Notes

Chapter 1. Thinking with Students: Deliberations on the History of Educational Reform

1. For more on the failure of the academic left to rebut Bloom's critique of higher education, see J. Miller. While Miller is concerned with highlighting the resilience of Bloom's argument after a decade of assault, I prefer to draw attention to the unquestioned assumption that refuting Bloom might be of any material consequence at the level of educational practice.

2. Stanley Fish and Dinesh D'Souza, for example, went on tour from September 1991 to March 1992 debating all matters curricular before capacity crowds at college campuses across the nation. See Fish 51–101 for his contributions to these debates.

3. In this way, Graff's proposal in *Professing Literature* illustrates the dynamic relationship that exists between a given historiographic approach to education and what subsequently becomes imaginable as a reform project: studying "the conflicts" leads to an argument for "teaching the conflicts." My own work demonstrates this dynamic as well, since my interest in various institutional constructions of "the student" has led me to argue for the importance of seeing the business of educational reform as intellectual work that is carried out in specific, bureaucratic contexts.

4. For my extended analysis of the relationship between Graff's historical approach and his subsequent reform proposals, see R. Miller, "Composing English Studies." See also Graff's response, "Conflict Pedagogy," and my rejoinder, "Ships."

5. Rose illustrates what is to be gained by moving beyond the official documents and debates of the educational sphere and into actual classrooms.

6. For a critique of methodologies that depend on generating a felt sense of surprise, see Guillory; for a critique of the current reliance on narrative in the academy, see Simpson, *Academic Postmodern.* These critiques do not apply to my use of surprise and of narrative, however. Far from seeking to deploy my own sense of surprise as evidence of what Guillory calls a "quasi-exteriority to the institution" (244), my methodology involves situating moments of surprise precisely within an educational history that permeates the purportedly "private space between the master and the disciple"—a space that is, in fact, overwritten by the curriculum, dominant teaching practices, and the structure of the institution itself. Furthermore, while Simpson sees the academic turn to narrative as a longing for a return to "preprofessional culture" (62), my concern here is to demonstrate that "telling a story" about learning is a historically and discursively constrained act: what can be said about the scene of instruction is restricted by, among other things, the insistence that this experience be described as a voyage from ignorance to understanding. By acknowledging these constraints and working within them here, I aim not to forge some purer communion with the reader but rather to establish my place inside the profession and my awareness of its cultural commonplaces.

7. Richard Nice, the translator of *Distinction*, offers a definition of misrecognition that draws on a common pedagogical event: "'Misrecognition' (*méconnais-*

sance) combines subjective non-recognition (blindness) with objective recognition (legitimation); for example, a teacher who observes his pupils' 'gifts,' or lack of them, and who imagines he is indifferent to social class, objectively helps to legitimate the causes and effects of cultural inequality" (in Bourdieu, *Distinction* 566 n. 46).

8. See Aronowitz and Giroux, for example, who object to "the mechanistic notions of power and domination and the overly determined view of human agency that characterizes much of [Bourdieu's] work" (83). The "dialogic method of knowledge acquisition" that Aronowitz and Giroux support is no less mechanistic, however: to achieve this "dialogic method," for instance, they recommend that teachers "be required to themselves become intellectuals in the technical sense, that is, attain a degree of mastery over the legacy of high culture as well as assimilate and validate the elements of students' experience, which is intimately bound with popular culture" (158). This additional training would, in turn, lead to the eventual collapse of the market for cultural capital: "The point [of revising teacher training in this way] is not to reproduce high culture; the point is to make these works a part of our popular culture and eventually, on the basis of selection, eliminate their canonical status entirely" (159).

9. While the history of composition studies is undoubtedly populated with instrumentalist approaches to language acquisition and instruction, anyone who characterizes the entire field as favoring a technobureaucratic mission misunderstands how cultural capital circulates in this realm of the profession and is wholly unaware of the field's ongoing debate about the role of "the personal" in writing instruction. For his purposes, though, Guillory is content to allow composition to figure as the beachhead on which "the technobureaucrats" have secured a foothold for launching their attacks on the essentially antibureaucratic work of literary studies.

10. At the end of *Cultural Capital*, Guillory acknowledges that there is no chance that the aesthetic experience will be universalized, since "socializing the means of production and consumption is only a thought experiment" (340). These final words are apparently meant to bear a certain self-ironic pathos, with their reference to Marx's "thought experiment" in *The German Ideology* about life in a communist society where, as Guillory puts it, "no one is a painter because everyone is (or can be)" (338).

11. On this point, my overarching concern with how commitments to theoretical, methodological, ideological, and evidentiary purity prevent the intellectual from acting on or analyzing the "impure" world of lived experience overlaps with Guillory's effort to explain why interest in the aesthetic has declined. Guillory attributes this decline to "the discourse of purity" that has suppressed the obvious fact that "the experience of *any* cultural work is an experience of an always composite pleasure" (336, original emphasis). As I will show, pedagogical materials and the artifacts of educational reform, more generally, rarely imagine the student as capable of "an always composite" response to the experience of schooling.

