INTRODUCTION.

WHAT WE TALK ABOUT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT DONALD MURRAY: FROM EXPRESSIVIST TO REFORMER

> [H]istorians in rhetoric and composition are more than storytellers who invite listeners to sit at separate fires to learn separate tales of the past. They are also teachers. It is the historian's responsibility to teach us a variety of ways to read the past, to engage in historical debate, to position narratives in relation to each other so as to gain critical perspective, to draw conclusions on and consider implications of opposing historical projects, and to create constructive tension that moves us forward in our inquiry.
>
> – Kathleen A. Welsch, "Review"

> Like most brilliant insights, Don's comments on writing were of the "what you didn't know you already really knew" variety. That is, they felt so intuitively and immediately true that you couldn't help but wonder how you had never come to them on your own. I suspect that is one reason why Don's contributions to our field have sometimes been underestimated: many of his insights about the processes of writing and teaching have become so deeply embedded in our practices that we often forget their source.
>
> – Lad Tobin, "Why Murray Matters"

I was several years into this project when Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle's collection *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* was published and quickly appeared on my "to read" list (and, just as quickly, on my course syllabi). "[F]ifty (plus) years of research has led us to know some things about the subject of composed knowledge and the questions we ask related to this broad term," Adler-Kassner and Wardle write in the book's Introduction. Their collection, they go on to explain, "represents an effort to bring together those things we know" (59).

As excited as I was about *Naming What We Know*, and as much fun as I had introducing its threshold concepts to students, I initially failed to connect the book with my research into the life and work of Donald M. Murray. Then one day I found myself discussing threshold concept 4.2, Failure Can Be an Important Part of Writing Development, with a group of students and the connection became too obvious to miss. As I walked back to my office after class, my mind kept returning to Murray's *The Craft of Revision*, a book with which I had taught during my first years in the classroom. Pulling my old, dog-eared copy off the shelf I skimmed to the first chapter, "Rewrite Before Writing," and read the two epigraphs Murray includes there:

> Fail. Fail again. Fail Better. (Samuel Beckett)
>
> I've missed more than 9000 shots in my career. I've lost almost 300 games. 26 times, I've been trusted to take the game winning shot and missed. I've failed over and over and over again in my life. And that is why I succeed. (Michael Jordan)

Failure was, I recalled as I read, a big part of Murray's approach to composition pedagogy. At my desk, a quick review of my research blog revealed, further, that failure was something Murray started writing about way back in 1968, in the early days of his career as a college English professor. In "Give Your Students the Writer's Five Experiences" he writes, "Sometimes the first draft may be the final draft, but usually the writer tries to say something, and fails, and through failure tries to say it better, and fails, but perhaps, eventually, he says it well enough" (8). Fast forward almost twenty-five years to 1991, the year of the publication of the first edition of *The Craft of Revision*, and Murray was still writing about failure:

> This book is an invitation. It is not a typical textbook in which the author, an expert on the subject, lectures and instructs, presenting the writer's ideas on history, absolute principles on economics, theories of psychology or law, the laws of physics.
>
> This book is different because the author is still learning to write. Each page reflects what I am learning as I write and rewrite this textbook. Write along with me. Try your own experiments in meaning, use your language to explore your world as I use my language to explore my world.
>
> It is all a matter of trial and instructive error. I try to say what I cannot say and fail but find failure instructive. It shows me another way to attempt to say what I have not before said. Fail with me. (5)

Fail with me. It's vintage Murray, speaking the unspeakable with an ironic wink and a smile.

As it turns out, however, and as I soon realized, this passage from *The Craft of Revision* suggests other connections between Murray and what we were now claiming to know about writing. When Murray writes, “This book is different because the author is still learning to write. Each page reflects what I am learning as I write and rewrite this textbook,” it’s hard not to think of threshold concept 4.0, All Writers Have More to Learn. When Murray urges readers to “Try your own experiments in meaning, use your language to explore your world as I use my language to explore my world” one can hear echoes of threshold concept 1.3, Writing Expresses and Shares Meaning to be Reconstructed by the Reader. When, later in the section I have quoted from above, Murray writes “Try what you can’t yet write and as you draft a topic that you think you do not know, you may find that you know more than you thought you did” it is not difficult to summon to mind threshold concept 1.1, Writing is a Knowledge-Making Activity. And when Murray writes, again, later in this section, “[A]s you continue to rewrite, you will find that the subject comes clear,” one cannot help but think of threshold concept 4.4, Revision is Central to Developing Writing. In sum, a quick skim of the opening pages of *The Craft of Revision* reveals numerous opportunities to trace what we were now saying we knew about writing to Donald Murray.

Replacing *Craft* on my shelf and picking up *Naming What We Know* I began a search for Murray’s name. Coming up empty in the index I searched in the various lists of citations at the end of each of the book’s five chapters. When he was nowhere to be found there, either, I quickly reviewed the book’s Introduction to try to better understand Adler-Kassner and Wardle’s editorial process. In their effort to concisely articulate the field’s knowledge, they write, their contributors “set about looking at the research and theory to determine what they could agree we collectively know” (63). Surely Murray, who, between 1963 and 2006 wrote twelve books about writing and its teaching and published fourteen articles in NCTE-sponsored journals alone, was part of the research and theory the contributors examined? If so, readers of *Naming What We Know* wouldn’t know it. The book contains not a single reference to or citation of Donald Murray.

Now, in pointing out this omission my intention is not to blame Adler-Kassner and Wardle or the contributors to their collection. Murray’s absence in *Naming What We Know*, I am sure, was not intentional. It is his *presence*, at least to those who know how to look for it, that makes his absence in the collection so conspicuous. For if Donald Murray is not credited, less than ten years after his death, in a collection as significant and momentous as *Naming What We Know*, with helping to establish what we now say we know about writing in the field of composition and rhetoric, with what is he credited? Asked differently (and with a nod to Raymond Carver), if not failure, lifelong learning, the social construction of meaning, writing-as-knowledge-making, and the importance of revision, what *do* we talk about when we talk about Donald Murray in the field these days?

