

2022-12-01

Rhetorical Conversations: Race, Class, and Gender in the Works of Jacqueline Jones Royster and Shirley Wilson Logan

Tanya Robertson
University of Texas at El Paso

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open_etd



Part of the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Robertson, Tanya, "Rhetorical Conversations: Race, Class, and Gender in the Works of Jacqueline Jones Royster and Shirley Wilson Logan" (2022). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 3722.
https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open_etd/3722

This is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

RHETORICAL CONVERSATIONS: RACE, CLASS, AND GENDER IN THE WORKS OF
JACQUELINE JONES ROYSTER AND SHIRLEY WILSON LOGAN

TANYA MARIE ROBERTSON

Doctoral Program in Rhetoric & Composition

APPROVED:

Beth Brunk-Chavez, Ph.D., Chair

Lucia Dura, Ph.D.

Erika L. Mein, Ph.D.

Stephen L. Crites, Jr., Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Copyright ©

by

Tanya Marie Robertson

2022

Dedication

To those who get my crazy ways and allow me to explore and soar.

RHETORICAL CONVERSATIONS: RACE, CLASS AND GENDER IN THE WORKS OF
JACQUELINE JONES ROYSTER AND SHIRLEY WILSON LOGAN

by

TANYA MARIE ROBERTSON, B.S., B.A., M.F.A.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English, Program in Rhetoric & Composition

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2022

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want thank the brightest star in my life, my son Carlos. Nothing is more motivating than thinking about being a role model for you. You have given me such joy and there are no words to describe just how much I love you.

I would like to thank Jaqueline Massey, the best friend of all friends. You have seen me through every phase of my adult life. When you say you are proud of me, I know that is the truth. You send the best care packages and they see me through all of my ups and downs.

I would like to thank my dissertation director, Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez, for the positive encouragement, the strong support, the gentle pushes, and the amazing understanding. You allowed me to run with my vision and you believed it would all make sense in the end—space time continuum and all. I cannot tell you how much I appreciate all of the times when you said, “you got this!”

I would like to thank Dr. Kate Mangelsdorf for getting me going and giving me advice on just about everything. I would like to thank Dr. Lucia Dura for all of the interesting ways you taught me. I learned so many new things from you and I still play with all of the strategies you introduced us to. Thank you Dr. Erika Mein for stepping in at the last minute and seeing me through this project.

I would like to thank Dr. Maceo Daily for giving me the idea for this dissertation. I have such fond memories of sitting in your office and talking for hours about anything and everything. Thank you for telling me stories about Jackie Royster.

I absolutely must thank my RWS cohort. My goodness. We had some of the most amazing, enlightening, combative, passionate, and brilliant discussions. Those are the kinds of things that

cannot be replicated and I will always cherish those memories for the things they taught me about myself and academia.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the people along the way that helped me to dot the Is and cross the Ts. Nothing as big as completing a Ph.D. or writing a dissertation can be done without the day-to-day people we tend to take for granted. You are appreciated.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Figures.....	ix
Chapter 1: Mapping the Course of Work.....	1
1.1 Sites of My Rhetorical Education.....	1
1.2 (Re)visiting the Gap.....	3
1.3 Connections, Circularity, and... <i>Habitus</i>	13
1.3.1 Arguing Against Myself (Or, My Own <i>Hysteresis</i>).....	15
1.3.2 Otherness.....	18
1.4 (Re)search Methodologies.....	20
1.5 (Re)search Scope and Constraints.....	22
1.6 Overview of Chapters.....	23
1.7 I, Journal – <i>Everything Means Something</i>	24
Chapter 2: Jacqueline Jones Royster.....	26
2.1 Curious Things.....	26
2.2 African American’s and Rhetorical Studies.....	30
2.3 Feminism and Rhetoric.....	34
2.4 Global Citizenship (Civil/Human Rights).....	38
2.5 English Composition and Literacy.....	42
2.6 I, Journal – “Seated under the same sun” (2009).....	46
Chapter 3: Shirley Wilson Logan.....	47
3.1 Locating Listening.....	47
3.2 Nineteenth Century Feminist Rhetorical Practices.....	49
3.3 English Language, Composition, and Literacy.....	53
3.4 Black Sites of Rhetorical Education.....	55
3.4.1 Free-Floating Literacies.....	58
3.4.2 Private Learners, Literary Societies, and the Black Press.....	61
3.5 I, Journal – <i>My Little Girl Self</i>	66

