
1

OF WORK AND ENGLISH

We are not only falling short educationally as a nation, but we are doing so in a way that threatens to create an undereducated underclass, one that falls ever farther behind, where unemployment runs impermissibly high among the less-privileged young (some four in ten African Americans between eighteen and thirty are without jobs), and where projected illiteracy levels among them foretell the likelihood of future unemployability. Our performance in regard to the rising generation of Hispanic Americans is not much better. By now, a new demographic question has arisen: are we locking an emergent underclass into urban ghettos so gripped by crime, drugs, and destructive street culture that even our best efforts at education might not prevail, even if we had the will to improve presently substandard ghetto schools, a will that seems to weaken as middle-class America moves to the suburbs?

—Jerome Bruner 1991, ix

We don't study the future like we do the past.

—Margaret Gayle 1992

When I was a child in the 50s, my mother taught me to cut up a chicken so I could fry chicken “when I grew up.” Although I was only six or seven, my disgust with blood and popping sinews made me resolve never to cut up a chicken again. The fast food outlets

that have proliferated since the 50s vindicate that early resolution. I don't need to cut up chicken in order to live successfully in late-twentieth-century America.

My experience in Mom's kitchen has made me wonder if current approaches to high school and college English will be sufficient for twenty-first-century challenges. If the past is any guide, they will not. Students taking English today will inhabit a world where language ability is more necessary and literacy practices more complex and demanding than they are today. The workplace is likely to be the most challenging arena. As Miles Myers, a recent Executive Director of the National Council of Teachers of English remarks, students will need "new habits of work and mind" (1996, 9) to earn a livelihood. English teachers must help students understand and use language for economic as well as aesthetic goals. Toward that end, this essay analyzes English teachers' attitudes toward the workplace. It considers why the work world has been so small a part of school English in the past, discusses new developments in business, and argues for adding pedagogy about the work world to English.

The Filthy Lucre Bias

This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre.

—1 Timothy 3:1–3a, Bible, King James Version

During my twenty-something years of teaching English I have felt a bias against applying language study to the workplace, which is seldom discussed openly.¹ I see that bias when "academic English" segregates itself from "vocational English" and "basic skills," giving those activities the least prestige in English studies and willingly handing them off to education departments at the college level. I see it in my English department. When budget cuts reduced course offerings, the first courses cut were business and technical writing courses, because they were not "our" courses nor for "our students."

The bias against the work world is the byproduct of many beliefs that we English professionals hold about ourselves, our subject, and our profession. First, most of us believe that literature is the pinnacle of English study and, therefore, its rightful center. We remember how literature delighted us as students. So part of our bias against allowing the work world into our classes comes from our powerful, positive response to the world of the imagination. Moreover, we are well trained to teach literature, and, perhaps, ill-trained and uninterested in teaching language for the workplace. After all, won't the analytical writing skills we teach during literature lessons transfer to the workplace? Certainly, some former students have made the transfer. (But see Beaufort, this volume, for problems with transferring learning.)

The bias toward literature is positive and understandable. However, this attitude is suffused also with a negative attitude toward utilitarian language study, which English professionals have absorbed but not examined thoroughly. I speak of the age-old bias against connecting the world of work with the "practice of letters." I want to briefly examine that attitude here.

English professionals' bias against studying language about/in/for the workplace is rooted, at least in part, in the Western world's more general and older bias against physical labor. In *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power* (1988), Shoshanna Zuboff analyzes this attitude and its development as part of a larger ethnographic work on the effect information proliferation (primarily via computers) is having on the workplace. Zuboff synthesizes ideas from a number of historians who see "contempt toward work" (24) as extending through thousands of years of Western civilization: "Wealth and power have everywhere meant an escape from toil" (24). Physical work was despised and classes of people separated on the basis of the kinds of work they did. Employers and landlords formed the higher classes while the lower classes worked for them. According to Zuboff, this mindset had three progenitors: the negative association that work had with slavery in Greek and Roman systems, the distinction between laborer and warrior in Barbarian society, and the privileging of contemplation over action in Jewish and Christian traditions (25). "Labor was toil, distress, trouble, fatigue—an exertion both painful and compulsory. Labor was our animal condition, struggling to survive

in dirt and darkness" (25–26). Being able to distance oneself from the body increased one's status (28). Consider the case of Ben Jonson, for example, the English poet and dramatist who lived from 1572 to 1637. Jonson experienced disdain because of his humble beginnings. Whenever his critics wished to insult his writing, they called attention to his bricklayer past. Men of letters wrote: others worked. The few who broke this convention were soundly criticized.