DONALD MURRAY = EXPRESSIVIST

For decades two narratives have circulated about Murray within the broad universe of our field. The first, largely a local story forwarded by members of the community of writers, teachers, and researchers who grew up around Murray at UNH in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, is a "Great Man" tale. Within this narrative Murray, author of "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product," an essay that has come to function as a kind of disciplinary "Declaration of Independence" for the field, shines as a heroic figure leading a revolution against the educational and disciplinary establishment. Well-suited to play the part of the "Great Man," Murray, a survivor of the Great Depression and World War II, reached the pinnacle of success in American journalism in the mid 1950s when he won a Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing, became an editor at *Time* magazine and then an accomplished and prolific freelance writer who placed essays and stories in some of the most well-known general interest publications of the post-war era. Transitioning to college teaching in 1963, the very year that many identify as the moment of the modern field's founding (Bridwell-Bowles; Carillo; Connors; Crowley; North; Smit), Murray functions as a kind of George Washington of our field. In penning our disciplinary Declaration of Independence, he may also be our Thomas Jefferson.

The second narrative about Murray circulates in the wider field of composition and rhetoric and positions him quite differently. If Murray plays the Great Man in the first account he functions as a figure of embarrassment, even ridicule, in the second due to his association with expressionistic rhetoric or expressivism. As an expressivist, Murray was deemed an advocate of a politically naïve and ineffectual writing pedagogy that failed to account for the socio-cultural and political aspects of composing. No one has narrated the story about how Murray (and Elbow and Macrorie) was marginalized in the late 1980s and 1990s more memorably than Wendy Bishop, who writes:

> Elbow and Murray were made safe by transformation into figures, by relegation to expressivist categories. Then, as the field professionalized, there followed a progression of diminishment and tuckings-away, a little like the nouveau riche habit of sticking the money-earning but foolishly-dressed grandfather in the back study, not introducing him to high society company where he might embarrass. (24)

Here, Bishop provides us with a striking image to grasp the second narrative about Murray: the "foolishly-dressed grandfather" or, in Murray's case, the foolish expressivist who still asks students to pen personal essays and read tired expository pieces by writers like E.B. White. If Murray plays the part of the hero in the first story, in the second he's more the fool.

Of these two narratives, the latter, I would argue, has had the greater purchase and staying power, giving birth to a conceptual frame, *Donald Murray = Expressivist*, that has, despite the efforts of those who have sought to resist or negate it (see Ballenger; Newkirk, "Donald Murray and the 'Other Self'"; Tobin; Williams), been highly influential in shaping our disciplinary understanding and conception of Murray. It's become what we talk about when we talk about Donald Murray. The linguist George Lakoff defines conceptual frames, and *Donald Murray = Expressivist* is surely a good example of one, as "mental structures that shape the way we see the world" (xv). All words, Lakoff argues, are understood within and "defined relative to conceptual frames." Words "activate" frames in our brains and once these are established they're difficult to shake. "Thinking differently," Lakoff asserts, "requires speaking differently" and speaking differently—about Murray, about anyone—as teachers of rhetoric know all too well, is no simple task.

I have lived uncomfortably with what the historian Lynée Lewis Gaillet calls the "traditional 'truth'" of the *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame since I first encountered it while reading James Berlin's (in)famous article "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class" in a graduate seminar in the early 2000s. I am not the first to be troubled by it but, as Bronwyn Williams acknowledges, there are limits to what one can accomplish when attempting to refute a dominant and established frame. "Like so many of my 'expressivist' friends" Williams writes of his efforts to push back against *Donald Murray = Expressivist,*

> I feel as if I am fighting on someone else's terms to have someone like Don Murray taken seriously again. . . . It is a defensive position, marked by attempts to re-label ourselves, qualify our statements, maintain that we are not "merely or simply expressivist" (22) and, yes, argue that Don Murray's work is based on theoretical assumptions that have not been adequately recognized. For our efforts we get lightly dismissed, like bright young children who don't yet understand how the world really works.

According to linguist Lakoff, "how the world really works" is that the best way *not* to change a conceptual frame is to attempt to refute it (hence the title of Lakoff's popular book, *Don't Think of an Elephant*). To really change a frame, Lakoff argues, a communicator must reclaim "the power to decide what's important" by creating a new frame "to reset the terms of discussion or debate" (xv). And therein lies my purpose in this book. In attempting to reframe Murray, my argument is simple: Donald Murray should be understood and remembered *not* as a proponent of a single approach to composition pedagogy but, rather, as a *reformer* of an academic discipline, English, that he felt shortchanged writing and its teaching and an educational system that he felt all too often disenfranchised students.

I draw this term, *reformer*, from the work of the late Robert Connors, Murray's colleague at UNH. In his wide-ranging *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*, Connors posits that in the 1960s, during the years Murray was transitioning from journalist/freelancer to college English professor, three new groups of scholars, researchers, and theorists emerged to challenge the dominant paradigm in composition (i.e., current-traditional rhetoric). For students of Berlin, two of Connors' three groups, the New Rhetoricians (later, social-constructivists) and the Empiricists (or cognitivists), likely sound familiar. Connors' coins a different term, however, to describe his third group: the Reformers (or writing process theorists). These teacher-scholars, Connors argues, were "concerned not so much with what students were taught as how they were taught." He continues:

> In the minds of these teachers, the problem with composition-rhetoric went deeper than mere issues of content, and the received methods of teaching writing were not merely inefficient or unworkable. The way in which composition was taught, to these theorists, was at best a bad method. At worst, it was actively destructive, leading to desiccation of the student's creativity, to useless fear about meaningless (and probably fictional) entities such as Emphasis and The Paragraph or Comparison and Contrast, to writer's block, paranoia about mechanical issues, and to dead, imitative, ponderous student prose that attempted to mimic the dead, imitative, ponderous prose of academia. (16)

In Connors' articulation of the Reformers, I find a vivid and accurate depiction of the Donald Murray I have come to know over the course of the dozen or so years I have spent investigating his life and work. In borrowing and forwarding this frame, *reformer*, I seek, per Lakoff, to "reset the terms of discussion or debate" about Murray. By historicizing him, which is to say by placing him, per Gaillet, "within the framework and exigence of [his] times," I seek to reframe Murray for a new generation of composition teachers and scholars and establish a new legacy for him rooted in the historical details of his accomplishments in and contributions to our field (36).

REFRAMING DONALD MURRAY

Reframing Murray, as I attempt to do in this book, can profitably begin with an examination of the roots of the conceptual frame that has so come to define him.