12. We are, of course, always awash in such statistical information, which means both that there is always evidence to support radically opposed programs of reform and that there is always an argument for collecting more information before acting. This doesn't mean that all this information is essentially useless, however.

For example, according to the *New York Times*, a recent study has confirmed—once again—that economic class plays the most significant role in determining school success, thereby providing evidence in support of the argument for expanding the availability of financial aid to low-income families (Honan). Furthermore, this report's finding that a child's aspirations with regards to higher education have been solidified by the eighth grade makes it clear that university-level reforms only affect a population already dramatically reduced by teaching and testing practices at the lower levels. Thus, to become engaged in the process of designing and implementing workable plans that will address the problem of producing and nurturing a desire for advanced education—indeed, even to recognize this as a problem—is to accept one's enmeshment in a bureaucratic system that necessarily views the population as a site of problematization in need of better management.

Chapter 2. Ministering to a Mind Diseased: Matthew Arnold, Her Majesty's Inspector

1. See, for example, Lipman: "Why, a century and a quarter after its initial appearance, should we read *Culture and Anarchy*? My answer is simple. Because we need culture, and we have anarchy" (213).

2. The relationship between educational practices in India and Great Britain is, in fact, much more complicated than Said's brief account allows. Before the British began forcing the people of India to speak and study English, they were importing Indian pedagogical practices into the British educational system. Dr. Andrew Bell, who recorded seeing in India "a youth of eleven years of age, with his little assistants under him, teaching upwards of fifty boys," is credited with bringing the "monitorial method" of instruction to Great Britain, where it was adopted by the two philanthropic organizations responsible for educating the poor (qtd. in Hyndman 17).

3. While Super admits he is "probably alone in thinking that Arnold meant this obviously exaggerated statement (as it must have seemed to him) from one of his father's private letters (where, for all we know, it was meant humorously) as fun" (qtd. in Walcott 130 n. 70), Keating makes a much more compelling case for seeing this passage as evidence of the depth of Arnold's commitment to bringing about a cultural change. As Keating puts it, for Arnold to "have spoken so strongly for culture without wishing to make it prevail would have been to become the aesthetic trifler his critics tried to see him as" (234).

4. To be sure, Arnold's writing shows up in important documents of educational reform. But citation does not necessarily establish influence: it can be read just as well as a strategy for gaining approval for decisions made elsewhere. Arnold is cited, for example, at the beginning of the Newbolt Report, as the committee sets about launching its argument that teaching English can serve to create a national culture: "Matthew Arnold, using the word in its true sense, claimed that 'Culture unites classes.' He might have added that a system of education which disunites classes cannot be held worthy of the name of a national culture. In this respect we have

even fallen away from an earlier and better tradition" (*Teaching of English* 6). As Baldick points out, though, Arnold did not in fact write "Culture unites classes," but rather that culture "seeks to do away with classes" (qtd. in Baldick 95). And, of course, in using Arnold to harken back to an "earlier and better tradition," the authors of the Newbolt Report forget that Arnold saw his own time as having itself "fallen away from" a former ideal. In other words, to determine the degree to which Arnold's thinking actually shaped this document, which misquotes him and repackages his moment as an occasion for nostalgia, one would need to pursue the kind of historical approach to educational reform that I outlined in Chapter 1.

5. All citations from Arnold's *Reports on Elementary Schools* are taken from the Marvin edition.

6. That Arnold thinks Shakespeare's plays are best read as poetry is clear from the fact that two of the ten "touchstones" of high poetic quality he refers to in "The Study of Poetry" come from Shakespeare's plays, none from his sonnets (169–70).

7. While not specifically concerned with this example, Willinsky argues that this division of intellectual labor between what students and critics are meant to do with poetry is the Arnoldian legacy that has been passed on to those who work in English Studies. We will see, however, that as an inspector of schools, Arnold was hardly free to pose questions of his own choosing to the students: although the examination question appears to be Arnold's, it is actually the state's way of transforming the act of reading into a measurable event.

8. It wasn't until I. A. Richards's system of reading protocols was institutionalized that the estimation of poetic quality was rescued from this silent interiority and made into a visible object subject to public evaluation. For more on how Richards's exam moved English Studies away from mere " 'fact-grubbing' on the one hand and vague impressionism on the other," see Baldick 155–56; Bové 39–78.

9. Contrary to those who imagine Arnold as having possessed some unique insight into the educational process, Ball insists that "there is little in the views [his School Reports] express to distinguish them from those of other Inspectors; indeed, much of what Arnold had to say before the time of the Revised Code, as to fees, pupil-teachers, class-teaching, infant schools and schools too poor to benefit from the Minutes of 1846, had already been said many times by the Inspectors" covered in her study (233–34).

10. For a consideration of the theory and practice of the monitorial method, see Silver and Silver.

11. Although Arnold's career and his thinking were profoundly influenced by his work for this commission, Pattison makes no mention of this time of government service in his memoirs.

