retained. Renee, her peer partner,

moves toward a more social landscape position in her second draft. She adds emotional clarity and description to build a more focused articulation of gender and power themes but retains her concern for the court frame themes of evidence, statements and intentionality of the first draft.

Clear influences and reenvoicements deriving from peer critique session with Angela, who maintained a social landscape/gender position throughout the span of texts, is evident. This is especially marked in her comments, during the peer session, on how she would modify her writing to better express her strong feelings on the case. Angela's venture into the themes of gender and power are tentative and partial, yet represent her reconceptualizing of the issues with a wider discursive field than in her first draft.

Revision of Tracy's (Case Study 2) letter accumulates disarticulating arguments of media coverage/publicity 'circus', discussed in the peer session. Tracy reframes the issues in personal/gender terms- taking a position on the basis of what she perceives as a manipulation of events. This social

landscape revision focuses on the exposure and the resulting humiliation of Anita Hill. The author reflects on the impact of this media inspired characterization, stating that its effect potentially exposes her own life as a woman. This position is embraced within an overall race/gender theme marking that is employed with support by disarticulations of media representations of the case.

In Case Study 4. in which two males participate, thematic differences between two social landscape positions is manifested. Sayeed rearticulates the hearings in a social landscape that emphasize the centrality of experience and qualification. In doing so, he also indexes his position vis a vis Ken's construal of 'male behavior' as the thematic core issue to be evaluated. Ken raises questions rearticulating Sayeed's concern for qualification in his general disarticulating strategy with regard to stereotypical depictions of gender and of the prevailing ideologies that he perceives as the basis for his textual reframing of the issues.

Another example of a shift in the themes marked

within social landscape letters is evident in Maude's (Case 6) drafts. Social landscaping in terms of power and gender is much more marked in revised text. Rearticulation is a successful strategy in avoiding a concern for the court frame while using the events to recontextualize her discussion in terms of gender communication expressed as pressures of power relations experienced in the workplace. Both of Maude's drafts hinge on binaries- 'truthful, lying', 'lower,' 'inferior', 'as a woman and as an employee', which help structure the theme of double victimization on the one hand, a vertical, evaluative perspective, as well as a general rearticulating or horizontal discursive equivocation regarding the court frame. Writer is able to maintain a balance between suspending judgement, stating both that 'for arguments' sake I will assume Hill is the truthful party' (second draft) while retaining the conclusion that the 'burden' (1st) and 'burden of "error" (2nd) remains or is placed on her.

A case of radical reorganization from a court frame to a social landscape position occurs in Case 8. Aaron' revised letter is marked by a strong subject

positionality that contrasts with the rearticulations formed in the first draft's thematization of individual ambition and advancement. His revision, a letter to his Congressman, rather than an essayist appeal to classmates, is an agentive call to reverse the political climate that made possible the selection and then the subsequent appointment of Thomas to the Supreme Court. The second draft is a cohesive disarticulation of the political agenda that brought both Thomas and David Duke to the foreground of the decade's political discourse. It reflects, as well, strong reenvoicements of positions debated during the peer session, marking an emergence of discursive positionality and evaluative strategies absent in the first draft.

Non-peer interactive group authors, who did not share the oral sessions, varied across the same range of strategies and shifts. As participants in classroom discussion, as well as everyday conversations, aspects of speech genre emerge and are interpreted and critically examined by some authors. Maxine, for example, (non-peer interactive writer 4) utilizes a

third person, formal gender positionality in her revised text. This textual change represents a discursive transition, a degree of agency, absent in the first draft. Strong parodic texts were evident by writers like Wilma (non-peer writer 3) and Sharon (non-peer writer 9) who establish a strong positionality through evaluative statements. Their first and revised letters constitute disarticulations and parodic reenvoicements of the hearings and the protagonists. A case of reorganization occurs in Ted's (non-peer writer 8) texts. In this case, the author switches from a disarticulation of Hill's testimony in a letter to his Congressman to a revised text in essayist genre that is centered around stylization strategies in support and alignment with Thomas' statements and qualifications for the Supreme Court post.

The actual context and activity of revision itself could prove to have borne greater significance as an occasion for reflection and the textual mediation of positionality than the peer group sessions.

Peer groups themselves ranged in focus, as in Nystrand's (1986) findings. This range may have

included a wide differences between those groups with a diffuse concern for editorial presentation to specific, 'higher order' reconsideration and problem solving.

This range of purpose may have mitigated the implementation of consistent reorganizations of texts. Moreover, peer groups may also have provided a context in which authors articulated and elaborated on their original evaluative positions and strategies. This is plausible particularly in explaining the considerable number of authors who did not revise their second drafts or who merely made slight editorial additions and deletions. Peer sessions may have often served as the context for arguing in defense of stated positions and allowing for reflection upon them, extending their initial propositions into shared and associated themes, topics and reference based on common and negotiated knowledge.

The court frame and social landscape division, the initial categorization of all first drafts, is an insufficient and artificial depiction of the complexity of text production and revision. As a device for examining the more global differences, it is a

dichotomous, etic separation that can not make the necessary distinctions involved in authorial discursive reenvoicement strategies. It is a division that does not address the inherent and situated differences and contradictions of positionality, including the unexamined problematic of the researcher's authority and intervention into the subjectivity and expressivity of student writers.

Court framers often used and indexed aspects of social contexts and relation through what appears to be a narrow and focused aperture, i.e., race or gender marking that are reduced and contained within the context of evidence and testimony statements. A possible perceived genre constraint was operating in the case of court frame letters. Their apparently limited focalization may be attributed to an implicit understanding and faithfulness to an appropriate evaluative posture and genre thematization within the task assigned by this researcher in assigning to them letters to the editor on the ostensible topic of sexual harassment charges as alleged in the video prompt of the Confirmation Hearings.

Recontextualization

Revisions can be considered, cumulatively, to function as dialogic contextualizations. Rather than merely organizing new aspects into prior ones, revised texts give evidence of a reciprocity and exchange with multiple voices. They allow for the contextualization of disparate voices through reflection and reorganization. As with analogies within texts, revisions themselves pose two or more contexts of meaning, characterization or activity. Contexts are placed in relation to one another and significance is drawn from them through direct use of sentences, phrases, figuration, and points of view or theme. Contexts are utilized as instances of perspective and positioning as well, becoming textual carriers of specific aspects of voice. The dialogic nature of revision can be discerned in the cases in which student writers manifest in their texts a reframing of their arguments, language and strategies. This is most salient in the cases in which these arguments and their formulation can be found to have been produced as an effect of the peer revision critique groups.

Recontextualizing may be situated by an implicit or explicit awareness of time- a period of reflection allowing for a repositioning or change in strategy or strategic emphasis. When and if recontextualization occurs- through analogies, rearticulations, disarticulations, or parodic reenvoicements, a given discursive field is broadened, made more inclusive and given a fuller framework-usually with the expression of some variety or combination of social identity discourse and marked positionality. Jessica's first draft and her evaluative comments (Case 8) are a clear manifestation of texts very expressively marked texts.

Repositioning or redirection occurs within letters with marked changes of emphasis, purpose, point of view or strategy. Between first and revised drafts, shifts shifts usually occur in terms of focus for social landscape authors in which the central frame is often constituted by a situating of the text in specific discourses or their co-presence through gender marking and/or of social identity (race, class, prestige, gender). Shifts for court framers more often occur in distinctions made in terms of personal identification

with protagonists and/or through use of analogies that are often based on personal knowledge and experience with issues of discrimination, sexual harassment, rape or interpersonal issues.

Utterances, Speech Genres and Discursive Strategies

In the peer revision sessions the expression of specific speech genres can be discerned. In a majority of the sessions instances of the speech genre of gender and gender/power was evident. Instantiations of other dominant genres that emerged from the initial written texts and the subsequent oral discussion included the speech genres of prestige and class, of race, and media representation and gradations can be made of these four prevailing speech genres into subgenres.

Bakhtin describes utterances as serving two aspects. The first is the utterance employed in a concrete linguistic exchange, or the "the relation of the utterance to the speaker himself, the author of the utterance, and to the other participants", as a "link in the chain of communion. It is the active position of the speaker in one referentially semantic sphere or

another. Therefore, each utterance is characterized primarily by a particular referentially semantic content." (1986, p. 84).

The second feature of utterances is their expressive and evaluative aspect, the "speaker's subjective emotional evaluation of the referentially semantic content of his utterance" Bakhtin, 1984, p.84). He indicates that this aspect is evident in all areas of communication, manifesting with varying degrees of force. This evaluative and expressive aspect of the utterance, in contrast to the first, which governs the semantic content in general, and stylistic forms, in particular, "determines the choice of lexical, grammatical, and compositional means of the utterance" (p.84).