Donald Murray = Expressivist was borne out of efforts in the 1970s and 1980s to describe the theories, philosophies, and rhetorics guiding composition pedagogy at the time (see Berlin, "Contemporary Composition," "Rhetoric and Ideology"; Faigley; Fulkerson, "Composition Theory in the Eighties," "Four Philosophies of Composition"; Lynn). Of those conducting such inquiries, some chose to point to specific theorists as exemplars of particular approaches while others left it up to readers to determine which theorists might be slotted into which camps—or even whether slotting was, in the first place, a wise endeavor. Of the taxonomizers only Berlin explicitly links Murray with expressivism, doing so for the first time in *Rhetoric and Reality*, where he asserts that Murray should be understood as "one of the leading expressionists of the sixties and seventies" (151) and, for the second time, in "Rhetoric and Ideology," where he mounts a full-throated critique of and attack on expressionistic rhetoric and on those he identifies as its chief advocates (Murray, but also Elbow and Macrorie). For those unfamiliar with or simply long past Berlin's arguments, I'd like to linger on them a moment, especially those presented in "Rhetoric and Ideology," since they have had such influence in the field for so long.[1]

"Rhetoric and Ideology" builds on and extends Berlin's earlier article, "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories" in which he describes the four pedagogical approaches he finds most evident in the teaching of composition and rhetoric at the time (i.e., Neo-Aristotelian or Classicist, Positivist or Current-Traditionalist, Neo-Platonist or Expressionist, and New Rhetorical), and argues, however lightly, for the New Rhetorical approach. If anyone plays the villain in "Contemporary Composition" it's the Positivists or Current-Traditionalists, who, by 1982, most in our field agreed were largely responsible for the decades-old failures of composition pedagogy. "Neo-Platonic, Neo-Aristotelian, and what I have called New Rhetoric," Berlin explains in "Contemporary Composition," are "reactions to the inadequacy of Current-Traditional Rhetoric to teach students a notion of the composing process that will enable them to become effective persons as they become effective writers" (777). While Berlin admits that his own "sympathies" are with the New Rhetoric, he argues that the three approaches "can be considered as one in their efforts to establish new directions for a modern rhetoric" (777). Notably, in his articulation of the Neo-Platonist or Expressionist approach, Berlin references neither Murray nor Elbow. Significantly, the polemical in "Contemporary Composition" is largely subverted to the expository. Berlin's purpose seems less to argue than to describe.

---

[1] This may be because "Rhetoric and Ideology" was long anthologized in one of the field's most popular collections used in graduate education, *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Notably, it was dropped from the book's third and most recent edition.

Fast forward six years, to the publication of "Rhetoric and Ideology," and Berlin's aims had evolved. Whereas in "Contemporary Composition" he was largely interested in describing approaches to composition pedagogy, in "Rhetoric and Ideology" he moves on from describing to critiquing the classroom rhetorics he finds most problematic and arguing for the rhetoric he deems most well-suited to a new goal, seemingly unrelated to teaching: exposing the "mystifications" of capitalist society.[2] The three rhetorics Berlin discusses in "Rhetoric and Ideology" are, famously, cognitive psychology, expressionism, and social-epistemic rhetoric, with the last being Berlin's preference in that it "places the question of ideology at the center of teaching writing." (Cognitive psychology, in its efforts to discover "objective truth," largely ignores or attempts to circumvent ideology. Expressionist rhetoric, while grounded in a critique of "the ideology of corporate capitalism," (492) is too easily co-opted by the forces it seeks to oppose.) The primary fodder for Berlin's critique of expressionistic rhetoric in "Rhetoric and Ideology" comes from the work of Donald Murray and Elbow, with Berlin drawing on Murray's first book, *A Writer Teaches Writing* and one of his first articles "Finding Your Own Voice in an Age of Dissent" as key sources for his analysis and critique.[3] A careful rereading of "Rhetoric and Ideology" suggests that Berlin's condemnation of expressionistic rhetoric ultimately boils down to its too-great focus on the individual as the locus of social change. "For expressionistic rhetoric," he writes, "the correct response to the imposition of current economic, political, and social arrangements is thus resistance, but a resistance that is always construed in individual terms" (487). Expressionistic rhetoric, he continues, is "inherently and debilitatingly divisive of political protest, suggesting that effective resistance can only be offered by individuals, each acting alone" (487). Contrast this with Berlin's preferred social-epistemic rhetoric, in which "Self-autonomy and self-fulfillment are possible not through becoming detached from the social, but through resisting those social influences that alienate and disempower, [and] doing so, moreover, in and through social activity" (491). If expressionists like Murray and Elbow and social-epistemics like Berlin share common ground, it seems, it is in their concern about the problem of alienation that individuals experience because of "the material conditions of [their] existence," (490). Where they seem to differ, however, is in their remedy (i.e., Murray/Elbow = individual empowerment; Berlin = social protest).

---

[2] Why or how does this matter to what writing teachers do in the classroom, one might ask. "[A] way of teaching is never innocent," Berlin warns his readers near the end "Rhetoric and Ideology." "Every pedagogy is imbricated in ideology" (492).

[3] It's amazing to discover, given the impact and longevity of Berlin's arguments, that in "Rhetoric and Ideology" he draws on just two of Murray's publications as evidence for his assertions, each of which was almost a quarter century old at the time he was writing.

DONALD MURRAY = EXPRESSIVIST . . .?

As scholars David Gold and David Stock have pointed out, Berlin's taxonomies have had substantial impact on our field's understanding of its disciplinary past. As Gold puts it, "Rhetoric and composition historiography might be considered a series of footnotes to Berlin" (19-20). For Stock, Berlin "has had an enduring and disproportionate influence on Writing Studies' perception of its history and pedagogies," his histories and taxonomies "often treated as historical facts rather than as social constructions" (193). As Maureen Daly Goggin reminds us, "History, like any scholarly endeavor, is after all a rhetorical act" (xv). While we cannot, of course, blame Berlin entirely for the marginalization that led to the establishment of the conceptual frame *Donald Murray = Expressivist*, we can investigate the ways in which the frame he helped create has been taken up and re-inscribed, largely without question or qualification, by subsequent scholars and historians of the discipline. In what follows, I examine one such instance, to better understand the way the frame has been activated and to investigate whether it stands up in the face of a more nuanced reading of Murray's work.