According to Zuboff, the negative attitude toward work has changed through the years such that society confers or withholds prestige on the basis of the type of work done. Thus, physical labor (blue-collar) divided itself into "unskilled" and "skilled" labor—that which requires only bodily effort and carries little prestige, and that which requires both bodily and mental ability and carries more prestige. Over time, skilled laborers developed expertise about the activity they performed most often, an expertise that gave those workers greater economic power.

But blue-collar workers lost their skill, through no fault of their own, and with it their prestige. Around the turn of the century, with the industrial revolution well under way, Frederick Taylor's push for efficient production (scientific management) led managers to scrutinize workers' skills with an eye to reducing all non-productive effort. As Zuboff explains, "Taylorism meant that the body as the source of skill was to be the object of inquiry in order that the body as the source of effort could become the object of more exacting control. Once explicated, the worker's know-how was expropriated to the ranks of management, where it became management's prerogative to reorganize that knowledge according to its own interests, needs, and motives" (1988, 43). This process usually included isolating core productive actions and, as a result, specifying how workers were to perform those actions. Thus, workers lost control over the products they were making, the processes they were using, and the skilled knowledge they had developed over the years. Management's object was for a worker to perform a task without stopping to think about that action; therefore, a task could be performed more quickly. The result of scientific management was a widened gulf between those who worked with bodies and those who worked with their minds (Zuboff 1988, 42–46, 48, 50).

Nineteenth-century entrepreneurs also split work between bosses and the bossed, this time partitioning "clean" labor. Execu-

tives passed off their most explicit, analytical duties to white-collar middle managers who then passed off their most explicit, analytical duties to clerks, whose numbers rose rapidly. As a result, executives kept the craft/skill/knowledge/power portions of their jobs for themselves while the central aspect of labor done by blue-collar workers and white-collar clerks remained physical—and thus connected with past connotations of low prestige and “dirty work.” That is, blue-collar workers and white-collar clerks perform the same actions repeatedly, “acting on . . . materials and equipment” (Zuboff 1988, 98–99). Today, clerks, though often using great mental concentration, still physically act on “paper and equipment” (99). Moreover, their “objects”—loans processed, pages typed—are often counted and used in performance evaluations, similar to counts of output of blue-collar workers (Wenger 1990, 46–48). As Zuboff explains, “[The introduction] of office machinery, together with the application of Tayloristic forms of work organization, did much to increase the physical suffering of the clerk . . . the clerk’s position was severed from its earlier responsibilities of social coordination and was converted instead to an emphasis on regularity of physical effort and mental concentration” (1988, 99). Thus, clerical work became a new type of “dirty work,” the label one of Zuboff’s informants gave to work at her computer terminal (140).

The negative attitude toward work surfaced in American formal education when nineteenth-century movers and shakers established professional schools to help “build a nation.” Liberal arts educators held fast to the intellectual and moral development of young people—the staple curricula of the colonial college—as the central purpose of a college education. Many of them reflected the argument of Englishman John Henry Newman, who wrote in 1852:

You see, then, here are two methods of Education; the end of the one is to be philosophical, of the other to be mechanical; the one rises towards general ideas, the other is exhausted upon what is particular and external. . . . We are instructed, for instance, in manual exercises, in the fine and useful arts, in trades, and in ways of business; for these are methods, which have little or no effect upon the mind itself, are contained in rules committed to memory, to tradition, or to use, and bear upon an end external to themselves. But education

is a higher word; it implies an action upon our mental nature, and the formation of a character; it is something individual and permanent, and is commonly spoken of in connection with religion and virtue . . . since cultivation of mind is surely worth seeking for its own sake, we are thus brought once more to the conclusion, which the word 'Liberal' and the word 'Philosophy' have already suggested, that there is a Knowledge, which is desirable, though nothing come of it, as being of itself a treasure, and a sufficient remuneration of years of labor (99, 100–101).

