The Braddock and Kinneavy Award collections—*On Writing Research* and *The Kinneavy Papers*—not only present some of the most significant scholarship in composition studies, but both collections are testaments to the success of composition as a scholarly discipline. The articles that won the Braddock Award, collected in *On Writing Research*, span nearly twenty-five years of work published in *College Composition and Communication*, while the essays that won the Kinneavy Award, collected in *The Kinneavy Papers*, span eleven years of work published in *JAC*. By "significant" I mean that these articles signify through the politics of criteria-setting and decision-making certain definitions of composition and approaches to composition research. In other words, these collections are significant because they serve as markers of difference within composition for what they include as worthy of distinction in relation to the particular agendas and institutional histories of their professional associations: the Conference on College Composition and Communication and the Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition (ATAC). They also highlight how debates about the relative value of theory and practice continue to trouble composition in significant ways. It is important, therefore, to ask how each collection marks or distinguishes itself within rhetoric and composition in relation to approaches to theory, research, and pedagogy. These collections are significant, then, for how they will mark composition, for how they will distinguish it—that is, for how they will influence future definitions of composition as a field and for how they will represent composition to graduate students in surveys and seminars, thereby influencing the direction of composition research.
I don't want to overstate the importance of these collections, but they do represent distinct and divergent approaches to composition research that highlight the current disciplinary politics of the very composition of composition itself.

Since its inception in 1949, the Conference on College Composition and Communication has not only left its mark on composition but has helped to forge what we have come to think of as the field of composition. Starting as a quarterly bulletin, *College Composition and Communication* soon became the journal of composition's major professional association, providing a forum for research on teaching writing and, in turn, helping to establish and solidify disciplinary credibility. The inception of the Richard Braddock Award for outstanding scholarly research in 1975 served as yet another marker of disciplinary success, suggesting as awards do "that a field has a developed body of research and that such research can be evaluated by a group of 'objective' experts" (Ede 11). CCCC began as a practical response to the increased influx of college students after World War II, and its original mission was pragmatic; it primarily concerned itself with the administrative and pedagogical challenges of staffing and teaching basic communication or communication-skills courses that combined instruction in first-year writing and public speaking (Ede 7–8). Although CCCC certainly has evolved throughout the years in relation to changing editorial policies and research trends, its main focus remains observational and data-based research on literacy, classroom practices, and the teaching of composition.

The research methodologies represented in *CCC* throughout the years include early empirical-based research, protocol analysis of composing activities, the case study, historical inquiry, and ethnography. All are represented, as well, in the pages of *On Writing Research*. From Richard Braddock's "The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences in Expository Prose" to Arnetha Ball and Ted Lardner's "Dispositions toward Language: Teacher Constructs of Knowledge and the Ann Arbor Black English Case," we get a picture of an emerging field drawing on a variety of different forms of qualitative and quantitative research. Certainly, Braddock's article best represents the kind of systemic analysis modeled on scientific empiricism. And later articles such as Ellen Cushman's "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change" and Mary Muchiri, Nshindi Mulamba, Greg Myers, and Deoscorous Ndoloi's "Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing Beyond North America" represent the social and political turn of current research. *On Writing Research* is a rich resource containing some of the
true pylons of composition research: David Bartholomae’s study of error, Robert Connors’ historical study of the modes of discourse, Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford’s work on audience, Robert Brooke’s analysis of the sociology of “underlife” in the classroom, and Joseph Harris’ revision of uncomplicated notions of “community”—to name a few. In this space, of course, I cannot speak to all twenty-six of the Braddock Award winners—articles that are already familiar to many of us—but I can say that On Writing Research is an invaluable collection of research on the teaching of writing and, as such, illustrates where the field has been intellectually over the past quarter of a century.

While On Writing Research presents research that has helped define composition, The Kinneavy Papers documents the insurgent presence of theoretical scholarship in composition and gives us an idea of future directions for the field. Although JAC has existed for less than half the time that CCC has, its impact on the field has been significant. Like CCC, JAC grew out of a specific set of needs, but a very different set of needs: the need for increased attention to the concerns of advanced writing and, later under Gary Olson, the need to create a forum for theoretical and hermeneutical research. Published by ATAC (formed in 1979), the Journal of Advanced Composition began in 1980 out of the University of South Alabama. Pre/Text and Rhetoric Review, the other major rhetoric and composition journals publishing theoretical work, began about the same time, reflecting not only an increased awareness of the value of theory but also the need for expanded definitions of research in rhetoric and composition. As the “journal of” advanced composition, JAC set itself apart from the early definitions of composition as specifically first-year oriented. At the time, ATAC recognized the need for scholars of composition to focus on the particular concerns and challenges of upper-level writing, not only for the pragmatic sake of the pedagogy but for the development of the field as well. Rita Sturm observed that what was needed at the time was an expanded sense of writing concerns, levels, and areas: “heterogeneous classes” and “advanced principles” (40). This expanded sense of composition included concerns associated with computers in writing, technical and professional writing, and writing across the curriculum. JAC’s first editor, Tim Lally, welcomed “speculative work” and stressed the importance of “developing our field” lest, according to him, it “lie fallow” (89).