In a chapter of their book *1977: A Cultural Moment in Composition* which examines the "national conversation" about composition teaching in the late 1970s via a case study focused on Penn State University, Brent Henze, Jack Selzer, and Wendy Sharer examine two "student-centered pedagogies," expressivism and cognitivism, which, they argue, following Berlin, first emerged as critiques of and responses to the dominant teaching approaches of the day (i.e., New Criticism and current-traditional rhetoric). Expressivism and cognitivism, Henze et al. assert, share a good deal in common, including their conception of "the relative autonomy of writers from social circumstances," and yet they compete for priority in the field as they promote "different basic principles and pedagogical strategies" (31). First, expressivists, and here Henze et al. identify the usual suspects, i.e., Macrorie, Elbow, Murray, hold that "formal instruction [in writing] [i]s more or less incidental to a writer's growth" (33). Second, within expressivist pedagogies, they argue, students are to be "regarded as independent agents—even teachers and textbooks [a]re irrelevant—who c[an] intuit principles of effective writing through trial and error" (33). And third, unlike advocates of the cognitivist school, whose central concern is teaching "communicative effectiveness," proponents of expressivism emphasize "personal growth, authenticity, self-discovery, and voice" (32-33). In sum, as Henze et al. define it, a writing course for expressivists is largely "a matter of a teacher's nurturing student self-discovery and self-expression" (33).

As we see, Henze et al. are working in the shadow of Berlin, adapting, or adopting his categories, defining terms in ways that are similar to and mostly aligned with his. My question, simply, is does it hold up? Does it work? Are there basic "principles and pedagogical strategies" that we can say apply to all (or even most) of those who have been identified with expressivism, or, minimally, in this case, to Donald Murray? "All of these [expressivist] values were already guiding the pedagogy of Donald Murray," Henze et al. assert as they go on to cite two of his mid-career publications (i.e., "Write Before Writing" and "Writing as Process: How Writing Finds Its Own Meaning"), as evidence for their claim that Murray "nurture[d] expressivism into the 1980s" (33).[4] Clearly, for Henze et al., there is little doubt that the terms and categories Berlin bequeathed to us are real, coherent, and largely accurate. There is no need for qualification. The *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame can be (and is) invoked without much thought or critical consideration.

But was Donald Murray concerned with students' personal growth? Did he advocate for writerly authenticity? Was he an advocate of self-discovery through writing? And was voice a central matter of his concern?

The answers to these questions are, at various points in Murray's career, yes, yes, yes, and yes. And yet, things are not so simple.

Let's take Henze et al.'s first point, that for expressivists "formal instruction [i]s more or less incidental to a writer's growth." It is difficult to align this way of thinking with Donald Murray, at any stage of his career. Murray's argument, from the moment he entered the field, was that the kind of formal writing instruction typical in schools, provided by teachers who did not write and were usually trained to teach literature, was not just incidental to but actually *detrimental to* students' writerly growth. The solution, however, was not the elimination of formal instruction. Rather, it was formal instruction of *a different* sort. Murray's first book about writing, *A Writer Teaches Writing: A Practical Method of Teaching Composition*, directed at an audience of those delivering formal instruction in writing, i.e., high school English teachers, provides a glimpse into his initial vision of what alternate formal instruction in writing might look like. No, Murray did not want to eliminate formal writing instruction in schools, and he did not want to get rid of writing teachers. Teachers were, in fact, the *very people* he most wanted to reach, so that he could offer them new and different ways to instruct.

There is a second crucial point to make about Henze et al.'s invocation of the *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame in *1977*. As "independent agents," they write, students were to "intuit principles of effective writing through trial and error." As we have seen, Murray never conceived of students as "independent agents" and while it is true to say that he wanted students to learn to write through a process resembling trial and error, it's not true to say that he wanted them to "intuit" a set of principles of effective writing because he did not believe such things existed. When Murray first came to UNH in 1963 writing had been taught, at least in freshman English, via a top-down, deductive process whereby students were first taught abstract, conceptual knowledge about writing (i.e., unity, coherence, emphasis, etc.) and then asked to apply and demonstrate their knowledge of these concepts via written themes. Murray objected to this approach and argued for a more inductive method, whereby students would write first and then reflect—but *not* on a set of principles of effective writing. Rather, Murray wanted them to reflect on what they were learning about the process of writing by practicing it. It was not so much *principles* Murray was after as it was *process*, for as we learn elsewhere in his work Murray's approach to principles was less prescriptive than it was rhetorical. "I think there are many good and right ways to write, depending on the content, the writer and the audience," he explains in a newspaper article he published circa 1976 ("City Boy Finds Woods" A31). A few years earlier he had made this same point in his first published article in *College English*: "There is no right and wrong in writing. There is what works and what doesn't work" ("Perhaps the Professor" 170). Finally, Murray surely didn't believe teachers and textbooks to be irrelevant. His approach to composition pedagogy was, ultimately, centered around the student-teacher conference. Teachers, properly trained, were essential to the process. As to textbooks, as someone who penned an entire curriculum series aimed at grade school children (i.e., *Write to Communicate: The Language Arts in Process*) and several textbooks aimed at college students (i.e., *Write to Learn* and *Read to Write*), Murray surely did not think such work irrelevant.

---

[4] That Henze et al. cite "Writing as Process" to bolster their claims is an indication of the power of confirmation bias, for this article stands out above almost all of Murray's other publications as the least "expressivist" in nature and as the clearest example of the extent to which Murray was, by 1980, working to adopt his writing to the new social science paradigm within the field. I will discuss this in greater detail in Chapter 4.

A final point: in the third passage cited above, Henze et al. invoke the now well-established point about the importance to expressivist pedagogies of writing-for-self-discovery. They call on the work of Donald Stewart to help make this argument:

> The primary goal of any writing course is self-discovery for the student and . . . the most visible indication of that self-discovery is the appearance, in the student's writing, of an authentic voice. (qtd. in Henze et al. 32)

At the start of his career, in the middle, and at the end, Donald Murray would not have agreed with the statement "the primary goal of any writing course is self-discovery for the student." Self-discovery, in the sense of writing-as-a-means-to-better-self-understanding (which is how I read Stewart's words), was not a primary goal of a composition course for Murray, although late in his life, as he, himself, sought to come to terms with the emotionally challenging aspects of his childhood, Murray came to appreciate and even advocate for the cathartic or therapeutic potentialities of writing (and was among the earliest in our field to do so). But "writing as therapy," as some have called it, was never Murray's primary or even secondary goal.