12. In this regard, Foucault is uncharacteristically nostalgic when he laments the replacement of the instruction of apprentices in guilds by exam-driven instruction in schools (187–91). Foucault overlooks the many for whom the guild system would never have validated "an acquired aptitude," whereas the examination system, because it functions as a "constant exchanger of knowledge" (187), has come over time to afford many of these formerly excluded people the opportunity to enter into the system of exchange. Here, as elsewhere, Foucault's preference for subjugated invisi-

bility as opposed to disciplinary subjugation exposes the borders of his utopian vision.

13. The table of examination standards that accompanied the Revised Code, a copy of which may be found in Appendix 1 of Fearon, provides a shining example of one such a *tableau vivant*. Fearon distinguishes "examination" and "inspection" in the following way: "many a teacher, who, if his school had been only examined, would have set his failures down to bad luck, has been convinced by a thorough but kindly inspection, that he has only himself to blame for them, and that it is his own fault if such failures ever recur" (2).

14. Though Lowe is regularly reviled by educational historians for the role he played in determining the shape and the content of elementary instruction in Britain, Sylvester argues convincingly that Lowe "did not invent the principle of payment by results. The idea was already common coin when Lowe decided to implement it as a policy for financing public elementary schools" (57). Corroborating this point, Winter notes that well before Lowe's ascendancy to power, Kay-Shuttleworth had "directed inspectors to hold examinations in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and to withhold funds from schools where the results were unsatisfactory" (177).

15. Arnold reiterates this point in his General Report for 1867, where he informs his superiors, "The truth is, what really needed to be dealt with, in 1862 as at present, was the irregular attendance and premature withdrawal of scholars, not the imperfect performance of their duties by the teachers; but it was far easier to change the course of school instruction and inspection, and to levy forfeitures for imperfect school results upon managers and teachers, than to make scholars come to school regularly and stay there a sufficient time" (*Reports* 112).

16. For evidence that these predictions were warranted, see Kay-Shuttleworth's argument that "Any grant, the amount of which is determined by individual examination after a certain attendance at School, tends to cause the neglect of the irregular, dull, and migratory scholars whom *it does not pay to teach*; while, on the other hand, grants proportionate to the average attendance of scholars are a direct inducement to fill the School, but not to teach the children, if such grants are not accompanied by conditions as to the number of the teaching staff" (15, original emphasis).

17. One of Arnold's General Reports is actually cited in the Newcastle Report as evidence of why the examination process itself needed to be reformed. Having highlighted Arnold's description of examining 150 students in just an hour and a half, the report observes, "such an *examination* is only one in name. It is really *an inspection* rather than an *examination*, and cannot apply the test and stimulus, particularly to the lower classes, which a real inquiry into their knowledge secures" ("Report on Popular Education" 230, original emphasis).

18. In 1864 Lowe himself was censured for "mutilating" the reports that spoke unfavorably of his reforms and, shortly thereafter, resigned his position in the Education Department. For a remarkable account of these proceedings, see Winter 188–93.

19. This aversion to practical details was evident in Arnold's working life as well. Fitch records of his colleague, "the details of administration, the framing of syl-

labuses and schedules, and the laying down of the legal conditions under which the public grant should be assessed and distributed, were tasks not to his mind. But when questions of principle were involved, he was frequently consulted, and we who were his colleagues received from him at times very weighty and practical suggestions" (177).

20. For all the claims about Arnold's prophetic powers, the truth is that the move toward free, universal, compulsory education in Britain came as a direct result of the extension of the franchise, which Arnold had steadfastly opposed (see Simon 354–56). Lowe had also inveighed against allowing a greater percentage of the male population to vote, but once it was clear that the franchise was going to be expanded, he, in that unprincipled fashion which defines the life of a bureaucrat, came to support broader educational reforms, so that those in power could "conquer back by means of a wider and more enlightened cultivation some of the influence which they have lost by political change" (qtd. in Simon 356).

Chapter 3. "Education for Everybody": Great Books and the Democratic Ideal

1. This chapter draws on archival material from two different locations: the Houghton Library at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts (identified HL in the text), which houses the Buchanan papers, and the Maryland Archives in Annapolis, Maryland, which house the papers for St. John's College. Materials drawn from the Maryland Archives are identified in the text as coming from the Buchanan Correspondence (SBC), the Barr Correspondence (BC), or the Klein Correspondence (KC).

2. Macdonald did take a certain delight in entertaining the possibility that his review was responsible for the poor sales of the "densely printed, poorly edited, overpriced and over-syntopiconized collection" in the early fifties (258).

3. Although the University of Chicago has retained the rhetoric of having a "common core" for undergraduates, this core is now composed of a set of rubrics within which there are a range of electives. Nowhere does the catalogue evidence a commitment to Hutchins's vision of what should constitute an undergraduate's education. Rather, it explains that revisions in the university's curriculum were made to ensure "that the tension inherent in contemporary academic life—between the demand for specialization and the need to provide common learning for members of a democratic society—would be resolved in a way consonant with the College's established mission" (*Courses and Programs of Study* 3).

4. See, for instance, Gilbert and Gubar; Said; Spivak, "Multiculturalism"; Gates, "The Master's Pieces" and *Notes*; hooks; McDowell.