Bakhtin's understanding of the utterance allows for an appreciation of the structuring of texts as whole discursive forms marked by subjective and evaluative positioning. It is a view that regards individual words, phrases and sentences as participating within a larger organization of language within specific situated exchanges. Bakhtin writes

"when selecting words we proceed from the planned whole of our utterance, and this whole that we have planned and created is always expressive. The utterance is what radiates its expression to the word we have selected, which is to say, invests the word with the expression of the whole" (p,86).

The relation between speech genres and utterances is dynamic and figurative. For Bakhtin, utterances are continuously recirculated in speech and written forms. They are generated in typical and identifiable forms of discourse or 'speech genre'. Bakhtin claims that "we usually take [utterances] from other utterances, and mainly from utterances that are kindred to ours in genre, that is in theme, composition or style. Consequently we choose words according to their generic specifications. A speech genre is not a form of language, but a typical form of utterance; as such the genre also includes a certain typical kind of expression that inheres in it" (p.8).

Speech genres preexist situated discourse. Bakhtin defines them as preexisting genres of oral and written cultural practice. Speech genres have indeterminate

linguistic boundaries, and are characterized by Bakhtin as 'impersonal', being "typical forms of individual utterances, but not the utterances themselves" (1986, p. 88). The boundaries are maintained by convention in pragmatic contexts of everyday social semiotic exchange and as such "in general submit fairly easily to re-accentuation" (p. 87). They are situated linguistic practices that contain their own terms, conventions, idiom and means of typification that are generally and accepted without reflection by the discourse communities that utilize them.

Speech genres, as explicated by Bakhtin, apply equally to written forms. In the analysis of the spoken and written forms used by authors in this study, recurrent speech genres were observed. These speech genres correspond to Bakhtin's specification of their practical and identifiable utility in their expression of "typical situations of speech communication, typical themes, and, consequently, also to particular contacts between the meanings of words and actual concrete reality under certain typical circumstances" (p.87).

This view of strategic discursive positioning is congruent with Bakhtin's emphasis on the expressive aspect of utterances. In his analysis of the utterance, Bakhtin stresses that an utterance can not be understood fully if only the semantic, referential theme is explicated. It is also necessary to understand the contextualization process involved in the relation between utterances in relation to one another in terms of either an explicit or implicit addressivity. Bakhtin claims that "the expression of an utterance always responds to a greater or lesser degree, that is, expresses the speaker's attitude toward other's utterances and not just his attitude toward the object of his utterance" (p. 92). For Bakhtin, thought itself is permeated by 'dialogic overtones', an inherent responsiveness characteristic of utterances in all forms of human communication. Bakhtin states that "our thought itself-philosophical, scientific, and artistic-is born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with others' thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thought as well." (p.92). Notions of responsiveness

and an inherent addressivity must be considered in examining utterances and their formulation. Utterances are always produced with the expectation of response by specific or generalized others.

It is in terms of addressivity that speech genres take on their specific character. Speech genres are distinguishable through an examination of forms of address. These include variations from specific, contexted others as participants in face-to-face communication to generalized or 'indefinite, unconcretized others', indicative of a preexistent continuum of communicative links. Bakhtin views addressivity as central to speech genres in that "both the composition and, particularly, the style of the utterance depend on those to whom the utterance is addressed, how the speaker (or writer) senses and imagines his addressees, and the force of their effect on the utterance. Each speech genre in each area of speech communication has its own typical conception of the addressee, and this defines it as a genre" (p.95).

The four genres (gender, race, class, and media representation) instantiated in both written and oral

modes in this study can be located within the range Bakhtin (1986) establishes between relatively 'intimate, 'familiar' and 'business' or 'neutral' speech genres. Bakhtin identifies 'personal proximity' of an addressee as a key factor in the selection of a genre and choice of language vehicles, or in terms of this study, discursive strategies. Citing letters as an example of the possible personal coincidence of an author with their addressee, Bakhtin distinguishes the forms of difference premised on expectations of response. These expectations are based on the common knowledge, perception and familiarity with the situation: "When speaking I always take into account the apperceptive background of the addressee's perception of my speech; the extent to which he is familiar with the situation, whether he has special knowledge of the given cultural area of communication, his views and convictions, his prejudices (from my standpoint), his sympathies and antipathies-because these will determine his active responsive understanding of my utterance" (p.96).

The position of the addressee in terms of social

prestige, stature and class are especially decisive in determining the choice of genre and discursive strategy. Bakhtin claims that they cause an 'extreme differentiation' in the employment of speech genres and styles. Their differentiation, however, remains static and standardized and consequently call for somewhat predictable forms of 'linguistic vehicles'. In the more 'intimate' and 'familiar' speech genres a greater 'internal dynamism' or expressivity and variation in discursive strategies can be observed. The key distinction between these forms of genre is the presumed understanding between speaker and addressee. In Bakhtin's formulation, intimate and familiar genres "reveal extremely clearly the dependence of style on a certain sense and understanding of the addressee (the addressee of the utterance) on the part of the speaker, and on the addressee's actively responsive understanding that is anticipated by the speaker" (p.97). Jessica's (Case Study 8) addition of the final paragraph in her revised text:

Ms. Hill, I believe you and I wish you every success in your future. I have been in your situation and I fully understand how you feel. Stay strong.

is an example of this in that it is directly addressed to Anita Hill in its expression of support.

In the 'business' or more 'neutral or objective styles of exposition', however, addressee expectations and considerations are never entirely absent. While 'business' genres concentrate on subject matter to the exclusion of expressivity in terms of audience sensitive differentiations of addressivity, they do assume a commonality of reference that does incorporate the addressee. For Bakhtin "objectively neutral styles presuppose something like an identity of the addressee and the speaker, a unity of their viewpoints, but this identity and unity are purchased at the price of almost complete forfeiture of expression" (p.98). In a revised text like that of Maude (Case Study 6) a deliberate transition to a more objective voice was made. During the oral peer session, discussion of certain affectively charged words were examined, thought to be inappropriate, and then reconsidered because of their impact. In the final draft the author decided to change the examined phrase and switch over to a 'smarter' and more 'business' stylized voice.

With regard to the expectation that the peer sessions would serve as a site for the mediation of the writers' first texts is the finding that a significant number of the oral sessions variously manifest a convergence or a Mwnflation of the four speech genre. This is most evident in the texts and transcripts of social landscapers. Each social landscaper utilizes at least two speech genre, often setting into discursive exchange a dialogic relation between them. This dialogization of speech genre within a text is usually identifiable and organized through the writer's employment of one of the six discursive strategies used in this study. These strategies assist the author in organizing a coherent, evaluative position. Student writers often self-authorize their right to speak and comment by positioning themselves as students or by multiple positions that could include such terms as 'feminist' and 'woman' or a combination of race, gender and affiliation. In addition to positioning in this sense, and the consequent validation of the first person 'I' to situate their comments, positioning is always also a means of marking discourse in relation to

an intended object and referent. In the latter sense, social landscapers, including those in the non-peer interactive group, most clearly indicate their reenvoicements and discursive strategy.

The marking of a position, as in the rearticulations and disarticulations that frequently occur in social landscape texts, can be thought of as a process allowing for the dialogization of aspects of larger sociosemiotic speech genres implemented and refracted through the use of particular discursive strategies. These strategies themselves are referential toward a position within a speech genre, acting in a metapragmatic fashion to communicate intent to an interlocutor or audience. Positioning becomes doubled in that the speaker/writer not only communicates a position toward the referent or theme, i.e., the media's appropriation and distortion of events, or disparities in gender rights, but also in the sense of positioning through the use of one of the four speech genre to position that speaker/writer in relation to both specific and generalized others who are presumed to participate in a common discourse community.

Strategies can be considered representative of positioning in the double sense described above as a means of situating the relation of a 'voice' within the complex array of potential other 'voices'. The metapragmatics of this voicing, mentioned above, works to position the speaker/writer within a speech genre directed to an audience, marking difference or alignment with previous statements, utterances and texts. This positioning in relation to audience can distinguish or corroborate the use and deployment of specific speech genres. The fashioning of 'voice' as a positioned discourse within a speech genre or their multiple convergence can be directed to various other 'voices'. These 'voices' can be differentiated as a generalized other addressed by the speaker/writer in their positioning within a specific discursive field or context, as distinguished from 'voices' that are indicative of a specific intended addressee, a singular, situated discursive context.