Chapter 4: Synthesizing the Space Time Continuum	68
4.1 Weaving Spaces	68
4.2 Weaving is Synthesis	69
4.3 I, Journal – <i>Immersed in the Company of Others</i>	79
Conclusion: I, Journal– <i>Universal Considerations and Future Study</i>	81
References	86
Appendix	94
Appendix A: Interview Questions	94
Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Information.....	96
Vita 104	

List of Figures

Figure 1: A rupture in the crust of a highly magnetized neutron star... can trigger high-energy eruptions.....	16
Figure 2: Jacqueline Jones Royster; Georgia Institute of Technology	27
Figure 3: Royster and Logan, RSA Summer Institute 2015. Royster workshop “Human Rights, Civil Rights, and Global Citizenship.”	40
Figure 4: Shirley Wilson Logan, University of Maryland	48
Figure 5: Shirley Wilson Logan and Tanya Robertson, Feminism and Rhetorics Conference 2015	67

Chapter 1: Mapping the Course of Work

1.1 SITES OF MY RHETORICAL EDUCATION

Throughout most of my life I had an understanding that I was being shaped by my experiences. I don't just mean in my adult life. As a young girl, I would think about things that were happening to me and wonder what they meant in the grand scheme of things. Everything was viewed in terms of "when I grow up this is gonna mean that." Of course, the perceptions of and reflections on the events that created "this" changed over time and the "is gonna mean that" was likewise altered. Looking back, I now understand why other kids and adults didn't understand much of what I asked as I pondered these things; I could never truly articulate my meaning either. I just knew that everything meant something. I still know that.

When I first began to study rhetoric I was in "academic mode." I read and heard everything as if I were studying facts—acquiring knowledge and attempting to put it all into neat categories in my brain. However, as a Black woman, the first in my family to complete a college degree, much of what I have learned has come by way of storytelling. According to Barbara Christian (1987), women of color theorize in the narrative form but the voices of those in academia are silenced by academic hegemony (p. 52-53). I hope, in this project, to be one of the ~~newer~~ voices to disrupt the academic hegemony that lies behind the lack of research into, not just African American rhetoric, but scholars of African American rhetorics and, specifically, African American rhetorical scholars.

So, in this project, I examine the work of African American rhetoric scholars. In their works, they tell of experiences and share stories that I want to hear. I do not only mean through the act of literally hearing, but listening to the words and phrases in their writing. What experiences shine through when they craft their essays, articles, books, and speeches? What

lessons about rhetoric can I learn from opening myself up to the white space in their pages and the silences between their spoken words? Because, as Krista Ratcliffe (2005) states, “sometimes the ear can help us see, just as the eye can help us hear” (p. 23).

Through this research, I do not make the claim that I will discover *an* African American experience in the rhetorical tradition, for that is no different than the idea that there is *an* English. Instead, I write a narrative about women who have helped to shape the field; women whose voices, both spoken and written, have taught us something about ourselves, our discipline, and our own work and ideologies. And, in the process, I hope to find a few experiences that will guide me as a Black woman scholar.

While some research has been done on how African Americans use rhetoric, very little has been done on the contemporary African American scholars who are helping to develop rhetorical theory and rhetorical pedagogy. As stated by Keith Gilyard (1999b) in his text *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition*, “even when writing instructors look beyond practitioners in the field to refine their theories, they can hardly avoid running into African American intellectuals. Few scholars of any hue are quoted more in our current literature than bell hooks and Cornel West...” (p. 642). It has been twenty years since Gilyard made that statement and the number of African American scholars has increased, with highly recognizable names such as Elaine Richardson, Beverly Moss, Gwendolyn Pough, and Adam Banks. Two names, Jacqueline Jones Royster and Shirley Wilson Logan, are at the top of the list in terms of scholarly and pedagogical contributions.