Nineteenth-century American educators echoed Newman's assessment of work-oriented curricula as only useful in a "low, mechanical, mercantile sense" (1852, 145). They labelled the new colleges "cow colleges" (Boyer 1990, 4–7, 6). Despite this opposition, however, liberal arts' curricular influence decreased. Not surprisingly, college literary professionals reacted negatively to the power shift. As David Russell says, building on statements by Laurence Veysey (1965) and Gerald Graff (1987), "academic literary professionals felt alienated from 'real world' matters, and indeed cultivated that alienation as a virtue, setting themselves apart from business and industrial concerns and upholding values they took to be higher than those of what they viewed as philistine commercial interests" (1993, 86). This cultivated alienation began an attack on "American materialism that became an important theme" in American literary criticism but which also "led . . . to a defeatist feeling that the world had passed them [literature professors] by, that . . . vulgar materialism had taken over higher education itself and rendered their very lives a contradiction" (93). Thus, English professionals developed a negative attitude toward the work-oriented curricula that, in their minds, produced "filthy lucre." I believe that this early anti-materialistic view has been passed on to successive generations of English professionals whenever new English majors have joined their mentors' discourse community. This attitude remains today and affects English professionals at all levels.

Losing influence and power within the American educational establishment over the years partially explains English professionals' negative attitude toward subjects and skills associated with the

workplace, as does our love for literature and our absorption—along with the rest of society—of the age-old elitist position that labor was appropriate only for the lowest rung of society. Lately, however, the filthy lucre complex has become a subject of discussion, albeit indirectly, by cultural theorists, many of whom are in college English departments. Cultural critics contend that America's governing institutions, including education, reproduce America's flaws. As John Clifford said in 1991, teaching is "one part of any culture's attempt to reproduce itself, both intellectually and economically, by creating accommodating students who are eager to fill designated positions of influence within various institutional landscapes" (39). Clifford's view is typical of a choir of voices that has been growing since Richard Ohmman forcefully asserted the connection between ideology and English teaching in 1976 in *English in America* (now reprinted and reissued).

The point that cultural critics make, that teaching is necessarily ideological, is a central truth and not debatable. However, too often the effect of such a belief on English professionals leads to a negative attitude or an oppositional stance toward the workplace, positionings that language arts educators have been absorbing for years from the spheres of influence discussed above. The late-twentieth-century incarnation of this attitude is the stereotype of the profit-oriented business person unconcerned with improving society. How true is that stereotype?

New Developments in Business

Recently some business people have both stated and acted on their desire to remake business and improve society, which, they assert, can occur simultaneously. Business visionaries have called for changes, instituted them, and are taking responsibility for misguided practices of the past. A story in the October 8, 1990, issue of *Fortune*, for example, described business people who rejected the "by-the-numbers approach" to look for a new way "of viewing the world," one that exhibits "love and caring" (Rose, 156). Some of the fifteen authors of the 1992 book, *New Traditions in Business: Spirit and Leadership in the 21st Century*, were the subject of this article in *Fortune*. John Renesch, editor of the essay collection, dedicates the

book to “men and women in the business community who possess a vision for a better world and the courage to evoke positive change—helping to establish new traditions that enable businesses to thrive while being responsible to and for the whole of humanity.” Renesch says that “growing numbers of professionals, business owners, and executives are exploring their own senses of personal purpose and defining what provides meaning in their lives, in a context of their chosen work . . . [They] are seeking congruence between their own evolving inner values and their day-to-day experiences at work . . .” (1992a, x).

New Traditions' authors—scholars, business people, educators—suggest that the profit-centered, market-share focus of the old business paradigm be replaced with one in which companies commit themselves to “stakeholders” (the company’s workers, suppliers, customers, and the local and global communities of which the company is a part) as well as to stockholders. This expansion of corporate responsibility includes accepting responsibility for “global dilemmas,” and “the role business has unwittingly played in accelerating modern society’s race toward self-destruction” (Harman 1992, 19).