Rather, his objective, throughout his career, was to help students become more engaged, thoughtful, reflective and, therefore, effective communicators. To do so he shared with them the experiential knowledge he had gained as a professional writer as well as the new knowledge he was gaining, in the 1970s and 1980s, as a deep reader in the emergent composing process research of the field. As they contrast expressivists with cognitivists, Henze et al. argue that what separated the two was a primary concern, on the part of expressivists, with "self discovery" and on the part of cognitivists with "communicative effectiveness." If these are the options and if we must continue to categorize our theorists, I believe that Murray might more accurately be placed among the cognitivists, for he was more concerned with teaching students to communicate effectively than he was with teaching them to write for self-discovery (a both/and synthesis, were such an option possible, might, however, be the most fitting for Murray). If not out of a concern for communicative effectiveness, why else would Murray have spent so much of his career (all of it, in fact) trying to map out the various stages or phases of the writing process, so as to identify a transferable model of writing that could be taught to students in order that they could communicate effectively regardless of the rhetorical situation?

There's another important point to be made here about the *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame as it is invoked by Henze et al., however, and one not to be missed: Donald Murray was a non-traditional scholar, to be sure, but perhaps not atypical of his era in the sense that many (most?) of his publications lack textual citations or references to the work of other researchers.[5] When Murray did cite others, however, beginning around the mid to late 1970s, he rarely called on the work of those with whom he is typically associated—so-called expressivists like Stewart, Macrorie, or Elbow. No, Murray's citations were almost always of so-called cognitivists, folks like Sondra Perl, Janet Emig, Donald Graves, Linda Flower, Carol Chomsky, and others who were mobilizing social science methodologies to try to find answers to the very questions about writing that Murray had been asking for years. Further, as early as 1970 Murray had begun to issue calls for writing research of the very sort scholars like Perl or Graves would eventually take up (sadly, none, aside from Graves, ever cited him as providing the exigence for their inquiries). "More scholars," Murray writes in "The Interior View," "using information from the social sciences and the sciences should be encouraged to contribute to the study of the writing process" (21). No surprise, then, that when such research began to appear in the pages of our field's major journals, Murray took notice and began to incorporate it into his work. Here are several examples from one of the articles Henze et al. reference, "Writing as Process: How Writing Finds its Own Meaning," a piece that comes as close to a social science research report as Murray was capable of writing:

---

[5] Note that I've used the word "researchers" here. Throughout his career, Murray was prolific in referencing the words of writers—novelists, poets, journalists—to bolster his claims, to the point where he eventually published a book, *Shoptalk: Learning to Write with Writers*, to collect the hundreds of quotes about writing that he had amassed over the years.

> Others of us, instructed by Janet Emig (1975), attempt to understand the relationship between the chemical and electrical interaction within the brain . . . (Newkirk and Miller 6)
>
> The term rehearsing, first used by my colleague Donald Graves (1978) after observation of children writing . . . (Newkirk and Miller 8)
>
> As Perl (1979) has documented, we write and react to those marks on paper . . . (Newkirk and Miller 14)

These passages are just several examples drawn from one article in which Murray works to position himself within the emergent conversation about writing that so-called "cognitivist" writing researchers like Emig, Graves, and Perl were initiating in the mid 1970s. There are others. Especially after Graves joined the UNH faculty in 1974, Murray increasingly worked to conceptualize his ideas and communicate them within a kind of quasi-social science framework and register, and yet these efforts have never, to the best of my knowledge, been acknowledged or examined. Such an analysis surely complicates the *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame that scholars like Henze et al., following Berlin, invoke all too easily. In sum, established frames must be tested by new generations of scholars. If they are found wanting, as I am suggesting is the case with *Donald Murray = Expressivist*, new frames must be created.

RISE AND FALL OF A REFORMER

While Berlin's histories have, as Gold and Stock have argued, been highly influential in shaping our collective understanding of our disciplinary past, the irony, at least in the case of Donald Murray, is that in the years leading up to the publication of Berlin's key works in the 1980s, Murray had, by any number of measures, come to stand near or at center-stage in composition and rhetoric. By the mid 1980s Murray was placing articles and essays in the leading journals of the day, including those aimed at K–12 English and language arts teachers, college English professors, journalism educators, and more general educational readers.[6] His status in the field of K–12 language arts education was so well-established that he was invited by the editors of *Language Arts* and *The English Journal* to contribute assessments on the current and future state of the field. Further, Murray's work was widely reprinted at this time. In 1986. his article "The Maker's Eye: Revising Your Own Manuscripts" was reprinted six times (Murray, "Faculty Annual Report, 1985-86"). Finally, Murray was distinctly present in the pages of NCTE's flagship journal for college-level writing instructors and scholars, *College Composition and Communication* (CCC) during these years. At least two of the articles he placed in *CCC* in the first half of the eighties were lead pieces (i.e., "Teaching the Other Self: The Writer's First Reader" and "One Writer's Secrets"). According to a citation analysis conducted of the journal by Phillips, Greenberg, and Gibson, Murray was the seventh most frequently cited author in *CCC* during the period 1980-1993, ahead of Nancy Sommers, Emig, and Mike Rose.

The range and diversity of Murray's writing at this time is similarly impressive. His published book chapters serve as one illustration of the various purposes for which and audiences to whom he wrote, with chapters appearing in collections on creative writing, rhetoric, professional writing, the discipline of English, composition theory and pedagogy, and in books aimed at mainstream audiences seeking writing advice.[7] As Moran points out, Murray's ideas in these essays, as well as in his published journal articles, were taken up and used by scholars theorizing diverse areas in the field, including writing center theory, one-on-one conference teaching, and computers and writing (136). In the area of textbooks, Murray was also productive during the 1980s, penning three new titles[8] and, in

---

[6] The pieces aimed at K–12 English and language arts teachers were published in *The English Journal*, *Language Arts*, and *English Education*; the essays directed at an audience of college English professors appeared in *College English*, *College Composition and Communication*, *The Journal of Basic Writing*, *Freshman English News*, *Rhetoric Review*; the piece aimed at journalism educators was published in the journal *Style*; and the article aimed at a general educational audience appeared in *The Journal of Education*.

[7] Murray's essay on creative writing appeared in *Creative Writing in America* (*Moxley*); his work on rhetoric was published in *Sentence Combining: A Rhetorical Perspective* (Daiker) and *Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition* (Freedman & Pringle); his essays on professional writing appeared in *Worlds of Writing: Teaching and Learning in Discourse Communities of Work* (Matalene), and *Writing for Many Roles* (Schwartz); his essay on English was published in *Education in the Eighties: English* (Shuman); his articles on composition theory and pedagogy appeared in *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition* (Donovan & McClelland), *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems* (Rose), and *Only Connect: Uniting Reading and Writing* (Newkirk); and his writing on writing for mainstream audiences appeared in *Writers on Writing* (Waldrep).