5. Denby is the exception here: his best-selling account of returning to the classroom to relive Columbia's yearlong course in Western classics records and reflects on student discussions of the Great Books precisely because the author feels such serious textual work is passing away from the world.

6. Erskine made these recommendations to the Great Books Foundation, a nonprofit organization established in 1947 to take over the University of Chicago's adult

education program. A subsequent study of adult learners participating in the foundation's program made clear that such recommendations were unnecessary since, in practice, the approach self-selected a homogenous group of participants: "in spite of any differences in sex, job, religion, age, generation, etc., most of the people [in the Great Books program] will be talking with others who have pretty much the same aims, and very seldom will they be talking across the table to someone who has a radically different conception of the purposes of the program" (Davis 40).

7. For a more general history of curricular reform at Columbia, see Bell.

8. For a detailed account of the tensions produced by the University of Chicago's obligation to provide undergraduate education and its desire to establish itself as a research rival to the Eastern universities, see McNeill 1–17.

9. According to McNeill, Mason was not a casualty of the battles between those university factions committed to research and those determined to revise the undergraduate curriculum, as his sudden resignation might suggest; rather, the hasty departure was occasioned by a "private, domestic scandal" (McNeill 171 n. 1).

10. While this bureaucratic reorganization ended up profoundly influencing the shape of undergraduate education at the university, Hutchins would later say that it had been accomplished "primarily in the interest of administrative simplification" (Hutchins, "State of the University" 2–3).

11. This appointment, one of Hutchins's first acts as president, had a catastrophic effect on the university's philosophy department: Adler's contemptuous attitude, combined with the faculty's growing suspicions about Hutchins's motives for bringing him to the university, caused the chair of the department, J. H. Tufts, to resign from his administrative position and three other prominent members of the faculty—George H. Mead, E. A. Burtt, and Arthur E. Murphy—to resign from the university (Ashmore 86–87).

12. Acknowledging the shortcomings of one's past educational experience is a central component in the narratives of those committed to advancing the cause of the Great Books Program. For examples, see C. Van Doren 6; Stringfellow Barr, qtd. in Wofford 87; Mellon 178; Wofford iii.

13. Near the end of his tenure as head of the university, Hutchins had this to say about his administrative style: "As I look back over the last twenty years, I am inclined to think that I have tended to put too much faith in mechanical changes" (*State of the University* 15). He observed as well, "Not much can be expected from hortatory resolutions" (16). As we will see, the history of the Great Books approach at Chicago bears out Hutchins's grim self-assessment of his lasting influence.

14. Hutchins was, in fact, called to testify before the senate of Illinois in 1935 to explain why students at the University of Chicago were required to read the *Communist Manifesto*. His defense of academic freedom in general, and of his faculty in particular, was so compelling that the department store magnate Charles Walgreen, who had originally brought the complaint to the state senate, was convinced to present the university with a substantial gift to establish the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions. See Ashmore 128–32; Kogan 250–52.

15. See Adler, *Reforming Education* 66–88, for an example of these incendiary charges.

16. Olson confirms Adler's assessment of McKeon's way of teaching the Great Books (304).

17. For an elaboration of this notion that the Great Books and their readers forever carry on a conversation with one another, see Hutchins, *Great Conversation*.

18. For the extraordinary story of how the University of Chicago acquired the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, see Kogan 247–62; Hyman 249–59.

19. According to Barr, Buchanan refused to accept the presidency on the grounds that he never answered his mail, agreeing to become dean only when Barr made it clear that he wouldn't become president of the college without his friend's help (qtd. in Wofford 88).

20. In a "Memorandum on the College," dated 5/24/37, Buchanan recommends presenting the resident faculty with two options: the college could either be shut down in 1938 or it could be reorganized. If the first option were to be pursued, it would mean that everyone would lose his or her job. If the second option were followed, everyone would have a chance to keep his or her job. If the faculty decided to adopt the second option, however, they needed to understand that the president would "be the sole judge of whom he will retain or invite to his faculty" (SBC, "Memorandum" 11). And in a letter from Barr to Hutchins (BC, 9/28/38), Barr describes the old faculty as doing a fairly good job of gearing up for the New Program, but notes that the AAUP had been "brought down on [his] head" for terminating teachers still under contract.

21. The college continues to promote this vision of itself by distributing a recruitment catalogue that announces, "The following teachers will be returning to St. John's this year..." before listing the names of the authors of the Great Books. This idea has been reiterated in the college's recent "Statement of Educational Policy," written by Eva Brann, longtime tutor and current dean of the Annapolis campus. In this statement, Brann catalogues the sixteen tenets that constitute the school's "radical pedagogy," including the belief that "WE ARE NOT PROFESSORS, and perhaps not even teachers. We are tutors, guardians of learning, at most" ("Statement" 15, original emphasis).

22. To this day, the college does not rely on SAT scores in evaluating applicants to the program. Admission is based on how the applicant responds to five essay questions that solicit, among other things, a discussion of the student's most important reading experience. As Eva Brann explains in her essay "The Program of St. John's College," "We find that except for occasional sad cases, self-selection is the best guarantee of aptitude; the desire to learn outweighs questions of talent" (10).