This is heavy stuff; the remnant of my filthy lucre complex makes me question the motive. Why this new paradigm, and why now? Renesch says that a new paradigm is necessary because the public increasingly holds business responsible for its actions (1992b, 1), and because the world is at the cusp of major change: “Never before in human history have we possessed the ability to change the course of evolution so dramatically.” We can destroy ourselves or create “a new reality—through vision, aligned intent, and a true change of mind. . . [We can] ruin our world forever or . . . launch new beginnings for a whole new way of living together, with each other and the earth, in a sustainable global society” (7). Renesch continues: “The business community possesses a unique opportunity and responsibility to take a leadership role in making this choice. . . [The choice] lies in a change of consciousness—a contextual shift in how we think about ourselves, our families, our businesses, our communities, and our planet . . . from one fueled by fear and doubt, competition, and domination to one of cooperation, vision, and responsibility. Human consciousness can change the context to one of personal empowerment in which everyone feels a sense of responsibility to the whole” (7–8).

Not only is business taking more interest in the environment, it is also becoming more and more interested in the well-being of its employees. These business visionaries see the workplace of the future, its business leaders and workers, as dramatically different from those of the past. Willis Harman, emeritus professor of engineering economy at Stanford University, argues that "intuitive leadership" is required in the new world of business. "Intuitive leadership" is Harman's phrase to describe the culturally sensitive person who wants a workplace where all workers use their inner resources. Harman says that intuitive leadership is required on the planet now, and that it will lead business to play a new role in society, that of "good business" (1992, 19).

Central to the *New Traditions* vision are business people empowered by "human spirit." Michael L. Ray, professor of creativity, innovation, and marketing at Stanford University Graduate School of Business, says that such spirituality can lead to "breakthroughs in creativity that occur when people are given responsibility for their actions" (1992, 29). Developing that power will enable workers to achieve their "heart's desire—to be a part of a larger community of endeavor that is worthy of our [their] best effort," according to Juanita Brown, of World Systems Associates (WSA) (1992, 124). Brown shows corporations how they can change from the old paradigm of "maximum financial returns and competitive supremacy" (128) to a "Corporate Community" paradigm, "a body of people sharing a common identity and purpose, acting with unity, to provide nourishment and life both to its own stakeholders . . . and to the larger society" (127).

Pie in the sky? An interview that World Systems Associates (WSA) conducted with Mike Szymanczyk, an executive who has worked for Proctor and Gamble, Kraft General Foods, and Phillip Morris, indicates otherwise. Szymanczyk has used features of the community model to institute long-term systemic change at several of the large companies where he has worked. He says that the absorption of spirit, community, and caring into a company benefits both the workers and their organizations. As he says, "If I keep giving you more money to satisfy you, I can never give you enough. If I keep creating the opportunity for you to explore your own potential in the exploration of the business' potential, then we have a positively reinforcing system. . . . That's not to say that monetary

reward systems aren't important. They're just not enough . . . one of the truly mystical things about the human organism is that it's always developing. . . . There's always more. There's never an end. And that's what grows community, grows people, and grows the business at the same time" (Cited in Brown 1992, 138).

Certainly the *New Traditions* world is a brave new one. Employees are expected to be creative and to find fulfillment, not just monetary rewards, in their work. The authors indicate that the prevailing business paradigm—environmental problems, slipping public respect, etc.—is ineffective and that many companies are unhappy with their profit-only approach. To redeem those companies, they turn to traditional liberal arts "territory," the human spirit.

Liberal arts' negative stereotype of the business world makes us suspect that the *New Traditions* group is atypical, and it may well be. Certainly, most annual reports I read emphasize profits, increasing sales, etc. However, many of these same reports also show a concern for the environment and for workers and their communities. For example, Russell Corporation pays parents for the time they spend in parent-teacher conferences (Garay 1993), while both Con Edison (Linton 1993) and Russell have educational programs for employees' children. Merck and Company, a large pharmaceutical business, was cited in 1992 by the National Minority Business Development Council for its support of minority and women-owned businesses and has been cited as one of the top ten employers of working mothers for six years by *Working Mother* magazine (1992, 50). Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing (3M), which donated \$1.5 billion to help overcome the destruction caused by Hurricane Andrew, had met the 1996 deadline for elimination of all but critical uses of ozone-depleting chemicals by 1992 (48). And these are but a few of many, many examples. Moreover, the "down side of downsizing"—stunted corporate growth, "survivor sickness" rampant among retained employees—has become clear (Molpus 1995).