In order to fully realize and argue for Royster and Logan’s places in the ever-changing field of rhetoric and composition studies, it is necessary to examine their scholarship, theoretical and pedagogical philosophies, how the scholarship and philosophies relate to epistemologies in

rhetorical theory (and specifically those claims that relate to race and gender), and service (administrative and leadership) roles in-depth. Essentially, looking at Royster and Logan in terms of the rhetorical tradition and the current trajectory of the field is in fact a critique of the discipline—one that can help to inform the ways in which other voices are permitted entry into the discipline and one that can provide knowledge beneficial to addressing race, class, culture, and gender in the classroom.

The following questions provide direction and focus for this research:

Q1: How have Jacqueline Jones Royster and Shirley Wilson Logan become knowledge-makers in the field of Rhetoric and Composition Studies? What are the epistemological aspects of their work?

Q2: Based on that *made* knowledge, how does the work of Royster and Logan feed back into Rhetoric and Composition Studies?

This project is an examination of Royster and Logan as knowledge-makers in the field of rhetoric and composition. Royster (1996b) states that, “Lorde teaches me that, despite whatever frustration and vulnerability I might feel, despite my fear that no one is listening to me or is curious enough to try to understand my voice, it is still better to speak.” (p. 36). Both Logan’s and Royster’s determination to not remain silent has led them to highly productive scholarly and teaching careers. Their work has increasingly influenced my work and understanding of the teaching of English, rhetorical sites for African American women, and my current and future position as a participant in the discipline.

1.2 (RE)VISITING THE GAP

There is a large gap in research on the contemporary African American women scholars who act as knowledge makers of rhetorical theory and rhetorical pedagogy. This project acknowledges and explores African American women scholars. The stories of these women could be told according to the “traditions” of academic writing. But, then, they would lose something of that intangible connection to the unique ways that we African Americans can narrate our lives. Toni Morrison (2000) speaks to this when she says,

now that serious scholarship has moved from silencing the witnesses and erasing their meaningful place in and contribution to American culture, it is no longer acceptable merely to imagine us and imagine for us. We have always been imagining ourselves. We are not Isak Dinesen’s aspects of nature,” nor Conrad’s unspeaking. We are the subjects of our own narrative, witnesses to and participants in our own experience, and, in no way coincidentally, in the experience of those with whom we have come in contact (p. 31).

Scholars in Rhetoric and Composition Studies acknowledge the need to include more voices and this project is a way for me to make a contribution to the field. Bizzell (2003) says “we must hear from rhetoricians who have struggled with culturally complex venues in which they were marginalized, if we are to live and work and function as responsible citizens in the American multicultural democracy. And as our needs and interests change, the rhetorical tradition will continue to change as well...” (p. 117). My initial investigation into Royster and Logan’s scholarly works, pedagogical practices, and service roles has led me to consider the recursive nature of their impact in rhetoric and composition studies. There is circularity in the notion that as they examine the history of the field—African American rhetorical practices, feministic rhetorical practices, English language studies and literacy, and classroom practices—they are, themselves, having an impact on the field.

Although Royster and Logan will be fully discussed in later chapters, it is necessary to introduce some of the highlights of their professional careers to demonstrate the importance of their work and their range of experience. The years in which they graduated and entered the field are important in my examination of their participation and their reception by peers. Royster attended Spelman College and then received her Master of Arts (1971) and Doctor of Arts (1975) in English from the University of Michigan. She began her professional career at Spelman College, serving as Director of the Comprehensive Writing Program, Associate Dean for Academic Advising, and Assistant Dean for Freshman Studies before embarking on an eighteen-year tenure at The Ohio State University (OSU) in 1992. At OSU she held various positions ([Ohio State, 2005](#)) to include Senior Vice Provost and Executive Dean of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Senior Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Affairs in the College of Humanities, Vice Chair for Rhetoric and Composition in the Department of English, and Director of the Writing Center. Since 2010 Royster has served as the Dean of the Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts, Junior Dean of Liberal Arts and Technology, and Professor of English in the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture ([Georgia Tech Faculty, 2014](#)). She became Professor Emerita at Georgia Tech in 2019 ([Georgia Tech People, 2022](#)).