23. Mellon was originally drawn to the program by a favorable article in *Life* magazine. Although he had already graduated from Yale and studied at Cambridge, Mellon decided to become an undergraduate once again in the fall of 1940. After about six months of struggling with the mathematical and scientific components of the curriculum and "very conscious of being nearer in age to the instructors than to the students," Mellon "gave it up for the life of a soldier" (Mellon 181). Despite the brevity of his stay, Mellon had an abiding fondness for the college and made a series of contributions over the following years that kept the college going, beginning

with a grant of $78,000 in 1941 to address problems with the physical plant (Weigle 10, 53).

24. In a letter of "recommendation," Jacob Klein asserted that many people felt that Buchanan "probably overestimated the average ability of students, the depth of their desire to learn, their devotion to the quest for truth" (KC, 11/22/57).

25. See Huber, who surveys upper-division literature classes and concludes that "the major works and authors remain preeminent in the courses surveyed, though nontraditional texts were cited among the works respondents had recently added to their required readings" (52).

Chapter 4. Cultural Studies for the Masses: Distance Education and the Open University's Ideal Student

1. Accounts of these events vary widely. In his Presidential Report for 1970–72, Marshak asserts that the "militant leadership of the Black and Puerto Rican student body" was responsible for the occupation of the South Campus (12). Traub credits the college's "black club, the Onyx society" with providing the initial impetus for changing the admissions policies at CUNY (48). According to Traub, an offshoot of the Onyx society, the Committee of Ten, worked in concert with members of the Puerto Rican student group, PRISA, to formulate the list of demands that were presented to President Buell Gallagher. When those demands were not met, "a handful of black and Puerto Rican students padlocked the gate leading to South Campus, refusing to allow white students to enter under any circumstances" (49). In yet another version, Lavin, Alba, and Silberstein cite a press release from the BPRSC announcing their "willingness to join white student groups to fight the budget cuts" as evidence that economic pressures played a major role in precipitating the student uprising at City College (11). By their account, the BPRSC called for a boycott of classes on April 21, 1969, for three reasons: the failure of the student protests to convince then-Governor Rockefeller to significantly alter the funding of the CUNY system, the fear that these the budget cuts would further diminish the presence of minority students in the City University system, and the dissatisfaction with the administration's response to the students' earlier demands. The next day, "some two hundred members of the BPRSC entered the south campus ... sealing off half the College's territory and eight of its twenty-two buildings," and "the following day a white group took over another building in a show of support for the BPRSC" (11–12).

2. Traub notes that pictures of the burning auditorium "made the top of each network newscast" and that one of the candidates then seeking to become mayor of New York, Mario Procaccino, "exploited the footage in [his] campaign commercials as if it were Kristallnacht" (53).

3. The other members of U203's course team were Tony Aldgate, Geoffrey Bourne, David Cardiff, Alan Clarke, Noel Coley, David Elliott, Ruth Finnegan, Francis Frascina, John Golby, Graham Martin, Colin Mercer, Richard Middleton, John Muncie, Gill Perry, Bill Purdue, Carrie Roberts, Paddy Scannell, Grahame Thompson, Ken Thompson, and Bernard Waites.

4. See Harris 45–70 for a fuller discussion of how production requirements constrain the writing schedules of the course teams and restrict the possibilities of revision. See Rumble for a more detailed economic analysis of these same issues.

5. Because of this unexpectedly high completion rate, the OU ended up flooding the market with newly degreed students just as the recession was beginning to hit hardest. Indeed, according to Robert McFadden, "by the 1980's [the OU] was awarding more degrees than Oxford and Cambridge combined" (B15). With this in mind, Simpson has argued that the OU's increased production of newly degreed students indirectly served to turn up the heat at Cambridge during Colin Mac-Cabe's famous tenure battle there, because Cambridge "responded to the challenge [of the changing market] not by reorganizing its ever more limited resources but by digging in and refusing to discuss change" ("New Brooms" 261).

6. While this kind of numbers juggling may have assuaged Perry's fears about OU's realization of its mission, McIntosh, Woodley, and Morrison argue after further analysis and study: "Now that the Open University has established its credentials it must concentrate its efforts on becoming more 'open.' While its early years saw some increase in the proportions of students with low educational qualifications and in the manual trades, little progress has been made since then" (193). And, a decade later, Woodley, Taylor, and Butcher report that the university has generally failed to retain ethnic minorities as either students or as members of the university's faculty and staff. For more on this issue, see this chapter's postscript.

7. For examples of such discussions, see the following articles in *Screen Education Notes*: Berry, "Film" and "Materials"; Pye; Bark; and all of nos. 4/5 (1972) and 8 (1973).