Understood as contextualized expressive formulations, or discursive situations, the three texts mark a trajectory in which positioning change be

observed to differ. First drafts evince the initial expression of an individual's situating within a discursive field comprised of specific speech genre and strategies. Oral discussion in the peer revision sessions and second drafts elaborate, extend, and reconsider the initial positioning.

Authors vary widely in both peer mediated and non-peer interactive groups in the forms of difference in their discursive situating. A large number of authors elaborate on specific aspects or develop an argument with more clarity, structure and support. Some authors reconsider their positioning by refocusing their writing in new directions. These authors either abandon prior positioning and speech genre, such as strong character evaluations working within an overall court frame or, on the other hand, move from a social landscape discourse of gender, race and/or class and prestige to a more narrow frame, such as consideration of the protagonists' careers or the utilization of a personal analogy. One example, Aaron, (Case Study 8) rejects an essayist, objective first draft rearticulating the issues and allegations dramatized by

the Senate Hearings in terms of issues of individual goals and achievement, to a an entirely refocused, disarticulating revised draft concerned with his perception of the threat to human rights an appointment of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court would represent. A non-peer interactive writer, Ted, operates in the reverse direction, rejecting his first disarticulating letter in favor of an essayist text marked by a strong stylization strategy.

Development of Local Discursive Fields

Analysis of the three texts, in both oral and written modes, generated by students in this study provide the basis for an understanding of the structure of the choices and forms of expression available to inexperienced, nonprofessional writers within a moderately informal setting.

This analysis is one which adapts Halliday's (1978) description of the texts and their fabrication through specific linguistic functions. Drawing from and modifying Buhler's (1934) delineation of functions that served the purpose of providing a means for analyzing ethnographic and cultural signifying structures, Halliday's definitions are more formal, narrowing the locus of his work largely on intralinguistic functions, 'situations' and relational structures.

Halliday defines text "as an exchange of meanings in a continuous process that is involved in all human interaction; it is not unstructured, but is seamless, and all that one can observe is a kind of periodicity in which peaks of texture alternate with troughs-highly

cohesive moments with moments of relatively little continuity" (p.136).

In this study text are understood as serving in the activity of what Halliday would designate as the interpersonal 'context of situation', or in Bakhtinian terms, as suffused by its own expressive function. The texts analyzed here can be understood as situated discursive fields drawing in various, specific manners from distinct speech genre. Within the use of thematic speech genre of gender, race, class and media representation, student authors represent their own relations through expressive and evaluative reenvoicements. Students position their discourse, employing a variety of strategies in shaping and altering thematic and rhematic structures.

Halliday appreciates a key aspect of textuality in that texts are continually modified in relation to their own extralinguistic environment. In his analysis linguistic selections are placed within the structural and functional levels and mediated relations between paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes, rather than in a positioned subject. He provides the basis for a

consideration of agency, not unlike Taylor's (1986) in stating: "text is a continuous process of semantic choice. Text as meaning and meaning is choice, an ongoing current of selections each in its paradigmatic environment of what might have been meant (but was not)." A formalism is retained in this 'sociosemiotic' perspective that, in attempting to situate the subject within a linguistic architecture, privileges functional and structures and 'texts' over their mediation and production through actual collective and individual discursive subject positions.

This study presents support for the premise that reflection on text production is productive in the development of local discursive fields. Across and within the trajectory of both the oral and written texts, especially in the partial, negotiation alterations or augmentations occasioned through the peer group sessions, diverse social and linguistic resources are consolidated. These resources or discursive reserves are the larger, macrotextual framework that Thibault includes when he enumerates them, including social contexts of texts in situation;

interfaces and conjunctions of textual practices and social semiotic praxis, heteroglossic intersections, as well as what has been identified as discursive strategies here, and by Bakhtin as 'linguistic vehicles'. These include the strategies analyzed as articulations, rearticulations and disarticulations. These are explicitly counterposed to the notion that discursive strategies or means of this kind act as forms of appropriation in dialogism. For Thibault, whose work revises Halliday's, this macro level views all texts existing in a dialectical momentum as reflections as well as producers of historically situated, contextualized social action. The revisions of this study can be seen to draw into their discursive nets intralinguistic, interpersonal and sociosemiotic functions, productive and produced between levels or aspects of the 'textual function', in their interpretative relation to their environments.

The discursive field or context of the reenvoicements is a situational interrelation, a convergence of positionality, evaluation and thematic reference. As a shifting, textual relation, each draft

represents a difference of positionality and its evaluative and strategic relations toward a construed thematic or 'ideational' referent. The referent, however, should not be regarded as static or stable, providing the linguistic ground on which evaluative commentary, position, and strategic choices are maintained and premised. The various identifiable referents are constructed in the fabric of text generation and revision. While relatively constant, they are modifiable and mobile themselves, in that they are representative of what can be considered intersubjective fields of reference each of which maintains its own modes of local, or dependent frames of interpretation.

An intersubjective approach, popular in literature emerging from social semioticians like Hodge and Kress (1977) and compatible with the 'interpersonal' function that Halliday identifies but deliberately does not emphasize, reduces the complexity of dialogic relations. It is useful here in situating reference to the contexts into which the referential function serves, usually being granted the role of foundations

and bases upon which arguments, rhemes, predicative and new information, are generated. It is the intention of this analysis to resituate Halliday's intersubjective and intralinguistic approach. In adapting Halliday's depiction of forms of reference, this examination identifies all forms of referential and thematic clustering as constitutive and constituted within local, discursive fields. In this study, these fields are produced across and during the production.

This study has provisionally located an initial texture, a periodicity, in Halliday's sense, or fragment like structure, to discursive relations. These fields are comprised by the global or macrolevel frames of reference, in what has been considered the thematic clusters of court frame evidence and social landscapers, upon which evaluative commentary, and forms of strategic discursive reenvoicement, have been deployed.

Strategies, or 'linguistic vehicles' may also be regarded as ways of solving perceived problems in the larger development of the revision context. Nystrand (1986) considers the peer revision context an activity

setting in which various 'hypotheses' are posed and tested in solving a textual 'problem'. These strategies, ranging across a spectrum from direct quotes, articulations, stylization, through rearticulations, disarticulations and parodic reenvoicements, are themselves the mechanisms through which authors convey their positionality. They provide for the expressive directions, the 'dialogic angle' from which authors evaluate and make commentary upon co-occurring frames of reference. These strategies are used and drawn from a paradigmatic reserve of identifiable, macrolevel, speech genres. These sociosemiotic speech genre, are, in turn, thematic clustering of culturally salient and embedded categories of discursive forms. Authors reflect and index these larger sociosemiotic genre, including aspects of the speech genre of gender relations, racial and class dynamics, as well as those of prestige and media representation. As such, they are utilized in a myriad of everyday and culturally salient 'interpersonal' sociolinguistic transactions.

Strategies can be seen as functioning to mediate

'intermediate' level expressive means, or forms of 'semantic register types' between 'higher level' and 'micro level order' features. In addition to the macro level features listed above, Thibault includes among such 'higher order' features the "structural determinants, social semiotic codes, control of access, differentials in economy of linguistic value, exchange, hegemonic and counterhegemonic formations, regulation and system, langue, determinant circumstances in which specific constellations of texts in situation, social register and microrealizations both occur and are regenerated or recontextualized." (1990). The microlevel order for Halliday includes identification of primarily syntagmatic elements amongst which Thibault, adapting Halliday, lists "textual markings and co patterns and variations, sites of interception of lexicogrammatical forms (i.e., projected and projecting clauses, para and hypotactic relations. Strategies are expressive devices, the linguistic conveyances into which authors' situate their positions. responding to and anticipating rejoinders. They are the envoys of a subjects' positionality.

Peer Group Environments

The peer group critique sessions offer insight into the practical selection and negotiation of themes. Discursively contested and reflected upon, themes emerge with greater distinctiveness and definition during the oral modes peer critiques. It is apparent from an analysis of twenty nine texts that notions of fixed topic or theme are idealizations of the actual complex interplay of positionality, strategy, speech genre tokens and forms of reference that develop into the constellations that are ordinarily identified and idealized by a reductive reading of 'voice.'

It is useful for the purpose of this analysis to utilize Brown and Yule's delineation of 'topic framework' for the provisional location of the referential themes produced in student texts. Brown and Yule claim that "those aspects of context which are directly reflected in the text, and which need to be called upon to interpret the text, we shall refer to as activated features of context and suggest that they constitute the contextual framework within which the topic is constituted, that is, the topic framework"

(P.75) .