Interestingly, Lally’s words were to come true, not concerning the field, however, but, ironically, concerning JAC itself. Hampered by insufficient funding and an enormously cumbersome review process, the
journal lay dormant for about three years. When Gary Olson became editor in 1987 and revitalized the journal (resurrected might be more accurate), he began to clarify and intensify \textit{JAC}'s approach to theory and advanced writing. \textit{JAC} asked for articles that examined "theory, research, and pedagogy directly relevant to teachers and scholars of advanced composition," and the editors were specifically "not interested in articles that simply describe classroom techniques divorced from their theoretical underpinnings" \textit{(iii)}. They were interested in articles that thoroughly examined "an issue or pedagogical concern in light of current scholarship," and they sought to publish articles on a wide range of topics, including "the application of computer technology to the advanced composition class; the contributions of psychology and critical theory to composition theory; the critical thinking movement; discourse theory; the effect of gender and class on the 'making of meaning'; studies of invention, audience analysis, and the writing process; research in and the theory of style and readability" \textit{(iv)}.

Soon after Olson became editor, James Kinneavy endowed the James L. Kinneavy Award for the most outstanding article in composition theory published in \textit{JAC}, and he presented the first award in 1989 to the 1988 winner, Reed Way Dasenbrock, for "Becoming Aware of the Myth of Presence." The Kinneavy Award did more than lend credibility to theoretical approaches in composition; it also signaled Kinneavy's work and his 1971 \textit{A Theory of Discourse} as exemplary directions that theory in composition might take, helping to facilitate theoretical research in rhetoric and composition. \textit{JAC} published rigorously theoretical articles grounded in current scholarship, with the aim of establishing a forum for and body of theoretical research on writing and rhetoric. In short, \textit{JAC} intervened in the business-as-usual politics of composition, expanding notions of "composition" by establishing a role for critical theory and hermeneutical research in the study of rhetoric and composition—concerns that in the past were largely ignored. Expanding ideas of composition also meant engaging other disciplines in productive cross-disciplinary dialogues, which is nowhere more evident than in \textit{JAC}'s in-depth interviews with prominent scholars from other disciplines.

What is documented in \textit{The Kinneavy Papers} is what we might call the growing into theory of rhetoric and composition, an interventionist period of growth and theoretical sophistication in the discipline. With this growth comes a rethinking of the previous belief that the field should concern itself with nothing more than pragmatic approaches to teaching
writing and that empirical research on writing and literacy should be the only (or at least most appropriate) method of scholarly inquiry available to the field. The kinds of theoretical approaches and hermeneutic methods that have become the hallmarks of JAC articles are well represented in The Kinneavy Papers. These works, unlike those based on observational and data-based research, make their arguments by referring to other texts and other theorists, and they do so in relation to the ongoing "conversations" of current scholarship and recent intellectual history. The Kinneavy Award winners also represent the social and political turn of current scholarship, as well as adroit cross-disciplinary engagements with theories from literary and cultural studies, postcolonialism, philosophy, and feminism— theories that inform rhetoric and composition in important but not always evident ways. For example, Susan Jarratt's analysis of the rhetorical strategies of three postcolonial feminists ("Beside Ourselves: Rhetoric and Representation in Postcolonial Feminist Writing") seeks to provide a better understanding of the multiplicity of speaking positions used in response to historical and institutional circumstances than that posited by classical rhetorical ideas of a speaker facing an audience. In "Confronting the 'Essential' Problem: Reconnecting Feminist Theory and Pedagogy," Joy Ritchie argues that the disconnect between feminist theory and feminist pedagogy can be addressed by remaining open to the "internally heterogeneous" perspectives of feminism itself and by analyzing "the impact of feminist teaching and feminist theory on the lives of students in our composition and literature classes" (279, 305). These examples have implications for research in rhetoric, for composition theory and pedagogy, but not necessarily for direct classroom application.