[8] *Writing for Your Readers*, a practical book on writing for journalists; *Write to Learn* and *Read to Write*, textbooks aimed at college audience.

1985, an entirely revised edition of *A Writer Teaches Writing*. Reviews of these books highlight Murray's significance and stature among his peers at this time. Richard Gephardt, for example, calls Murray "one of America's most respected teachers of writing" (432). Carol Berkenkotter describes him as "a significant tradition in composition studies," (111) and "a major force in American writing pedagogy" (115). John Clifford asserts that "Murray's process-oriented ideas are so woven into our thinking that we forgot who said them first" (99). And Susan McLeod reminds readers that Murray was "one of the earliest to discuss writing as a process and to speculate about how that process could best be taught" (417). The words of these scholars, Murray's contemporaries, further signal the esteem with which he was held by many in the field at this time.

Murray's speaking schedule for any year in the 1980s provides additional evidence of his stature in the eighties. During the 1981-82 academic year, for example, he gave talks, sat on panels, or lead workshops or seminars away from campus over 30 times. In late August, he taught a week-long program for journalists and editors in Raleigh, North Carolina. In early September, he gave a workshop for secondary school teachers in Connecticut. In October, he was a panelist at the international meeting of the Associated Press in Toronto. In November, he gave a lunchtime address at the Conference of English Education at NCTE. In December, he was in Virginia. In January and February, he was in Maine and Rhode Island. In March, he was in Ohio and Texas (Murray, "Faculty Annual Report, 1981-82"). In sum, Murray's yearly travel schedule offers yet another window onto his influence as he approached the final years of his career. It was by no means inevitable, then, that he would become locked in the disabling and debilitating *Donald Murray = Expressivist* frame at this time.

A close look at changes taking place in composition and rhetoric during the late eighties and into the early nineties, however, suggests the seeds of Murray's displacement were, with or without Berlin, being sown at this time. In a 1985 review of Murray's textbook *Write to Learn,* Berkenkotter, with whom Murray had collaborated on an extensive research study just a few years earlier, was among the first to publicly question the efficacy of "the principles Murray represents" (115). In light of shifts in the field that increasingly understood composition pedagogy as serving the ends of academic enculturation, Berkenkotter asserts that "The issue of a student's socialization into the academic disciplines is one that writing teachers must confront if they want their students to succeed in college" (114). It was an issue Murray had dealt with in only a cursory way in *Write to Learn* because it was an issue in which he was, in 1985, but also in 1975, and 1965, largely uninterested in confronting.[9] Murray had an expansive vision of composition pedagogy and never imagined that he was preparing students to write only for academic audiences. "We are teaching writers," he explains in the first edition of *A Writer Teaches Writing*, "boys and girls who will write descriptions of automobile accidents and living room suites which are on sale, reports on factory production and laboratory experiments, political speeches and the minutes of League of Women Voters meetings, love letters and business letters" (154). Here, we see that from the start, Murray's objective was to prepare students for writerly success *wherever* they wrote.

---

[9] In a late-life interview, Murray suggests his understanding of the challenge of devising ef-

The movement towards teaching writing in the service of academic socialization was, of course, an important element of a larger transition, the so-called "social turn" in composition and rhetoric in the mid to late 1980s and 1990s. Richard Fulkerson, self-nominated chronicler of the field's evolutions (and revolutions) from the late seventies to the early 2000s, captures the changes afoot at this time when he argues that there was a kind of disciplinary consensus forming at this time around a "rhetorical axiology," i.e., pedagogies in which "readers and their responses are the final criteria of [writing's] effectiveness" (415). If, as Fulkerson points out, "genuine and extensive conflicts existed" at this time "about what constituted good writing and thus about what sort of writing one ought to teach," scholars and teachers of composition and rhetoric were, by the late 1980s and early 1990s, aligning behind a socio-rhetorical orientation to composition pedagogy which, as Newkirk, invoking Kenneth Burke, has put it, shifted the field's attention from the "writer" to the "scene of writing" ("Donald Murray and The 'Other Self'" 47). Murray, whose interest in how writing is made and, by extension, how it ought to be taught had always foregrounded the writer and not the reader (or audience) in his investigations. As such, he struggled (or refused?) to adapt or re-align his thinking to attend to the more social and rhetorical aspects of composing which came to dominate the field's discussions of composition pedagogy in the late 1980s and 1990s. Adapt Murray did, though, if only incrementally. "There is no one, correct, theologically sound writing process," he writes in the *Instructor's Manual* for his book *Write to Learn,* circa 1987. Rather, as he explains, the process changes due to several factors—"the cognitive style of the writer; the experience of the writer with a particular task; the psychological makeup of the writer and the psychological climate in which the writing is done; the content of the writing, its purpose, its audience; the length of time in

---

fective discipline-specific pedagogy for first-year writing courses: "When I first taught freshman English, my idea of teaching it was very clear. I thought I'd ask the history students to write history and the psychology students to write psychology and the physicists to write physics. Except I forgot what it was like in school. The psychology majors hadn't yet taken a course in psychology and the historians hadn't studied history, so they had no material yet to write about in those subjects" (Boe, "From the Editor!" 5-6).

which the writer has to work; and the tools the writer is using" (24). Here, we see Murray's continued emphasis on "the writer," but also his accounting for other factors that influence writing, including traditional rhetorical concerns.

To the list of factors that coalesced to shift Donald Murray out of composition and rhetoric's spotlight in the late eighties and early nineties we should add changing publication norms. As Daly Goggin has shown, by 1990 or so journals in composition and rhetoric had become "formal, scholarly forums designed both to accommodate and encourage sophisticated research and scholarship" (139). Murray, of course, had entered the field at a time when the range of what was deemed acceptable in its leading journals was more flexible and when his unique style of essayistic self-inquiry was not just welcomed by journal editors but embraced (and imitated by other writers). It was a time, further, when Murray's chief credential, a Pulitzer Prize, bestowed upon him a kind of credibility that may have come to mean less as the first generation of composition scholars with Ph.D.s assumed control of the field's knowledge-dissemination apparati.[10] Late into his career and without the capacity to conduct "sophisticated research and scholarship," Murray was increasingly left behind by changes in the field's publication norms, a fact which, as we will see, can be measured both anecdotally and quantitatively.