Brown and Yule's notion of activated context features is intended to provide a basis for examining clusters of sentences, or utterance units, that cohere around certain contexts of meaning distinguishing them from others. The notion of a topic framework is also pertinent in that it is explicitly conceptualized as a means by which to analyze actualized, or 'activated' forms within and across a span of utterances. Brown and Yule's usage contrasts the meaning of fragments of discourse within different topic frameworks and, further, delimits the realization of actual statements from a more inclusive knowledge base. Their claim is that "the topic framework consists of elements derived from the physical context and from the discourse domain of any discourse fragment. If we say that characterizing the topic framework is a means of making explicit some of the assumptions a speaker can make about his hearer's knowledge, we are not talking about the total knowledge which the speaker believes he shares with his hearer" (p. 79) .

In the negotiation over the frame of meaning in

the peer sessions, transitions between topic frameworks are evident. Brown and Yule's notion augments Venneman's (1975) use of the term 'presupposition pool' in drawing attention toward the mobile, often contested, and always context dependent, nature of topic, theme and reference. Venneman defines a presupposition pool as a discourse reserve that is "constituted from general knowledge, from the context of the discourse, and the from the completed part of the discourse itself" (1975, p. 314). Each participant in a peer group draws from this reserve, and, depending upon the nature of the relation between members of a peer group may vary in quality and quantity. The potential of sharing a vast number of discourse subjects within a common presupposition pool is considerable, especially for students sharing similar experiences and relations as positioned subjects. It is not possible to identify, in any exhaustive manner, the diversity of shared knowledge and discourse subjects that participants, in summoning varied topic frameworks, in a peer group may have in common. It is possible, however, to observe how they emerge in

discourse fragments that give an indication of shared and differentiated presupposition pools.

Propositional discursive 'pools' are important in that they are macrolevel, social heteroglossic knowledge domains into which students are already positioned and from which they initiate their negotiation of topic frameworks through evaluative strategies. They provide a basis for understanding the nature of actualized or 'activated' positioned knowledge formulated in evaluative discourse fragments. Amongst these forms of positioned knowledge are the recurrent aspects or tokens of speech genre identified above. Their generation in first drafts as diffuse, often indexed topic frameworks, are frequently found to cluster and crystallize as ' ' in revisions. The transfer of these tokens from diffuse to distinct forms of positioned knowledge and evaluation can be attributed, in part, to the effect of the negotiation of topic frameworks and their dialogization during the peer sessions.

Thibault contests the notion of a linguistic reserve of meaning as the basis or generator of

presuppositions. Thibault's critique of intersubjectivity is incisive in placing the formulations of Brown and Yule, as well as Halliday, within the context of an epistemological tradition that does not question the 'knowledge-being couplet'. Thibault's argument is adapted for this analysis in bringing to sharp relief the nature of the local, discursive field as formulated, contested and defined within the peer session environments. I claim that the peer session critiques contribute to a foregrounding on certain contextually germane topic frameworks in which subjects position their discourse. Generalizations of positionality and 'world view' or knowledge base beyond these local discursive fields can not be made without examining how positionality is expressed in a vast array of discourses, genre and exchanges between subjects. Thibault uses Bakhtin in his critique of how intersubjectivity has implicitly functioned as an epistemological reification. He states that

social reality is assumed to be representable as a totalizing world view. Bakhtin's concept of social heteroglossia provides us with a way of breaking with the presumed intersubjective unit of the knowing subject and the object of knowledge,

for example, language. Bakhtin's concept shows that there is no necessary and unified point of reference for social meaning making practices, just as there is no given, determinate worldview that is simply mirrored or reflected in, say, language. Social meaning making practices and the discursive subject position these enact depend upon specific social and historical conditions, but these conditions do not add up to a total worldview, or even a set of opposing worldviews. The concept of worldview suggests that these are already fully articulated and fully given. The notion of the social semiotic as a systemic resource or 'meaning potential' (Halliday, 1978) demonstrates the inadequacy of this conception, which is founded on the knowing subject/object of knowledge distinction (p.104).

Thibault's critical engagement of Halliday and premises of textual 'intersubjectivity' is crucial to an appreciation of the generativity of the texts and text meanings. Thibault rejects notions of textuality that take the view that social structures and relations are merely reflected in texts. His position is one that grants textuality a degree of autonomy as historically situated semiotic mediators and material forms of the realization, regeneration and negotiation of social discourses. Thibault emphasizes key positions that attempt to deessentialize textuality, including referential stability. In addition to making the claim that supports the analysis of this study, that

discursive positions are practices are "made, remade, and changed in and through contextually specific uses," (p.105), Thibault also stresses that these practices and their 'textual voicing' do not define the limits of possible discursive forms and expression. He makes the larger claim, as above, that the worldviews and discursive positions made in specific sociohistorical contexts "have no referential center and no determinate unifunctional pattern of effects, although there are always social constraints on meaning practice that shape their form or functioning" (p. 104).

The critique of the 'knowledge-being couplet' that Thibault provides is germane to the construction of positionality in the revision contexts of this study. Positionality itself cannot be granted an interiority, or analytic, individuated source of rational agency, from which an exteriority of relational or social context, can be posed. This is the binary fallacy of intersubjective approaches that evade the discursively composed expressions of subjectivity. As discursive convergences through and in which 'hybrid' aspects of subjectivity are inscribed, but not contained or

determined, positionality is provisional, elusive and often contradictory. It is, most importantly, often discontinuous with itself, in that there is no essence or determinate, privileged moment from which a totality or ensemble of positions, emerge and diverge. Subjectivity is expressively instantiated, contested and conveyed within the course of the situated discursive fields of text production and reflection.

It is in the contestation and negotiation of meaning that occurs within speech genre and positioned practices that convergences and delimitations of agentive meaning making practices are generated and come to their ephemeral and fragmentary actualization. Thibault is explicit in calling for this kind of perspective:

Social heteroglossia emphasizes the dispersed, discontinuous character of meaning practices and the social formations in which they are articulated. The relations of alignment, conflict, opposition, and struggle among social meaning making practices enact the dialectic of stability and change, hegemony and struggle in the social semiotic system or some part of it (p.104).

This study has adapted this view and has consistently applied Thibault's reformulation of

Bakhtin's germinal assay of dialogic exchanges. For Thibault the generativity of the dialectics of contest in discourse "manifests itself in the constant processes of articulation, disarticulation, and rearticulation of social meaning making practice in and through joint or hybrid contextualizations these entail" (p. 105). In this view, Thibault articulates Bernstein's notion of context in the latter's delimiting of linguistic codes. Bernstein stated that what counts as a context depends not on relationships within, but on relationships between contexts. The latter relationships, between, create boundary markers whereby specific contexts are distinguished by their specialized meanings and realisations" (Bernstein, 1968, p.13).

The manifestation of what, for this study, has been designated as and positioned marking for race, class, gender, and media representations, otherwise identifiable within this discussion within the problematic of thematic, topic and reference, offers evidence for this process of contextualization as a relationship established discursively within the course

of textual negotiation and revision. Thibault prefers to think in terms of hybrid discursive realizations. His position is one that rejects those who would talk of replacement, negation and appropriation, expressive of what is perhaps a binary logic. Thibault stresses this when he avers:

the conceptual framework of social semiotics, the concept of social heteroglossia resists the idea that one discursive positioned-practice appropriates another. The relation between the two contexts is, as the concept of hybridization shows, more adequately taken about in terms of the articulation, disarticulation, and rearticulation of positioned-practices and their textual voicing (p.106).

The effects of the peer revision critique groups varied in terms of positionality and strategy across the case studies. A general effect of the complex convergence that the peer sessions occasion is their potential to influence reflection on text production. Addressivity and audience become salient in negotiating the value and appropriateness of a draft in peer critique sessions. In a number of cases, peer critique groups are catalytic in the contextualization of theme, strategy and positionality. This effect is evident in the textual reorganizations that appear in revised

drafts and manifesting a transition from diffuse to more distinctive configurations of subject positionality, linguistic strategy and the construal of topic frameworks or thematic clusters.

While many of the first drafts were merely edited in their revisions, constituting what Nystrand identified as lower level reflection, especially among some of the initial court frame letters, substantial reorganizations of these essentially dialogic and discursive aspects of textuality are in evidence. These changes may be attributable to the reflection and questioning of initial topic frameworks, and the dynamics of summoning aspects of both 'presupposition pools' and speech genre during the peer sessions. Non-peer interactive group authors, however, also evidence discontinuities and significant shifts in positionality, strategy and reference that vitiate any strong claims for a causal effect or determining influence of peer group work on revised texts. Adopting Bernstein's sense of context quoted above, positionality in this study can be viewed as being marked by indications of the negotiation and

establishment of provisional relations between expressive strategies, topic and reference as generated within the three texts, including the original videotaped Senate hearings. Revision, in itself, is a potential site for the expression of heteroglossia and the convergence of multiple subject positions.