8. During this time, Len Masterman offered a third position on the importance of this new area of study, when he argued that film's immediate accessibility makes it the perfect medium for instructing students not destined for the university, a group he describes as "largely composed of those who have never experienced literature's 'civilizing' influence" ("Film" 21). Masterman subsequently revised this position in light of his experiences teaching "low stream kids" in the sixties and seventies, having developed "quite low tolerance thresholds for the elitism of much film culture and criticism" (*Teaching* xiv). As a result, he found himself "increasingly guided in [his] teaching by the dominant media experiences of pupils and students," coming to the conclusion that "if a critical education is to be of any value at all, then it will need to be firmly grounded in the life-experiences of each learner" (xiv). As we will see, this third position—that film was easier to understand than other modes of representation—is one that neither of the warring parties at *Screen* or *Screen Education* was willing to entertain.

9. This last term was suggested by the Editorial Board in *Screen Education*, no. 21 (1976–77), to designate the process of students' making films.

10. One could also argue that the movement toward high academic status reflected a need to move away from students whose life experiences might directly challenge the emergent discipline's assumption that the disempowered were in need of a "serious political education." For an example of such a challenge, see Goodwin, who discusses a course he designed to illustrate the biases of the media to a largely unknowing student body. However, he found himself teaching students

who were the wives and children of coal miners then engaged in a bitter national strike—students, in other words, who knew quite well the power of the media to shape events to meet the interests of the dominant classes. Goodwin's essay illustrates how the student that is constructed in theory and the student with a history in the world are not identical, the latter serving to disturb the assumptions that produced the former if the actual student is allowed to speak and be heard.

11. The reply is signed by the following: Ben Brewster, Elizabeth Cowte, Jon Halliday, Kari Hanet, Stephen Heath, Colin MacCabe, Paul Willemen, and Peter Wollen. The four resigning members were replaced by six new members: Richard Dyer, John Ellis, Christine Geraghty, Annette Kuhn, Steve Neale, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith.

12. When I interviewed Colin MacCabe about this time on the journal, he said: "Questions of education weren't exactly ignored or repressed. We were not interested in the dominant educational orthodoxy at all." This is borne out in MacCabe's response to my follow-up question regarding whom he would name as representing this dominant position: "After the 1976 split, there were no representatives of progressive [i.e., student-centered] educational opinion on the board. There were some of the board committed to educational questions but hostile to progressive views and there were others who were not interested in education at all" (interview with author, April 10, 1991).

13. Nor is it the case that "hard" (i.e., structuralist) theory took the high road to *Screen*, while "soft" (i.e., culturalist) theory found a happy community in *Screen Education*. Hall, for instance, provides a critique of *Screen*'s use of psychoanalytic theory remarkably similar to the one proffered by Buscombe et al., diverging only in his commitment to developing "an adequate concept of 'struggle' in ideology" ("Emergence" 161).

14. During the past decade, *Screen* (the journal is never referred to by its longer, official name) has turned out two issues devoted solely to pedagogy: 24.2 (1983) and 27.5 (1986). In 1989, when the British Film Institute did away with SEFT entirely, *Screen*'s ownership and its editorial offices were transferred to the John Logie Baird Centre in Scotland where, the new editors assured its readers, it would be "difficult for *Screen* to maintain a pretence any longer that it is not an academic journal" (Editorial Board 3).

15. The overlap with U203 is not just discursive: some figures surface in both contexts. Colin MacCabe appeared as one of many scholars who made presentations to the U203 course team, while Ed Buscombe (one of the resignation signatories) and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (one of the replacements for the resignation signatories) also "helped in various ways" (T. Bennett, "Out in the Open" 152 n. 1). And, as we will see, Bennett himself contributed to *Screen Education*.

16. Consider, for instance, Womphrey's assessment of the student responses to the block on "Form and Meaning": "U203 students found Block 4 very hard going. Hardly any OU units have been rated more difficult than U203 15 and 16 ["Reading and realism" and " 'Reading' popular music," respectively]; Unit 16 is in the bottom 1% of OU units for 'interest,' and Units 15 and 16 are in the bottom 10% as regards high workload" ("Feedback Block 4" 3).

17. Bennett was prompted to provide his 1996 account of U203, "Out in the Open: Reflections on the History and Practice of Cultural Studies," by my essay " 'A Moment of Profound Danger': British Cultural Studies away from the Center," which puts forth a substantially abbreviated version of the argument I'm making here.

18. It is worth recalling Keddie's concern with relevance in this regard: in the highly visible arena of education at the OU, downplaying student "experience" might well have been perceived as a necessary step for realizing a higher disciplinary status.

19. The summer session, which included a stay at Blackpool Beach, may have afforded just such an opportunity. For reasons that are not entirely clear, the IET did not solicit evaluations for this part of the course, which in itself suggests that that office did not see the session as integral to the course. Cubitt, in contrast, uses the summer session as the cornerstone of his appeal to save U203 from cancellation (92–93). Ian Purser, a student in the course, recalls the journey to Blackpool: "I certainly didn't feel that we were intended to condemn Blackpool and its culture. What came over to me was the fascination of the intellectual middle-class for an earthier, less inhibited culture, that of working-class Northern England, a combination of admiration for its vigor and vulgarity, and amusement and/or horror at some of its forms (e.g. the wax museum showing exhibits of gruesome murders and car-crashes)" (letter to author, October 11, 1994).