Some successful, progressive companies already embody the corporate community paradigm that Brown recommends. For example, Southwest Airlines has had a different kind of workplace ever since Herb Kelleher became its CEO in 1982. Kelleher believes that "title and position signify nothing about a person's true worth" (Cited in Henderson 1991, 32). Southwest was the airline

industry's first company to have a profit-sharing plan. Its executives receive the same percent raises as do other employees, and all employees spend at least one day per month handling bags or working the counter. Moreover, employees have instituted their own "catastrophic assistance charity" for fellow employees, to which they contribute by payroll deductions (32). As Kelleher says, "We have a different culture. Our people are very proud of what they've created. They look on Southwest Airlines as a crusade . . ." (32).

Finally, even if the *New Traditions* business visionaries are atypical, the *New Traditions* statements hold the promise of reform. The beginnings of most movements start with vocal minorities. Of course, a new paradigm will not solve all problems, take care of all concerns. Formidable challenges, such as operating within a litigious American society, loom ahead for companies that embrace the *New Traditions* views.

Adding the Workplace to the English Curriculum

Despite the inevitability of barriers to change, however, liberal arts educators should embrace this new paradigm of a creative, caring corporate community with a focus on matters of the mind and heart. The new paradigm resonates with our values. Our skepticism will tempt us to extend our filthy lucre complex into the twenty-first century. However, it would be highly ironic for English professionals to turn away from business visionaries now, just as they have begun to accept the values that we have held for years: wholeness, humanity, and individual worth. A better response would be to join hands with business people in those areas where we agree—empowerment of the individual, rewards to the spirit, the value of creativity—to help them do what we have always hoped they would do: Reward workers in "the pocketbook and the soul" (30), as Jack Welch, CEO of General Electric, said in 1989 (Cited in Tichy and Charan, 120).

But, that said, how can teachers balance the desire to help business change, with the cultural critical truth that the nature of our profession itself reproduces society's flawed institutions? Edward Jennings and Alan Purves respond to the critique that teaching is ideological in the following way:

The move to help others acquire abilities we possess is a sincere attempt to give power away, not a selfish attempt to indoctrinate and control the uncorrupted. The extension of Western standards of living and planning and controlling may not be entirely altruistic on the part of every participant, but at this point change is not a matter of choice: the globe is hurtling down a one-way street, and bringing ourselves together to learn to steer seems more sensible than trying to stop and find reverse gear. (1991, 6)

The sixty participants of the 1987 English Coalition Conference may have shared Jennings and Purves's feeling. At this meeting, representatives from eight major English organizations met to discuss goals for English in the twenty-first century. Conference participants decided—independently of suggestion from the Conference agenda—to determine a theme for the conference (Elbow 1990, 15). The theme they chose was “Democracy though language” (NCTE 1989, 85–86). Peter Elbow, whom the Modern Language Association commissioned to write a book about that conference, interpreted that slogan to mean “‘save our [democratic] society’” (41).

While many cultural critics have grave reservations about the ability of education to “save our society” and express concern that schools tend to merely reproduce and reinforce existing class structure,² most cultural critics themselves continue to teach—despite the logical do-not-teach extension of their critical truth. As John Clifford tells writing teachers, “we should do the intellectual work we know best: helping students read and write and think in ways that both resist domination and exploitation and encourage self-consciousness about who they are and can be in the social world” (1991, 51). Clifford, however, does eschew what he calls “competence pedagogy”—where much of Working English would fit (see Ch. 2)—in favor of the “critical pedagogy” he advocates.

Is such exclusion desirable? Is there no way to marry practical needs to critical consciousness? Some cultural critics have tried to find common ground between these two pedagogical aims. Myron Tuman, for example, argues that we compromise—teach conventional literacy abilities to those who want to learn them. This compromise suggests yet another compromise. Students could respond

both to communication possibilities in specific work world situations as well as critically examining those situations and the responses they engender. Such a balanced curriculum could be a formidable force to help students develop both the economic and ethical fitness they need for twenty-first-century America.