While CCC continues to play a central role in the dissemination of research on writing and literacy, JAC represents a much-needed outlet for theoretical work in rhetoric and composition, and it enriches the discipline itself by providing an alternative forum for research and knowledge production. This alternative space invariably involves a reconceptualization of what we mean by "composition" and thus creates divisions in the field, divisions based on competing ideas about what composition should be and what it is becoming. It should come as no surprise, then, that there is a certain amount of anxiety associated with such growing pains. Composition, defined broadly as modern rhetoric, should include a range of methodologies and modes of inquiry, including those that are speculative, theoretical, and critical. Composition is at a point at which it should be interrogating and expanding its bound-
aries, not narrowing and enforcing them. Diversity in this respect, as in most respects, is a good thing—even if clear connections cannot be drawn between theory and what we do in the classroom on Monday morning.

These differences, to me, are appreciable and dialogic; as such, they put me in mind of the cover of the first issue of *JAC* published under its current editor, Lynn Worsham. The cover depicts a digitally revised photograph of a “mezzotint rocker,” a tool, or stylus of sorts, widely used before the invention of lithography to mark copper plates for achieving a certain effect when printing (Worsham vii). As a marking tool, the rocker offers an illustrative meditation on technologies of signification and politics of differentiation—the process and product of “making a mark.” Worsham says that the cover is intended to offer “a kind of visual analogy for the work of composition, suggesting both the process of marking a surface in a way that conveys meaning, texture, and value, and the mark that remains as a result of this process—that is, a text” (vii). All marks—traces, signs, stains, scars—are by definition distinct; as such, marks *mean* in relation to other marks, in their significant interplay among one another. In part, composition has been defined by its quest to mark out disciplinary territory, to inscribe an identity, or text, of its own—an endeavor in which it is still engaged. As others have observed, teaching and service have played formative roles in marking composition, but it is yet another mark of disciplinary development that theory, as process and text, has taken hold so substantially and marked composition so indelibly. Such a play of signification should be encouraged as scholars in writing and rhetoric continue to mark composition in new and different ways.

Disciplinary and research issues in composition have implications not only for how future professors of composition are trained but also for their employment. A colleague in the field who was interviewing candidates for a job in rhetoric and composition recently commented, “You know, you have to watch out for cultural studies scholars masquerading as writing teachers.” I find such a sentiment to be quite curious. It leads me to ask: Who are these people who are “masquerading” as writing teachers? How does one define and spot them? Are they those who publish in *JAC* and win the Kinneavy Awards? Those who study culture? Isn’t writing culture and culture writing? To me, such a comment seems reactionary, and it quite possibly indicates that the speaker does not believe that theoretical research “fits” into composition. It would be interesting to hear someone make the case that John Trimbur is not a
writing teacher because in “Articulation Theory and the Problem of Determination: A Reading of Lives on the Boundary” he reads Mike Rose’s book through cultural studies’ theory of articulation. In fact, Trimbur has done quite a lot of work on the connections between writing theory and cultural theory. Does this make him any less of a writing teacher? I think many of us would agree that it makes him a better teacher. The same could be said of Bruce McComiskey. In “Social-Process Rhetorical Inquiry: Cultural Studies Methodologies for Critical Writing about Advertisements,” he uses theories of production, circulation, and consumption to detail explicitly a sequence of writing assignments about advertising. There is no easy distinction between theory and practice here, between cultural theory and writing practice, between “cultural studies scholar” and “writing teacher.” The either/or logic of the comment above is specious and indicates a lack of knowledge about how theory can inform writing practices (although, as has been my argument, it doesn’t always need to).

We can expect more rifts and anxieties as theorists struggle to mark out new territories for the study of discourse and culture, of literacy, of political rhetoric, and of the social rhetorics of geography, technology, sexuality, ethnicity, gender, and race. We can expect more rifts and anxieties as those interested in disciplinarity and hermeneutical inquiry struggle to redefine what terms such as “composition” and “literacy” mean, as they seek to move beyond current impasses. The intellectual order of the day is cross-disciplinarity, engagement, difference, hybridity. The differences in methodologies and approaches represented in On Writing Research and The Kinneavy Papers are, therefore, appreciable; these differences both enrich and stress composition. We should be glad that the field has reached such a point of growth and diversity so as to enable different and contested versions of composition. This is not to make a case for navel-gazing or for infighting that can lead to paralysis; it is to make a case for quite the reverse: the kind of dialogue that will help us expand the boundaries of composition and reframe existing problems. These two collections of award-winning scholarship are markers of disciplinary success, a level of success that can be maintained by encouraging the “marking” of composition by a variety of research methods and modes of inquiry.
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Here’s a pop quiz: which of the following five passages come from articles that won JAC’s Kinneavy Award and which come from those that won College Composition and Communication’s Braddock Award?

1. By rejecting the metaphysical concept of a single, stable, and universally available (if partially obscured) meaning, one foregrounds the labor of composition and so makes conscious the effort to manipulate and control, to participate, in other words, in the conversation. While we lose the innocent commitment to discovering the truth behind a given collection of words, we gain an active ability to consciously influence the collection.