A general transition was evident in those texts described in this study as situated in court frame contexts. These letters and discussions, focusing largely on the Senate Confirmation Hearings testimony and 'evidence' statements, were usually utilized in supporting or criticizing one or both of the protagonists. In these court frame contexts, an unstable tension could be observed and sustained between intrapsychological attributions of intentions, motivations and characteristics of the protagonists, on the one hand, and more intersubjective, relational attributions, on the other. This tension within some of the court frame texts was negotiated in the peer session discussions. This unstable attribution between what can be considered static state ascriptions, as opposed to more relational or 'intersubjective'

analyses, is the primary feature characterizing the transitions from first drafts of the court frame texts through the peer revision sessions and the final drafts.

In analyzing the revision process this study reenvoices Thibault's premises regarding the 'hybridization' of sociocultural, discursive fields comprising subject positionality, linguistic strategies and aspects of social speech genres. This understanding stands in opposition to the kind of interpersonal or intersubjective approaches that situate individuals at the center of textual choices and their negotiation. This intersubjective approach, evident in Halliday as well as Taylor and other social semiotic work, is compatible with an appreciation of the tension manifest in the attribution of static state versus relational ascriptions of the court frame texts. An intersubjective approach generally privileges and emphasizes more intralinguistic, formal and 'interpersonal' depictions of language use of individuals drawing from their paradigmatic and macrolevel linguistic reservoirs in selecting their

specific strategies and affording the potential for agency in their evaluative commentary on topics. The 'hybridization' notion of local, discursive fields situates subject positionality within a dialogic terrain in which the potential for agentive linguistic strategies, evaluative statements and the negotiation of topic frameworks are constantly taking place. Revised texts in several cases indicate that peer critique sessions serve to facilitate, rather than determine, the reconceptualizations of texts. In Thibault's terms, this is the aspect of hybridization of discursively constituted subject positions mentioned above. As fragments of a discursively generated field of social relations and their linguistic 'realizations', revisions, and the peer groups that precede them, are dialogic encounters. They both reflect and produce text meanings and relations between linguistic and extralinguistic features. These hybrids are provisional, local and transitory constellations of subject positions, linguistic strategies and aspects and relations established in the contextualizing of the themes emerging from aspects of recurrent social speech

genre. This premise is substantiated by Nystrand (1986) whose analysis of thesis, topic and comment development showed that "genre, topic and comment all implicate and constrain each other, and a shift in one can have implications for the others. Any given text will be a specific configuration of genre, topic, and comment." (p. 210). An interesting observation of his study was that any one of these features can serve as an 'entry point' for the reconfiguration of text structure and meaning.

Rather than viewing the peer groups effects as unidirectional and causal, this study adopts Nystrand's notion of texts as 'rhetorical problem solving' or 'text hypothesis' experiments. Nystrand, in his analyses of college freshmen 'studio' and 'nonstudio' peer revision settings, distinguished the work and focus of differing groups. Among some groups he found that the peer group "seldom go beyond considerations of spelling, punctuation and usage. And they don't interact much either. Instead they recite their suggestions for copy editing and go on to the next paper." In contrast, other groups were

observed to scrutinize texts and to solve certain perceived textual problems. These groups were focussed on "larger considerations of the writer's purpose, organization, rhetorical effect, and adequate development." A majority of the case studies examined in this study fall within the latter category, manifesting an interaction and negotiation of topic frameworks, whether or not they are initially designated as court frame or social landscape contextualizations.

Nystrand also points to a difference in how groups approached texts for peer critique. In his analysis, "effective groups work by collectively examining written texts rather than by merely listening to oral readings by authors." Nystrand observed that the difference between those groups that merely listened to the reading of a text as opposed to those that read photocopies manifests an

apparent relationship between visually examining written texts on the one hand and considering higher order writing problems (such as structure of argument, presentation of arguments, paragraph development, etc.) on the other. By contrast, there seems to be another relationship between listening to oral readings of written texts on the one hand and considering lower order writing

problems (e.g., word choice, usage, and phrasing) on the other. In short, groups that proceed by listening rather than by reading rarely go beyond sentence-level concerns (p.189).

This study did not examine oral as opposed reading presentation of texts during peer revision contexts, though it is clear from several of the case studies that considerable variation of text reflection and critique does exist. What is evident are transitions in the register of letters, in the transitions in speech genre Bakhtin details. These are marked in movements from more objective or 'business' style registers to more familiar or even intimate expressions. This is evident in a revised text like Jessica's (Case Study 8) in which she merely adds one paragraph to her first draft, but which indicates a dramatic shift from a familiar register speaking in the voice of women's rights and parodying male privilege that took on an intimate tone of direct address and support to Anita Hill. The structure of this study was conducive to transitions in register. Since this structure necessitated transitions from written first texts to oral peer group critique sessions and then to written

final drafts, concurrent movements in the nature of audience sensitive aspects of speech genre became readily manifest.

Revisions show a predominant use of rearticulating and disarticulating strategies that may be reflections of the subject positionality of predominantly female classes in which gender was foregrounded by the very nature of the ostensible topic of sexual harassment in the original allegations aired in the Senate hearings. Articulations and stylizations occurred as strategies that marked the expression of subject positions in alignment and often in defense of a protagonist as well as the topic framework or theme they might index, i.e., Clarence Thomas as a representative of a qualified African American, or Anita Hill serving to thematize women's victimization and the struggle of women in attaining equal rights. Repetition strategies are evident only in direct quotes that are incorporated into another strategy. This study did not find a basis for claiming that any use of prior language was purely objective and reportorial. At the other end of the strategic spectrum, parodies, though infrequent, were

usually marked by affective language that transgressed and recontextualized the ostensible themes that served as their dialogic objects. Parodic axis strategies comprised qualitatively richer forms of difference or non-alignment with prior text. It was assumed here that agency is discursively constituted by the specific use of strategies that mark differentiations in utterances from their precursors. At the limit of parodic strategies, differentiation was manifested by emphatic agentive strategies utilizing satire, irony or dialectic.

Revisions can be regarded as temporal textual spans, constructed around an artificial intervention. As such they track a discursive convergence and subject positioning, including the development of the distinctiveness of aspects of speech genre and their often provisional interrelationships from initially more diffuse, less tensely articulated expressive and evaluative first drafts. In addition, these convergences and divergences importantly include the emergence of what has been termed - situated clusters of race, class, gender, media discourses that

simultaneously reflect and are productive of the mutual constitution of subject positions and texts. The local discursive field quality of revisions as fragments themselves, should be contextualized as materializations of an inherent textual generativity and production. Texts should only be regarded as relatively autonomous within the contested discursive terrain of given sociohistorical meaning making practices in general. The observations of this study are abstracted from a discursive continuum that could indicate reconfiguration and resituating of subject positions both prior and subsequent to those actualized in the three texts analyzed in this study.

This study of reenvoicement strategies in the context of revision processes is itself a rearticulation of the germinal investigations of Bakhtin. As a way of situating discursive and dialogic relations in the context of an ordinary college classroom setting, this work has attempted to further inquire into the means by which non-literary forms of hybrid and heteroglossic relations are negotiated. As the basis for possible future ethnographic work of this

nature, this study can offer an analytic key for describing features of the very complex convergence of particular linguistic practices, cultural repertoires and subject positionality in contexted signifying practices such as the writing revision and peer critique contexts.

The discursive strategies utilized here, adapted from Bakhtin and Thibault, provide a provisional delineation of aspects of the linguistic complexity of specific exchanges generated by initial and culturally salient themes. In attempting to address the processes by which writing revision incorporates elements of the dynamics of dialogism, this work also provides a way of hearing the momentum and discontinuities of discourse, the actual interventions and convergences by which the social mediation of textuality occurs. Social mediation is realized within that interface of subject positionalities that text construction represents, in its serving as the medium through which reference, evaluation, expressivity and positioned identities encounter, collude and rival each other.

This work has attempted to incorporate the social

semiotic work of Thibault, Lotman and others who wish to place their ears closer to the murmur and flux of discursive relations as signal elements in the dynamics of subject formation. Thibault's premise regarding the hybrid nature of utterance is a finding validated by the often multiple textual layering of strategies and thematic vectors and the contextualizations authors make between these aspects of everyday speech genre of gender, race, media and class. This study proffers the claim made by Lotman (1990) when he describes the 'internal heterogeneity' of textuality, and Thibault calls the process of hybridization of utterances. It is my contention that these insights can be productively extended to an appreciation of the contested nature of subject positionality.