20. Obviously, I have not provided an exhaustive study of the forces that shaped the pedagogical encounter in U203. Ian Purser notes, for instance, that the political events occurring at this time also had an obvious influence on the reception of this course. Specifically, the Conservatives' return to power in Britain in 1979 "brought with it a return to 'red-menace' rhetoric, talk of the 'enemy within' and an increasingly hardline stance in the Cold War. To be left-wing was to be unpatriotic, and flag-waving was brought to a new pitch by the Falklands War in early 1982" (letter to author, October 11, 1994).

21. In describing what it was like to teach at CCCS during the sixties and early seventies, Hall recalls that "it was impossible for us to maintain for very long the illusion that we were teaching our graduate students from some established body of knowledge, since it was perfectly clear to them that we were making it up as we went along" ("Emergence" 17).

22. In the summer of 1995, CUNY announced that it would "no longer accept students judged unable to complete all remedial work within the freshman year" (Jones A1). It further declared that beginning in the fall of 1996, it would "limit the number of remedial courses students at the four-year colleges can take" (Bernstein). Amid the general declarations of the failure of open admissions, a new study by David Lavin and David Hyllegard, *Changing the Odds: Open Admissions and the Life Chances of the Disadvantaged*, which surveyed "students who entered the City University under the open-admissions policy, [has] found that more than half received bachelor's degrees, sometimes more than a decade later, and [that] they went on to better-paying jobs as a result" (Arenson A1). Apparently, earlier studies failed to consider how long it would take students to complete their degrees, with the result that many who were still inching toward completion were counted as dropouts.

Chapter 5. Teaching Others:
Ethnography and the Allure of Expertise

1. There are many excellent ethnographies of high school students, including Ogbu, *Next Generation*; Willis; MacLeod; Foley; Heath and McLaughlin. Aside from Moffatt, *Coming of Age*, the only other sustained ethnographic study of undergraduates is Holland and Eisenhart, which focuses on women in college. One need only consider the huge success of the documentary film *Hoop Dreams*, which concludes when the two aspiring basketball stars enter college, to get a glimpse of schooling's master narrative, which places the drama of the process in the transitional space of secondary education: once the aspirants have moved through this space, they no longer evoke the same degree of interest or sympathy and so the story must be over.

2. Baker, for instance, states that Moffatt "has written a book every professor should read, especially those who teach in large state universities." And, Baker continues, *Coming of Age in New Jersey* is "one of the most thoughtfully crafted case studies of undergraduate culture that has ever been written in the field of higher education" (54). Wilkinson describes Moffatt as "a multi-talented, multi-disciplinary scholar of higher education who writes without a trace of gobbledygook. He deserves a wide following" (160). Thelin characterizes the work as "beautifully written, carefully researched...a classic" (105). And Ebner praises Rutgers for fostering "an admirably high standard" for academic freedom by allowing Moffatt to pursue his "extraordinary ethnographic work" (354–55).

3. For example, John Ogbu was hired by the Stockton Unified School District in 1968 to study their bilingual educational project in order that they might understand the disappointing performance of minorities in the school system (Ogbu, *Next Generation*). At the same time, on the other side of the country, Heath's graduate courses in anthropology and linguistics had started to fill with teachers who desperately wanted help finding ways to understand the new student populations that confronted them (Heath, *Ways with Words*).

4. It is, as chance would have it, where I am employed as well.

5. In his review article ("Ethnographic Writing" 210), Moffatt places himself in an elite group of anthropologists who spent from six to ten years in the field.

6. Moffatt's choice of words here reveals his own investment in class distinctions among institutions: the undergraduate perspectives are "less-than-elite" because the students involved in his study go to Rutgers, not Harvard. And, as we will see, this fact about the student population is meant to suggest that their perspectives on higher education are both more representative and less worthy of being taken seriously that those of their counterparts in the Ivy Leagues.

7. In his balanced review of Freeman's critical reevaluation of Mead's work, Rappaport concludes that Freeman has missed the crucial point that Mead produced both better science and better myth than the eugenicists she was arguing against. As Rappaport puts it, "the choice, if choice there is, for any individual or society is not between myth and no myth but among accounts contending for mythic status. We will be well served if those we choose [in the future] are as humane and liberating as the text Mead gave us" (347).

8. As a representative of the values and conventions of academic culture, Moffatt is strikingly consistent in presenting himself as someone who knows better than the students themselves do the intentions behind their actions. Thus, when one of his roommates seeks to engage him in what the student might well have felt was a scholarly discussion, asking the anthropologist if "blacks have a better survival instinct than whites," Moffatt's response is immediate: " 'Well, for a start,' I replied, 'the question is a racist one' " (*Coming of Age* 17). When the same student described college students from the sixties as "rebels without a cause," in contrast to his own "more mature" generation, Moffatt reacts with a list of alternative adjectives for the undergraduate population: "How about more quiescent, more apathetic, and more apolitical?" Following this outburst, Moffatt observes only that the student "looked embarrassed and asked me to tell him what those words meant" (17). From our vantage point, it is worth asking what the student is meant to learn about academic culture from such an interchange—besides that his teacher perceives him to have racist thoughts, an impoverished sense of history, and a rudimentary vocabulary.