In addition to serving in leadership and service positions on campus she has taught a wide range of undergraduate and graduate courses such as Literacy and Social Change, African American Women and Contemporary Discourse, Literacy Across and Beyond the Curriculum, Rhetoric, Race and Gender, and multiple levels of Composition. Royster served on the Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in 1994 and continues as a member of various other NCTE committees. In 1995 she simultaneously became the Chair of The Conference on College Communication and Composition (CCCC) and the

Chair of the Modern Language Association of America (MLA) Division on Teaching of Writing. Additionally, she spent fourteen years as a co-editor of *SAGE: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women* and co-edited *Double Stitch: Black Women Write About Mothers and Daughters*.

In her scholarly work Royster (2000a) advocates for a critical reflection of the field, stating, “In our area, as a knowledge-making and knowledge-using enterprise in English studies, the challenge for us is to sustain in a qualitative way both our strengths and the strengths of the discipline at large, but we cannot do this alone. We must act collectively, as a discipline” (p. 1227). This call to action carries through in her writing, teaching, and speaking. And, while this dissertation provides just a glimpse into her career and philosophy, the implications of her claims, activities, and expectations in the volume of work that she produces are such that the field cannot ignore her voice.

Throughout her career, Royster’s scholarship has focused on three main areas—the rhetorical contributions of women of African descent, feminist rhetorical scholars, and English composition studies. Within those three areas there are subtopics that include marginalized voices, reimagining rhetorical theory, literacy, and service responsibilities to the field. In her article “When the First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own” (1996b) from her 1995 CCCC Chair’s address, Royster discusses all of these main areas. She writes of her personal experiences as an African American woman in social and academic settings and of using subjectivity as a terministic screen to analyze voice as “a central manifestation of subjectivity” (p. 30). Her assertion is that using her voice alongside the voices of other Others lends credibility to the collective voices in the call to transform rhetorical theory and practice. She states that “the call for action in cross-boundary exchange is to refine theory and practice so that they include voicing as a phenomenon that is constructed and expressed visually and orally, and

as a phenomenon that has import also in being a thing heard, perceived, and reconstructed” (p. 30). She goes on to discuss the problematic occurrence of elite and dominant speakers using their voices to speak for her and her community without acknowledging their place or including the voices for who they are speaking.

Many of Royster’s publications address the eliteness of the rhetorical tradition and the adherence to Western rhetorics. In “Disciplinary Landscaping, or Contemporary Challenges in the History of Rhetoric” (2003) she asks,

What if I started a rhetorical interrogation with a consideration of more southern territories, with a focus on women, and with the possibility that eliteness may or may not hold its viability across variations in rhetorical performance? How, after all, might the concept of eliteness shift when the focus of interrogation or the site of interrogation shifts? (p. 150).

She aggressively advocates for the acknowledgement of female voices in the rhetorical tradition, writing often about women from Enheduanna to Audre Lorde and bell hooks to her contemporary collaborators, influences and peers such as Andrea Lunsford, Shirley Wilson Logan, Cheryl Glenn, and Beverly Moss. Her latest publication, a book co-authored with Gesa Kirsch, includes various individual reflection pieces. In one of these pieces Royster (2012) states that, “Feminist rhetorical practices are not only changing research methods but also research methodologies...Many of these changes—toward more reciprocal, collaborative, mutually beneficial research methods—have been brought about by feminist scholars” (p. 34). According to Audre Lorde (1979), “Interdependency between women is the way to a freedom which allows the I to be, not in order to be used, but in order to be creative. This is a difference between the

passive be and the active being” (p. 111). Royster appears to have taken this notion and incorporated it into her scholarly philosophy.