What has often been regarded as social mediation of ordinarily solitary activities such as the writing revision process of this investigation, can be regarded as not merely a reflection or refraction of intersubjective, social and private spheres, but as constitutive and constituted in the processes that generate what is usually considered identity and

subjectivity. I believe Bakhtin perceived this dynamic in his concern for the unfinalizability of discourse as well as in his development of the germinal concept of exotopy. The internal heterogeneity of texts or subject positions calls into question the bases for boundaries and demarcations, of the very foundational principles of interiority and exteriority and asks of us to inquire how to formulate a language capable of describing and articulating the presence of otherness and alterity within the very dynamics and processes of our inquiry.

It is a questioning of the processes by which we question; venturing investigations of the materiality of discursive relations, and calling for a situated reflexivity that will not grant textuality transparency. In this gesture, the markings of power and discontinuity will need to be disclosed in the interest of what I consider a materialist critical pedagogy that chooses to make explicit its own complicity and engagement in the production of difference. This augurs a critical practice that acknowledges difference in identity in its praxis while

remaining vigilant to the task of hearing the collective and singular voices of marginalized and alternative subjects who, in the everyday context of very tangible forms of power/knowledge relations, strive for agency and transformations of the conditions and substance of their lives.

Appendix A:

Frames, Strategies and Marking

First Drafts

Name	Frame	Strategy
1. Irene	Court/Char. eval	rearticulation>* Hill
2. Mercedes	Court/Char. eval	prestige stylization>Thomas
3. Celia	Court	race/gender vector
4. Derwin	Court/Char. eval	race/class
5. Michelle	Char. eval	articulation
6. Vanessa	Court/Char. eval	articulation
7. Areles	Court/Char. eval	rearticulation>Hill
8. Sharon	Court/Char. eval	rearticulation>Hill parodic>Hill questions
9. Aaron	Social landscape	race
10. Fatema	Court/Char. eval	articulation>Thomas
11. George	Court/Char. eval	
12. Ted	Court	stylization>Thomas
13. Iyeesha	Social landscape	race/gender
14. Ted	Court	
15. Simon	Social landscape	power
16. Terri	Court/char. eval	
17. Louis	Court/char. eval	rearticulation>Hill

* > is used here to indicate the object of the strategy

SYMBOLS:

= is used here to indicate continuation of frame from first draft.

< is used here to indicate a change from first draft frame of social landscape, usually to court frame/character evaluations.

> is used here to indicate a change from first draft frame, usually court frame/character evaluations to social landscapes.

+ - is used here to indicate intermediate frames that reflect both court frame and social landscape aspects.

* is used here to indicate change in discursive strategy and/or marking from first draft

Second (Revised)

Name	Frame	Strategy
1. Irene	=Court/Char.eval	*disarticulation: Hill *gender/prestige v
2. Mercedes	=Court/Char.eval	*articulation:Thomas *repetition
3. Celia	=Court + - Soc. landscape	race/gender vector
4. Derwin	=Court/char.eval	race/class
5. Michelle	+ - Soc. landscape	gender rearticulation
6. Vanessa	=Court/char.eval	*disarticulation: Hill
7. Areles	=Court/char.eval	gender
8. Sharon	=Court/char.eval + - Soc. landscape	*group gender/ind. v
9. Aaron	<Court/char.eval	*stylization:Thomas *ind./group race v
10. Fatema	=Court/char.eval	*race *disarticulation: Hill
11. George	=Court/char.eval	articulation
12. Ted	=Court/char.eval	articulation
13. Iyeesha	<Court/char.eval	*gender
14. Ted	>Social landscape	*gender/race/class v
15. Simon	=Social landscape	power
16. Terri	>Social landscape	*race/gender/power v *rearticulation: Thomas*parodic: Thomas
17. Louis	=Court/char.eval	rearticulation:Hill

First Drafts
Name

Frame

Strategy

18. Zina	Court=analogy	gender articulation disarticulation
19. Giselle	Char.eval/ Identification	race/gender vector rearticulation
20. Susan	+ - Soc. landscape Char.eval/analogy	gender/class disarticulation repositioning
21. Althea	Court/char.eval	race/class/gender v rearticulation
22. Christina	Social landscape	Gender/class
23. Carla	Char.eval	race/gender/power v articulation
24. Molly	Social landscape/ char.eval	race/gender disarticulation
25. Cheryl	Social landscape/ char.eval	race/class/gender v
26. Angela	Social landscape/ char. eval	race/class/gender v
27. Madelyn	Court/char.eval	class
28. Barbara	Social landscape- char. eval=analogy	gender/race/class v
29. Tyrone	Court=analogy	gender/ articulation
30. Molly	Court	gender/power
31. Samantha	Court	gender/parodic
32. Laura	Court	articulation
33. Tracy	Court/char.eval	class/race v

Name	Frame	Strategy
34. Lucille	Social landscape	gender>race class
35. Frances	Social landscape/ char. eval	race/gender rearticulation
36. Melanie	Social landscape	gender/race
37. Joselyn	Social landscape	gender rearticulation
38. Nadine	Court	race/gender
39. Renee	Social landscape/ char. eval.	rearticulation repositioning
40. Vera	Social landscape/ char eval	gender/power v reposition= articulation
41. Maude	Court/ char. eval	gender/ prestige
42. Laurie	Char. eval	gender
43. Esmeralda	Court/char. ev	gender
44. Carmen	Social landscape/ analogy	gender
45. Heidi	Court> Social landscape	gender disarticulation
46. Claribel	+ - Soc. landscape/ char. eval	gender
47. Marcia	Social landscape	gender

48. Cabanella	Court /char eval> social landscape	gender/power v disart.
49. Jennifer	Social landscape	gender>race

Name	Frame	Strategy
50. Stacy	Court/char ev.	gender
51. Ken	Social landscape	disart> male discourse
52. Sarah	Social landscape/ char.eval.	gender/ rearticulation
53. Sara	Social landscape	race/media parodic
54. Latif	Social landscape	race/gender
55. Sayeed	Court	gender
56. Sylvester	Social landscape/ char. eval	race/gender parodic>Thomas disart>Thomas free indirect discourse
57. Alex	Social landscape/	politics/race disart> Thomas
58. Bradford	Court/char ev.	disart>Thomas
59. Valerie	char.eval/ identification	disart> Thomas
60. Joan	Court/char.ev,	race>class articulation

Revised Drafts

Name	Frame	Strategy
18. Zina	+>Social landscape	gender rearticulation> peer
19. Giselle	=Char.eval/ Identification	race/gender vector rearticulation
20. Susan	+Soc.landscape Char.eval/analo gy	gender/class disarticulation
21. Althea	=Court/char.ev	race/class/gender v rearticulation
22. Christina	=Social landscape	Gender/class
23. Carla	+>Social landscape Char.eval	>gender/race articulation
24. Molly	=Social landscape/ char.eval	race/gender disarticulation
25. Cheryl	=Social landscape/	race/class/gender v
26. Angela	=Social landscape/ char. eval	race/class/gender v
27. Madelyn	=Court/char.ev	class
28. Barbara	=Social landscape	gender/race/class v
29. Tyrone	+>Social landscape	race>gender rearticulation
30. Molly	=Court	gender/power

31. Samantha	=Court	gender parodic
32. Laura	+> Social landscape/ char.eval	race>gender rearticulation> peer
33. Tracy	+>Social landscape	race/gender

Name	Frame	Strategy
34. Lucille	+ Social landscape	gender > race rearticulation reported speech
35. Frances	= Social landscape/ char. eval	race / gender rearticulation
36. Melanie	= Social landscape	gender > class disarticulation parodic
37. Joselyn	= Social landscape	gender / class rearticulation
38. Nadine	= Court	race / class / gender v rearticulation
39. Renee	= Social landscape/ char. eval. / analogy	class / gender disarticulation parodic
40. Vera	< Char. eval	gender / power v articulation
41. Maude	< Char. eval	gender / prestige articulation
42. Laurie	> Social landscape /	gender rearticulation
43. Esmeralda	> Social landscape	gender articulation
44. Carmen	= Social landscape / analogy	gender
45. Heidi	> Social landscape / char. eval	gender / class v rearticulation

46. Claribel	<Char.eval	gender/class
47. Marcia	=Social landscape	gender rearticulation
48. Cabanella	>Social landscape	gender/race/ power v disarticulation
49. Jennifer	Social landscape	gender>race/dis articulation> race

Name	Frame	Strategy
50. Stacy	=Court/ch.ev.	gender
51. Ken	=Social landscape	disarticulation> male discourse
52. Sarah	=Social landscape/ char.eval.	gender>race/class v rearticulation: questions
53. Sara(1)	Social landscape	race/media parodic
54. Latif(1)	Social landscape	race/gender
55. Sayeed	=Court	rearticulation
56. Sylvester	>Social landscape/ char.eval	race/gender parodic>Thomas disarticulation
57. Alex (1)	Social landscape	politics/race disarticulation> Thomas

**Appendix B:
Coding Manual for Discursive Strategies**

The primary strategies observed and coded in this study included the following.:

1. Repetition
2. Articulation
3. Stylization
4. Rearticulation
5. Disarticulation
6. Parody

The six strategies listed above were considered evaluative responses to prior discourse in observations of both the oral and written modes.