To summarize, the filthy lucre complex which English professionals have absorbed for many years has placed practical aspects of language arts, and the teachers of those arts, at the bottom of the prestige ladder in English departments. The imaginative world of literature and its criticism remain at the top of that ladder. This distancing from the "dirty work" of teaching students how to use language to accomplish practical as well as critical ends has had the following result: further alienation of the English curriculum from the workplace. This trend should be reversed. Omitting study of language used in the workplace from English curricula disadvantages students. Whereas education does not promise employment, it is necessary for it, and standards are likely to be raised, not lowered. English has become far too narrow—English studies needs an expanded vision that includes a connection with the workplace where students sink or swim.

Such a vision asks teachers to adopt a new mindset—one that is always aware that we are never teaching English only for English's sake, or for appreciation, or to respond to important ideas, or even to use language in a democratic society. We likely do have all these goals at different times. However, we must never forget that our guidance of students' language development contributes directly to our students' economic survival. This is a cliché that those of us who are well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed say often—and with heart. Despite our good intentions, however, many of us forget, if we ever experienced it, that anxious struggle for basic necessities, which some of our students experience daily. Only money provides a permanent solution to such a problem. As Miles Myers notes, "A form of literacy authorized by a culture always gives benefits to those who have it and losses to those who don't. It is our job as English teachers to help as many students as possible to cut their losses and increase their benefits" (1996, xvii). Myers is right; English professionals must include work world knowledge and skills in language arts pedagogy. We must not abdicate our social responsibility (Purves 1991, 51).

Notes

1. There are a few exceptions. The bias has been mentioned recently (Lewis 1989, 84, and Richardson and Liggett 1993, 129). In fact, Patricia A. Sullivan and James E. Porter suggest that professional writing become "a separate but equal component within the department of English" (1993, 391). Sullivan and Porter remark that "All nonliterary (or nonbelletristic) writing . . . has historically had an adjunct status in the department of English" (392) and that ". . . business and technical writing have been viewed suspiciously because of their attention (and suspected allegiance) to the professions and the workplace" (400). Russell (1993) echoes this view and discusses some historical precedents for it. A few English professionals have advocated including the workplace in existing English courses (Myers 1996; Tebeaux 1988), but little has changed. There have been other efforts to go beyond the academy for assignments by having students write for and about community service organizations (Cooper 1993).

2. Views on capitalism change continuously. Consider the opinions of literary critic Gregory S. Jay and journalist William Pfaff. Jay suggests that literary critics question "the equation of consumer capitalism with repression, inauthenticity, and dispossession . . . as we witness the stampede of the former communist states toward the market economy" (1994, 13). Jay asks, "Are the people of these regions simply the dupes of capitalism, as the critical theorists once said that the masses were the dupes of religion or of the entertainment industry? Or must we come up with a more complicated (and yes, post-Marxist) account of the relationship of freedom and liberty to the ownership of property, access to the media, and control of the flow of information? It is not at all clear that the globalization of consumer economics has meant only a reduction in freedom or happiness: such a critique is the luxury of people who already have Visa cards and fax machines" (13-14). On the other hand, journalist Pfaff, covering the 1996 World Economic Forum, says that "The current wisdom about capitalism, the globalized marketplace and appropriate corporate behavior is today under increasingly severe criticism. As a 'vision' of society it seems too narrow, defective in its social and political assumptions, lacking a sense of history. What can take its place is unclear and will come both from theoretical economics and the practical and political demands of society. But a change unmistakably is on the way" (2/3/96).