9. This is a standard aspect of Moffatt's research methodology. When he wanted to know how students feel about race, he handed out an anonymous questionnaire, where students were instructed to give "their real opinions on the questions, however embarrassing they might be, rather than the polite ones that they usually felt they had to offer up in public" (*Coming of Age* 177 n. 26). And, when Moffatt came across a review of *Ferris Bueller's Day Off* with which he disagreed, he handed out a questionnaire to his students that asked, among other things, if they would want Ferris as a friend and what they thought Ferris would be doing at age forty-five ("Do We Really Need 'Postmodernism'?" 372 n. 1, 373 n. 5).

10. Moffatt renamed all the dorms in his study, noting that "readers who don't recognize the source of the 'Erewhon' in Erewhon Hall have only themselves and their shoddy educations to blame" (*Coming of Age* 21 n. 3). Readers who do recognize the source, however, might wonder at the appropriateness of this particular allusion, which transforms these college living quarters into Samuel Butler's fictionalized world that is the inversion of our own.

11. Heath herself has subsequently used *Ways with Words* to make statements about the reading and writing of African Americans in general. See, for instance, Heath, *Ways with Words* 368, and "Sense" 15.

12. Ogbu's ethnographic work has managed to keep its focus squarely on minorities in the educational system without disposing of the categories of class and race. As a result, he has reached conclusions about the existence of "caste-like minorities" in the United States that would, no doubt, have disturbed the students in Heath's class. See Ogbu, *Next Generation* and *Minority Education*.

13. Heath and Shelby Anne Wolf have subsequently coauthored a book that explores how it is that the children of "townspeople" come to learn the arts of imagination that promote success in school.

14. Heath has since said that given the chance to do the book over again, she would omit the "Ethnographer Doing" section entirely. Although she insists she "would have written a better book had [she] stuck to writing about the communities and their settings of work and leisure" ("Madness(es)" 266), what makes her

book remarkable is that it moves from research to reform. To excise the "Ethnographer Doing" section would be to return the work to the normative realm of conventional, descriptive ethnography. As Heath's more recent work on inner-city youth groups reveals, she fortunately has not confined her subsequent work to this safer realm, insisting instead on using ethnographic research as the basis for developing policy from the ground up (see Heath and McLaughlin).

15. That the literate practices of the black community should end up ultimately escaping final analysis will not surprise some. Henry Louis Gates Jr. has asserted, for instance, that African Americans learn "how to 'signify' " as part of their adolescent education, which involves "ever punning, ever troping, ever embodying the ambiguity of language" ("The 'Blackness of Black' " 286). And Mae Henderson has argued that "black women must speak in a plurality of voices as well as in a multiplicity of discourses," a practice she calls "speaking in tongues" (277). Others, though, might be troubled that in Heath's study this unspeakable knowledge is seen to show itself only when blacks are singing in church and not when they are at home teaching their children to speak and read or when they are moving about in the secular world.

16. Heath has subsequently acknowledged that her "comfort level was highest in Trackton where themes, tastes, and smells of [her own] life as a child among Trackton-like children played again and again for [her]" ("Madness(es)" 264).

17. This approach has led Heath to advocate consistently on behalf of African Americans and other minorities, arguing that their potential contributions to the evolving workplace have yet to be recognized. Indeed, she has gone so far as to say that "traditional oral and literate habits of Black Americans match the demands and needs of employers in the late 20th century far better than those of most classrooms" ("Oral and Literate Traditions" 372).

18. Ironically, the micromanagement of classroom practice that followed in the wake of this bureaucratization of the schools ended up making it possible for two of the children of Roadville to grow up and become teachers. As Heath reports, these two "like the individualized instruction mandates of their districts, feeling secure in 'knowing what it is [they] have to do each day' " ("Madness(es)" 257). Heath even attributes the entrenchment of "step-by-step learning and standardized testing" to the fact that more and more Roadville women have come to see teaching as a viable career option (260–61).

19. See, for example, Heath and Thomas, where Heath asserts that letter writing and research on early language use helped her subject, "T," show "increased confidence in expressing herself, some improvement in her command of the mechanics of writing, and development of an ability to write a well-formed friendly letter and to summarize facts in a narrative style" (67). See, as well, Heath and Mangiola, where the benefits of cross-age tutoring are extolled: "By the end of the term the students' transcriptions of their own data had become so expert, and their methods of analysis so keen, they could determine subtle sentence structure differences between native speakers and non-native speakers and differentiate 'real' conversations from invented ones or literary dialogue" (32).

20. Heath's interest in Zinnea Mae is ongoing: see Heath, "Oral and Literate Traditions"; "Children of Trackton's Children"; and "Fourth Vision." This long duration of their relationship has allowed Heath to study Zinnea Mae's children, who have been raised in a tenement in Atlanta. Because these children show none of the signs of verbal facility and playfulness displayed by the Trackton children discussed in *Ways with Words*, Heath has been compelled to revise her view that the ways of using language within a given community change very slowly ("Children of Trackton's Children" 500).