Repetition, articulation and stylization strategies were considered forms of response giving evidence of alignment, agreement and acceptance of the prior discourse to which they were rejoinders.

These three strategies were viewed here as constitutive of the **stylization axis**. This axis of discursive strategies was considered to instantiate syntagmatic textual relations, involving rewording, and

syntactical and lexico-grammatical alterations. The stylization axis was considered to manifest reenvoicements marked by absent or weak evaluations, diffuse or congruent intentionality in terms of prior discourse, utterances or text. These utterance rejoinders (retellings) were the most aligned and envoiced acceptance of the context of prior discourse.

These three forms of stylization strategies formed a continuum ranging from the most aligned in repetition to a more agentive form in both articulation and stylization strategies.

Repetition was evidenced by direct or approximate quoting and the use of the lexical or figurative devices of the originating utterances.

Articulation was evidenced by the reenvoicement of prior utterances without the expression of distinctions in meaning as found in summaries, gists and glosses. Articulations did not make use of contextualizing deictic references to the originating utterance. This intermediate form of stylization was considered non-agentive and was marked by absent or weak evaluations aligned with prior discourse.

Stylization was considered the agentive reenvoicement of alignment with prior discourse. Agreement was marked by contextualizing deictic referencing to either or both the original utterance and the speaker. Prior text was distinctly an object for the envoicement of alignment or agreement. A second degree of stylization could be observed in reenvoicements that emphasized and explicitly underscored prior utterances, forming a kind of verbalized italicization. These were the most agentive and evaluative of stylization strategies, constitutive of a co-contextualizing with originating utterances. This strategy often employed use of free indirect and reported speech.

Rearticulation formed a border between the two axes of stylization and parodic strategies. Rearticulation strategies were considered equivocations, bearing distinctions and rephrasings of prior text. They carried implicit evaluations at variance with their precursors and could not be considered to be wholly aligned with prior text. **Disarticulation and parodic strategies**, comprising the

parodic and paradigmatic axis, were analyzed as reenvoicements of prior text in terms of intentionality, differences in meaning, purpose and context. They were considered to always be agentive practices marked by strong evaluations. They utilized prior text as their object, contextualizing utterances and evidenced evaluations and divergences in meanings from the originating utterances.

Disarticulations were coded as forms of reenvoicement that made distinctions with prior text explicit and posited non-aligned evaluations. They were contextualized utterances using prior text as their object, constructing an alternate, exaggerative or contradicting context that framed originating text.

Parodic reenvoicements were considered the most mediated forms of agentive discursive strategy. Parodic strategies created new discursive and 'public space' by their articulation of alternate or contradicting contexts most explicitly. Parodic reenvoicements were marked by strong evaluations such as contradiction, ridicule, criticism, punning, rejection and satire. Parodic strategies were often framed through explicit

use of irony.

These strategies were premised on expected differences in the revision context. The general trend anticipated by this study was toward the parodic axis of agentive discursive strategies. It was expected that the interactive peer revision context would facilitate reflection and mediation of text production, leading to greater and more explicit use of agentive dialogic strategies, including figurative language foregrounded through the reflection on texts. Parodic axis strategies comprised qualitatively richer forms of difference or non-alignment with prior text. It was assumed here that dialogism is constituted by specific use of strategies that mark differentiation from their precursors. At the limit of parodic strategies, differentiation is manifested by emphatic agentive strategies utilizing satire, irony or dialectic.

Discursive Strategies

Articulations marked agreement and alignment with prior discourse. After **repetitions** they were considered the first discursive strategy to make any degree of

evaluation. **Articulations** were distinguished from **stylizations** in that the latter distinctly utilize prior text as objects for envoicement of agreement or alignment, while **articulations** were marked by absent or weak evaluations of prior discourse. **Rearticulations** co-occurred in the context of implicit **evaluations**, serving partially to ironize prior statements.

Rearticulations, disarticulations and **parodic reenvoicements** were evident in phrases, sentences, and whole utterance spans across oral and written texts. They also served as instantiations of an overall metaevaluative positioning in relation to the issues, themes, and significance of the events and the protagonists and what they may have symbolized.

Rearticulations were viewed to suspend given notions, placing them in a discursive flux, making fluid and problematic what was previously assumed.

Rearticulations and **disarticulations** were contextualized usually in terms of evidence. Truth and falsity of actual sexual harassment served as the referential ground for their envoicement.

Disarticulations: i.e., some men feel that Anita

Hill wanted Clarence Thomas to carry her to the top with him. I don't think so." **Disarticulations** can also be employed through the use of questions which serve to situate reference.

Vectors of positionality or co-positioned discourse, i.e., **evaluative** and metaevaluative statements, indicating connections and activities of protagonists or others in terms of variously combined effects of race, gender and class agency. Vectors of positionality indicated expression of unequal distribution of the contributing influences and roles of more than one kind of identity, i.e., race, gender, class, prestige, vocation, origin.

In positioning themselves writers **articulated**, **rearticulated** and **disarticulated** positions with regard to claims of which, if either, protagonist, was lying or telling the truth. They were also marked in terms of differentials, (>, <), in terms of articulations of their relative significance in an utterance (see Appendix). Degrees of positioning were evidenced by utterances- rearticulations, disarticulations, and parodies.

Vectors were considered contextualizing frames that often situated the expression of social identity in the texts. They were often textually unstable, even contradictory analyses of the differential roles and significance attributed to these factors. They were **evaluative** assessments of the events and positioned the writer outside the text unless otherwise indicated by intentional positional affiliations.

The principal types of vectors were comprised of **gender, race, class** themes. **Class** themes were also identified by **power, prestige** and **status** distinctions often voiced by writers.

Analogies

In an analogy that established relations such as the following: i.e., Thomas /Hill= not equal//Thomas/ Clinton = equal, the second term of analogy serves as an ironic frame for first. In the letter using this analogy, the taking of a powerful position became more important and subsumed that of gender inequality and allegations of harassment. In this letter it served as a **disarticulating** strategy- turning inside out,

displacing and using the question of his possible culpability instead on his quest for prestige.

Analogies were used to recontextualize- based on experiences they served as points of reference for rethinking, reframing issues i.e., Zina, who started with an **articulation** of others' views and then lead into a personal analogy narrative which reframed the original situation/view of events, in a kind of in situ revision, that often **disarticulated** previous (other) positions. **Analogies** framed first context.

Bibliography

- Abrams, Philip (1982). Historical sociology, Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). Problems of Dostoyevsky's poetics, University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1988). Speech genre and other essays, University of Texas Press.
- Bal, M. (1977). Narratlogie, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Bally, C. (1965). La langage et la vie, Geneva: Droz.
- Banfield, A. (1982). Unspeakable sentences, London: Routledge, Keagan, Paul.
- Bartlett, E.J., (1982). Learning to revise: component processes. In M. Nystrand, (Ed.), What writers know: the language, process, and structure of written discourse, New York: Academic Press.
- Barthes, R. (1988). The structural analysis of narrative. In Barthes, R., The semiotic challenge, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Beneviste, E. (1971). Problems in general linguistics, University of Miami Press.
- Berger, P., Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality, New York: Doubleday.
- Berkenkotter, C. (1984). Student writers and their sense of authority over texts. College Composition and Communication, 34 (3), 312-319.
- Bernstein, B. (1986). Elaborated and restricted codes: An overview 1958-1985. To appear in (Annol, Ditmar, Eds.), Handbook in sociolinguistics and the new science of language.