References

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Brown, Juanita. 1992. Corporation as community: A new image for a new era. In *New traditions in business: Spirit and leadership in the twenty-first century*, ed. John Renesch, 123–39. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1991. Introduction. In *Literacy: An overview by fourteen experts*, ed. Stephen R. Graubard, vii–xi. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Clifford, John. 1991. The subject in discourse. In *Contending with words: Composition and rhetoric in a postmodern age*, ed. Patricia Harkin and John Schilb, 38–51. New York: Modern Language Association (MLA).
- Cooper, Jennie C. 1993. Writing for real people: A client-centered approach. *College Composition and Communication* 44: 386–88.
- Elbow, Peter. 1990. *What is English?* New York: MLA.
- Garay, Mary Sue. 1993. Workplace literacy in the 90's: Definitions, descriptions, opportunities, and cautions. In *Studies in technical communication, 1992*, ed. Brenda R. Sims, 37–59. Denton, Tex.: University of North Texas Press.
- Gayle, Margaret. 1992. Strategic thinking about the future. Presentation to Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge Vocational Education Leadership Training Institute, June 18.
- Graff, Gerald. 1987. *Professing literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harman, Willis. 1992. 21st century business: A background for dialogue. In *New traditions in business: Spirit and leadership in the twenty-first century*, ed. John Renesch, 11–22. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Henderson, Danna K. 1991. Southwest luv's passengers, employees, profits. *Air Transport World* 28: 32.
- Jay, Gregory S. 1994. Knowledge, power, and the struggle for representation. *College English* 56: 9–29.
- Jennings, Edward, and Alan C. Purves. 1991. Introduction. In *Literate systems and individual lives*, ed. Edward M. Jennings and Alan C. Purves, 3–9. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lewis, Janette S. 1989. Adaptation: Business writing as catalyst in a liberal arts curriculum. In *Worlds of writing: Teaching and learning in discourse communities of work*, ed. Carolyn B. Matalene, 83–92. New York: Random House.
- Linton, Linda. 1993. Letter to author, September 2.
- Merck and Company. 1992. Annual Report.
- Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. 1992. Annual Report.
- Molpus, David. 1995. Creative Learning Center celebrates 25th anniversary. National Public Radio, *Morning Edition*, July 11.
- Myers, Miles. 1996. *Changing our minds: Negotiating English and literacy*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

- National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). 1989. *The English coalition conference: Democracy through language*, ed. Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea Lunsford. NCTE.
- Newman, John Henry. 1947. *The idea of a university*, ed. Charles Frederick Harrold. 1852. Reprint, New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Ohmann, Richard. 1976. *English in America: A radical view of the profession*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pfaff, William. 1996. Seeking a broader vision of economic society. *International Herald Tribune*, February 3, News Section.
- Purves, Alan C. 1991. The textual contract: Literacy as common knowledge and conventional wisdom. In *Literate systems and individual lives*, ed. Edward M. Jennings and Alan C. Purves, 51–69. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ray, Michael L. 1992. The emerging new paradigm in business. In *New traditions in business: Spirit and leadership in the twenty-first century*, ed. John Renesch, 25–37. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Resch, John. 1992. Preface. In *New traditions in business: Spirit and leadership in the twenty-first century*, ed. John Renesch, ix–xiv. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- . 1992. Introduction. In *New traditions in business: Spirit and leadership in the twenty-first century*, ed. John Renesch, 1–6. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Richardson, Malcolm, and Sarah Liggett. 1993. Power relations, technical writing theory, and workplace writing. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 7: 112–37.
- Rose, Frank. 1990. A new age for business? *Fortune*, 8 October, 156–64.
- Russell, David R. 1993. The ethics of teaching ethics in professional communication: The case of engineering publicity at MIT in the 1920's. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 7 (January): 84–111.
- Sullivan, Patricia A., and James E. Porter. 1993. Remapping curricular geography: Professional writing in/and English. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 7: 389–422.
- Tebeaux, Elizabeth. 1988. The trouble with employees' writing may be freshman composition. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 15: 9–19.
- Tichy, Noel, and Ram Charan. 1989. Speed, simplicity, self-confidence: An interview with Jack Welch. *Harvard Business Review* 67: 112–20.
- Tuman, Myron. 1988. Class, codes and composition: Basil Bernstein and the critique of pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication* 39: 42–51.
- Veysey, Laurence R. 1965. *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Wenger, Etienne. 1990. Toward a theory of cultural transparency: Elements of a social discourse of the visible and invisible. Tech. Report 90-41. Palo Alto: Institute for Research on Learning.
- Zuboff, Shoshanna. 1988. *In the age of the smart machine: The future of work and power*. New York: Basic Books.