In 1986, Murray published his essay "One Writer's Secrets" in *CCC* where it was positioned as the May issue's lead article. According to Richard Larson's "Editor's Note," "most of the items in the May issue are concerned, broadly speaking, with matters of 'scholarship' and 'research'" (145). Thus, in 1986, Murray's "brand" was considered worthy of kicking off a special issue in the field's flagship journal devoted to matters of scholarship. A few years later Murray submitted another essay to *CCC* for another special issue, this one focused on "Teaching and Theory in College Composition." The piece, "All Writing is Autobiography," was ultimately accepted and published, but not within the special issue area of the volume. Rather, it was placed in the "Staffroom Interchanges" section where, according to the editor's note, "descriptions of specific instructional or administrative practices and fuller essays of application, speculation, and introspection" (66) were discussed.[11] This anecdote signals the rapid decline in the value of Murray's brand over the course of just a few years, at least as measured by his experience with one journal.

---

[10] The irony here, that it was folks like Murray who worked to establish the doctoral programs in which the first Ph.D.s who replaced them were trained, should not be missed.

[11] Worth noting, further, is the fact that the "Staffroom Interchange" section of the journal had existed in *CCC* at least since Murray published his first article in the journal in the spring of 1969. His earlier work had never been placed there, however. In fact, of the six articles Murray published in *CCC* over the course of his career, three appeared as lead articles.

Further support for the claim that Murray's star was falling in the field by the early 1990s comes from a second *CCC* citation analysis, this one conducted by Derek Mueller on the years 1987–2011. In terms of total citations in the journal during this period, Murray slipped from number seven to number thirty-one. Of the 19,477 citations Mueller examined, Murray was referenced just 46 times, six fewer in the 24-year period of Mueller's analysis than in the 13-year period of Burns Phillips et al.'s (i.e., 1980–1993). These numbers, drawn from the field's flagship journal, signal Murray's decline in visibility and stature within the field during the closing years of the twentieth century and the opening ones of the twenty-first.

And yet, throughout the 1990s and right up until the time of his death in late 2006, Murray continued to play an active role in discussions of writing and pedagogy, albeit outside the bright spotlight of composition and rhetoric's center stage. When he wasn't writing his weekly column on aging for *The Boston Globe*, which began in 1986, or writing his memoirs, Murray continued to write and publish about writing and pedagogy during these years, placing essays and articles in small-scale journals aimed at aspiring writers and/or classroom teachers or edited collections assembled by friends in the UNH community. During this time Murray also wrote and rewrote his textbooks, revising all of his previous books and penning five new titles including two on journalism and two on composition.[12] And he continued to evangelize, giving talks and lectures on writing and writing pedagogy to just about everyone and anyone who was willing to listen.

In sum, in his retirement and on the margins of composition and rhetoric, proper, Donald Murray continued to exert influence on the teaching and study of writing, particularly within New England and particularly among school teachers and writers. His voice may have gone quiet in the field's primary publication venues but Murray was far from silent on the topic of writing and its teaching during the twenty-year period following his retirement from UNH and leading up to his death.

RESEARCHER STANCE AND METHODOLOGY

Robert Connors famously described archival research as "a kind of directed ramble, something like an August mushroom hunt" ("Dreams and Play" 23). My decade-long journey through this project has been a long and fairly *undirected* ramble, with a fortuitous discovery of a substantial trove of shrooms late in the hunt. What, readers may be wondering, has sustained me on this journey and kept me in the forest?

---

[12] The books on journalism were *Writer in the Newsroom: The Poynter Papers* and *Writing to Deadline: The Journalist at Work*; the books on composition were *The Craft of Revision* and *Crafting a Life in Essay, Story, Poem*.

My sustenance has been both personal and professional, and therein, perhaps, lies the cause of its longevity. In *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Experience,* Gesa E. Kirsch and Liz Rohan suggest that "the most serious, committed, excellent historical research comes from choosing a subject to which we are personally drawn." A personal connection, they continue, "brings the subject to life and makes us more likely to pursue hunches, follow leads, and spend extra time combing through archival materials than we would without a 'personal attachment'" (8). So, it is with me. Twice a graduate of UNH and its English department (B.A. 1996; Ph.D. 2007), I came of age as a writer, teacher, and researcher in the years just after Donald Murray's retirement. I met Murray for the first time in the summer of 1996 as I wrapped up my undergraduate coursework and prepared to depart for the University of Iowa, where I pursued a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) to become a high school English teacher. At Iowa, I read Murray for the first time in Dr. Bonnie Sunstein's graduate course, Approaches to Teaching Writing (Sunstein, herself, a daughter of UNH) and got to know him a good deal better during my first year as I transcribed dozens of hours of audio interviews he had given Sunstein for a 1997 NCTE session celebrating his career.

Back in New Hampshire in the early 2000s, I enrolled in the doctoral program at UNH and reconnected with Murray to interview him for a graduate paper I was writing on the history of writing conferences. At the same time, as a teaching assistant in my own early classrooms, I experimented with Murray's pedagogical methods, trying out with my students approaches to the teaching of writing which I had experienced at UNH as a student myself just a few years earlier and was now studying in the graduate classroom. Throughout my years in the doctoral program I attended potlucks at Murray's home, at which he held court, regaling students and faculty alike with stories of his life and work and walking us through his latest writerly discoveries. And when Murray passed away in late 2006 I joined the hundreds of mourners who came together to celebrate his life in the Johnson Theater at UNH, just a short walk from Murkland Hall where, sixty years earlier, Murray, himself a UNH alum, had taken his first undergraduate English classes and, twenty years later, taught his first college courses. In sum, "a personal connection to one's research" *has* "ma[d]e all the difference" with this project and it is this connection that has kept me at it these many years. As such, it perhaps goes without saying that this history is far from disinterested. My personal knowledge of my subject and affiliation with the larger community of UNH writers, teachers, and scholars has shaped my inquiry every step of the way.

As to methodology, I can say that since 2009, when I took my first steps in the direction of this project, my research has proceeded through several distinct stages or phases. During Phase I (2009–2011), after being denied a visit to the Poynter Institute for Media Studies where Murray's archive was then housed,[13] I was fortunate to gain partial access to his materials via a librarian, David Shedden, who listened patiently to my inquiries and sent photocopies of documents to me through the mail. Additionally, at this time, I began to piece together a bibliography of Murray's corpus of academic writing and to read (and reread) his work. Thus, Phase I of this project was largely exploratory as I expanded my knowledge of my subject by focusing on sources that were available to me, organized my nascent archive, and immersed myself in Murray's writing.