- Biber, D. (1988). Variation across speech and writing, Cambridge University Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). Language, New York: Holt.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice, Cambridge University Press.
- Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities (11-18), London: Macmillan.
- Brown, G., Yule, G. (Eds.), Discourse analysis, Cambridge University Press.
- Bruffee, K. (1985). A short course in writing, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Bruffee, K. (1986). Social construction, language, and authority of knowledge. College English. 48, 773-790.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. Critical Inquiry. Vol. 18, No.1, 1-21.
- Buhler, K. (1934). Sprachtheorie: die darstellungsfunktion der sprache, Jena: Fischer.
- Chafe, W. (1985). Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing. In D.R. Olson, A. Hildyard, and N. Torrance (Eds.), Literacy, language, and learning, Cambridge University Press.
- Chatman, S. (1978). Story and discourse: narrative structure in fiction and film, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Cohn, D. (1978). Transparent minds: narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Corbett, E.P.J. (1971). Classical rhetoric for the modern student, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Corsaro, W.A. (1985). Peer friendship in the nursery school. Norwood: Ablex.
- Crapanzano, V. (1991). The postmodern crisis: discourse, parody, memory, Unpublished paper presented to the Israeli Anthropological Association, Winter 1990.
- Danes, F. (Ed.), (1974). Papers on functional sentence perspective. Prague: Academia.
- Di Pardo, A., Freedman, S.W. (1987). Historical overview: groups in the writing classroom, Technical Report 4, Center for the Study of Writing, Berkeley: University of California.
- Dyson, A.H. (1987). Unintentional helping in the primary grades: Writing in the children's world. Technical report, Center for the Study of Writing. To appear in Raforth, B.A., Rubin, D.L. (Eds.), The social construction of written communication. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. Elbow, P. (1973). Writing without teachers. London: Oxford University Press.
- Firbas (1974). Some aspects of the Czechoslovak approach to the problems of functional sentence perspective. In Danes, F. (Ed.) Papers on functional sentence perspective. Prague: Academia.
- Flavell, J.H. (1975). The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. Huntington, N.Y.: Krieger.
- Flower, L., Hayes, J.R. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. College English 4 pp. 19-37.
- Foucault, M. (1976). The archeology of knowledge, New York: Harper and Row.
- Fredericksen, P. (1986). The language parallax: linguistic relativism and poetic indeterminacy, Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Freedman, S.W. (1985). Response to, and evaluation of writing: A review. Resources in Education (ED 247 605).
- Genette, G. (1980). Narrative discourse, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Genette, G. (1988). Narrative discourse revisited. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gere, A.R., Abbott, R.D. (1985). Talking about writing: the language of writing groups. Research in the Teaching of English 19, (4) 362-379.
- Gere, A.R., Stevens, R. (1985). The language of writing groups: How oral response shapes revision. In Freedman, S.W. (Ed.), The acquisition of written language: Response and revision. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory, Berkeley: University of California Press. Giroux, H. (1983). Theory and resistance in education: a pedagogy for the opposition, Boston: Bergin and Garvey.
- Glatt, B.S., (1982). Defining thematic progressions and their relationship to reader comprehension. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: the language, process, and structure of written discourse, New York: Academic Press.
- Greimas, A.J. (1987). On meaning: selected writings in semiotic theory. University of Minnesota Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and social identity. Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). Language as social semiotic. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Hawkins, T. (1976). Group inquiry techniques for teaching writing, Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English/ERIC.

- Healy, M.K. (1980). Using student writing response groups in the classroom, Berkeley: Bay Area Writing Project.
- Heath, S.B. (1983). Ways with words. Cambridge University Press.
- Hodge, S. Kress, R. (1988). Social semiotics, Cornell University Press.
- Holman, E. (1976). In Scinto, L. (1985), Text, schooling, and the growth of the mind. In E. Mertz and R. Parmentier (Eds.), Semiotic mediation. Academic Press.
- Hjelmslev, L. (1961). Prolegomena to a theory of language, University of Wisconsin Press
- Jakobson, R. (1971). Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. In Jakobson, R. Selected writings. Vol.2, The Hague: Mouton.
- Kay, P. (1977). Language, evolution and speech style. In B. Blount and M. Sanches (Eds.), Sociocultural dimensions of language change. New York: Academic Press.
- Labov, W. (1982). Competing value systems in inner-city schools. In Gilmore, P., Glatthorn, A. (Eds.), Children in and out of school. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lanser, S. (1982). The narrative act: point of view in prose fiction, Princeton University Press.
- Lentricchia, F. (1980). After the new criticism, University of Chicago Press.
- Lopate, P. (1978). Helping children start to write, In Cooper, C., Odell, L. (Eds.), Research on composing: Points of departure. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Lotman, Y. (1990). Universe of the mind, a semiotic theory of culture. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Luria, A. R. (1981). Language and cognition, New York: Wiley.
- Macrorie, K. (1979). Telling writing. New York: Hayden.
- Martin, W. (1986). Recent theories of narrative. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mathesius, V. (1942). From comparative word order studies. In Brown, G., Yule, G. (Eds.), Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press.
- Mauss, M., (1938). A category of the mind; the notion of person, the notion of self, In Carrithers, M., Collins S., Lukes, S. (1985). The category of a person. Cambridge University Press.
- Mead, G.H. (1947). Language and the development of the self. In T.M. Newcomb and E.L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Henry Holt.
- Michaels, S., Foster, M. (1985). Peer-peer learning: Evidence from a student-run sharing time. In Jaggar, A., Smith-Burke, T. (Eds.), Observing the language learner. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English/International Reading Association.
- Moffett, J. (1968). Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Murray, D. (1969). A writer teaches writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Myers, G. (1986). Reality, consensus, and reform in the rhetoric of composition teaching. College English 48 (2), 154-171.

- Newcomb, T., Wilson, E.T. (1966). College peer groups. Chicago: Aldine.
- Newkirk, T. (1984). How students read student papers: An exploratory study. Written Communication 3, 283-305.
- Newman, D., Griffin, P., Cole, M. (1984). Social constraints in laboratory and classroom. In Rogoff, B., Lave, J., (Eds.), Everyday cognition: Its development in social context. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nystrand, M. (1986). The structure of written communication: studies in reciprocity between writers and readers. New York: Academic Press.
- Nystrand, M. (1986). Learning to write by talking about writing: A summary of research on intensive peer review in expository writing instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In Nystrand, M. (1986). The structure of written communication. New York: Academic Press.
- Olson, D.R. (1977). From utterance to text; the bias in language in speech and writing. Harvard Educational Review 47. 257- 281.
- Prince, G. (1973). A grammar of stories. The Hague: Mouton.
- Rader, M. (1982). Context in written language: the case of imaginative fiction. In Tannen, D. (Ed.), Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy, Vol.IX in R. Freedle (Ed.), Advances in discourse processes, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Scholes, R., Kellogg, R. (1966). The nature of narrative. Oxford University Press.
- Scinto, L. (1985). Text, schooling, and the growth of mind. In E. Mertz and R. Parmentier (Eds.), Semiotic mediation. Academic Press.

- Scribner, S., Cole, M. (1984). Literacy in three metaphors. American Journal of Education, 95, 6-21.
- Scribner, S. (1981). The psychology of literacy, Harvard University Press.
- Shapiro, M, Shapiro, M. (1988). Figuration in verbal art, Princeton University Press.
- Smith, P. (1988). Discerning the subject, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spear, K. (1984). Promoting cognitive development in the writing center. In Olson, G. (Ed.), Writing centers: theory and administration, Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Spivak, G.C. (1988). In other worlds: essays in cultural politics, New York: Routledge.
- Steinberg, Z., Cazden, C. (1979). Children as teachers of peers and ourselves. Theory into Practice 18 (4), 258-266.
- Tannen, D. (1982). The oral/written continuum in discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Spoken and written language; exploring orality and literacy, Vol IX in R. Freedle (Ed.) Advances in discourse processes, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Taylor, C. (1985). Human agency and language. Philosophical papers, 1, Cambridge University Press.
- Thibault, P. (1990) Social semiotics as praxis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Todorov, T. (1981). An introduction to poetics, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Uspensky, B. (1973). A poetics of composition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Vachek, J. (1966). The linguistic school of Prague.
Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Venneman, T. (1975). Topic, sentence accent, and
ellipsis: a proposal for their formal treatment.
In Keenan, E.J. (Ed.), (1975), Formal semantics of
natural language. Cambridge University Press.
- Volosinov, V.N. (1973). Marxism and the philosophy of
language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and language, MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society. Harvard
University Press.
- Werner, H., Kaplan, B. (1984). Symbol formation; an
organismic-developmental approach to the
psychology of language, Hillsdale, New Jersey.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1985). Vygotsky and the social formation
of mind, Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, L.C. (1982). Introduction: A sociolinguistic
approach to communicating in the classroom. In
Wilkinson, L.C. (Ed.), Communicating in the
classroom. New York: Academic Press.