Phase II (2011–2017) began with my first visits to the Milne Special Collections and Archives at UNH in the winter of 2011, where I viewed Murray's teaching evaluations and assembled an account of his teaching schedule. Hearing the voices of Murray's students and gaining a bird's eye view of his yearly work was powerful in that it allowed me to begin to understand my subject in new ways, less as a famous person in our field and more as an English professor working in a college English department, much like myself. While researching at Milne I was also able to access and analyze a wide range of documents which shed light on the larger institutional context in which Murray operated at UNH as an undergraduate in the 1940s and, again, as a faculty member from the 1960s through the 1980s. In some ways, these documents carried me away from Murray, but they also helped paint a picture of the teaching of English at UNH in the twentieth century which ultimately helped me to understand the impact and influence of the university on Murray's intellectual and professional development. During Phase II I also gained access to a very haphazardly organized but ultimately productive departmental archive in the UNH English Department which shed further light on the local, institutional context of Murray's work. For much of Phase II, then, I pursued a series of new questions about UNH and its English department while still holding my questions about Murray close at hand. I also began to share the fruits of my labor, twice presenting papers at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC); publishing my first article about Murray (Michaud, "Victims, Rebels, and Outsiders"); publishing interviews with members of the UNH community who knew and worked with him (Michaud, "Democratizing Writing") and publishing a memoir about my own enculturation process into the UNH writing "tribe" (Michaud, *Notes of a Native Son*).

---

[13] The world financial crisis caused Poynter to tighten its belt in the area of staffing and this meant, ultimately, suspending public access to Murray's materials.

Phase III of this project (2017–present) began on a warm spring morning in April 2017 when I first gained access to Murray's materials in a dark cinder block building on the outskirts of the UNH campus. A few weeks earlier I had received word that with the help of a generous donor, Murray's archive was coming home. That morning and on a series of subsequent trips, as I reviewed thousands of uncatalogued documents, my knowledge and understanding of my subject deepened as I connected dots across years of inquiry and finally began to conceptualize this book. I continued to publish during this time, as well, including additional interviews with members of the UNH family of teacher/scholar/writers (see Michaud, "Composing a Career"; "On the Creative-Nonfiction of Composition and Rhetoric") and retrospective pieces on the anniversary of two of Murray's major publications (Michaud, "What We Talk About When We Talk About Donald Murray"; Michaud and Downs). In sum, I have spent Phase III of this project among Murray's effects and at the writer's desk, trying to synthesize roughly a dozen years of research into something coherent, this book, *A Writer Reforms (The Teaching of) Writing*, the title of which nods playfully to Murray's first book of writing about writing, *A Writer Teaches Writing*, published just over a half century ago.

As to approach, I draw in these pages on a methodology called microhistory and I am indebted to Bruce McComiskey and the contributors to his excellent collection *Microhistories of Composition* for introducing me to this approach. Microhistory, with its emphasis on granular particularity and specificity, a reduction in the scale and scope of inquiry, and an embrace of nuance and complexity is well-suited to the work of rescuing, recovering, and reframing historical figures such as Donald Murray. According to Stock, microhistory accords "historical agency" to individuals by "avoiding labels based on preconceived norms" (194). According to Brian Gogan, microhistorical approaches encourage historians to "knock the rust off" "corroded" conceptual categories and "render more nuanced representation[s]" of disciplinary figures and forebears. In these pages, I aim for both, and a bit more. As the historian Edward Muir explains, microhistory offers an approach which seeks to understand "individuals making choices and developing strategies within the constraints of their own time and place" (Muir, qtd. in McComiskey 20). And therein lies my rationale in approaching Murray through the lens of the microhistory and the archive for what has been missing in much of the scholarship on Murray is a specific rendering of the choices he made and the strategies he developed within the constraints of *his* own time and place. This book aims to fill that void by hewing closely to the historical record and drawing extensively on primary documents to bring to life Murray's many contributions to our field's growth and development while also placing his work within the context of his personal story, his institutional affiliation with the University of New Hampshire, and his membership in the early, burgeoning modern field of composition and rhetoric.

In the pages that follow, I organize my investigation into Murray's life and work by attempting to answer two questions: *why*, after transitioning to college teaching in 1963, did Donald Murray work to reform the teaching of writing in schools (and schools themselves) and *how* did he go about this work? I begin, in Chapter 1, with the *why*, attending, first, to Murray's complex childhood as he, himself, narrated it in numerous memoirs and autobiographies and second, to his undergraduate years as an English major at UNH. Here, I attempt to understand how Murray's literacy narrative came to serve as an important exigence for his educational and disciplinary reform project once he transitioned to college teaching. In Chapters 2 through 4, I investigate the *how* of Murray's reform work. I begin, in Chapter 2, with an examination of the years 1963–1971, during which time Murray found himself unexpectedly working with two groups of students—freshman and pre-service teachers—who caused him to begin to theorize about composition pedagogy. These early experiences drew Murray into his first major reform project, a collaboration with a school administrator's organization, the New England School Development Council (NESDEC), which came to serve as an important early sponsor of his work. In Chapter 3, focused on the years 1971–1977, I examine several of Murray's important reform projects at UNH, including and especially his efforts to design and experiment with a new kind of college writing class, what he liked to call "a remedial class at an advanced level." I also examine his brief tenure as director of Freshman English, during which time he worked to reform the teaching of writing in general education at the university. In Chapter 4, I focus on the final decade or so of Murray's years on the faculty at UNH, 1977–1988, a period of amazing growth and innovation in the teaching and study of writing at the university and in the larger field beyond. Here, I examine Murray's relationship with his closest collaborator, Donald Graves, and investigate their work to establish the UNH Writing Laboratory and to create two new doctoral programs in literacy and composition and a national conference in composition pedagogy and research. Further, I examine Murray's efforts to reinvent and adapt his writing to the new landscape of publishing in the field as publication norms evolved during this period. Finally, in the conclusion, I analyze Murray's growing sense of disillusionment with and alienation from the field in the early years of his retirement and then briefly examine the role of his wife, Minnie Mae, in his work, trying to understand the nature of their decades-long collaborations. I close with a discussion of Murray's legacy and my sense of his most important contribution to our field: his efforts to democratize writing, to make writers out of not just teachers and students but all who seek to learn and improve at the craft.