As previously stated much of Royster’s scholarship focuses on feminist rhetorical theories and examinations of the female voice in the role of rhetorician. According to Audre Lorde (1979), “As women, we have been taught either to ignore our differences, or to view them as causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change...But community must not mean a shedding of our differences, nor the pathetic pretense that these differences do not exist” (p. 112). Lorde’s influence on Royster’s philosophical stance is evidenced by the many articles in which she discusses the challenges of speaking and acting respectfully in regard to “the loved people and places of Others.” (Royster, 1996b, p. 33). The key to navigating these challenges, she says, is “to teach, to engage in research, to write, and to speak with Others with the determination to operate not only with professional and personal integrity, but also with the specific knowledge that communities and their ancestors are watching” (Royster, 1996b, p. 33).

Like Royster, Shirley Wilson Logan advocates for more thorough examinations of the African American female voice. She asserts that studying the pedagogical practices of nineteenth century black women is critical to understanding the racial and gender issues in current higher education (1998). In *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African-American Women*, Logan (1995) discusses her reasoning for the edited collection stating, “Some muffled voices are those of black women, voices that are gradually being restored to full volume. This anthology is designed to contribute to the restoration by presenting the rhetorical responses of black women who spoke and wrote as preambles to action” (p. xi). Much of Logan’s work examines African American rhetoric for social change and

considers the importance of looking to the past in order to understand its role in the composition classroom today. According to Logan,

Looking to the past for models and uses of rhetorical education, we recognize that social change has always been partially the result of rhetorical action, oral or written arguments crafted to elicit specific responses. Given that rhetorical action is initiated in response to mediated exigencies, few Americans have had a greater need to respond than have African Americans nor a greater desire to learn how to respond effectively. From the perspective of a disenfranchised people, the exigencies appeared to be abundant (Glenn & Sharer, 2004).

In *Liberating Language: Sites of Rhetorical Education in Nineteenth-Century Black America* (2008) she explores the ways in which African Americans, during a time in which their rights were finally beginning to be recognized, were able to develop rhetorical awareness and astuteness. Her examination is particularly focused on how African Americans in the nineteenth century were able to acquire rhetorical education in a hostile environment and then work to make change in that environment. Her definition of a site of rhetorical education involves “the act of communicating or receiving information through writing, speaking, reading, or listening” (p. 4). Logan (2006) connects her philosophical stance to her work into the classroom and her pedagogical practices when she claims that teachers of college English should ensure that students (people) are made aware of the cultural implications of their language and communicative choices and to “have them think about what it means to privilege a certain mode of speaking or writing.” Logan’s 2011 National Council of Teachers of English Chair’s address specifically targets the responsibilities of NCTE in ensuring that students and teachers are aware that what is taught is just one (or a few) of the many Englishes that exist globally. Much of

Logan's work demonstrates the link between what is spoken culturally (and within communities), how that language is learned, and how that translates to what happens in a classroom setting—by both teacher and student.

Logan's dedication to the teacher-student relationship can be seen through the many service and teaching roles she takes on. She received her Master's from The University of North Carolina in 1966 and her Doctoral degree in 1988 from the University of Maryland where she served as Associate Chair and Professor in the Department of English. She is co-editor of the Southern Illinois University Press Series, *Studies in Rhetorics and Feminisms* along with Cheryl Glenn and is a member of the editorial board of *The Voices of Democracy: The US Oratory Project*. Logan was elected Chair of NCTE in 2011 and was the 2003 Chair of CCCC. In addition to these leadership roles she taught courses on writing, composition theory, the history of rhetoric, nineteenth-century African American rhetoric, and African American literature ([University of Maryland Profiles, 2014](#)). Logan became Professor Emerita of English at University of Maryland in 2016.

Royster's and Logan's work makes the connection between rhetorical theory and literacy; it examines race, gender, and language and how those things come together in and out of the classroom. In "By The Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak," Logan (2005) discusses the various ways in which African Americans acquired rhetorical education. She states, "I use the term rhetorical education here to mean those combinations of experiences influencing proficiency in communication. This rhetorical education did not always include explicit training in rhetorical theory, but the application of theoretical principles occurred nonetheless" (216).

As I write this dissertation, I reflect on my little girl—teenage—young adult language practices. They did not live in a space that allowed me to clearly articulate the things going on

inside my head. It was as though my child's brain was trying to operate in grown-up space. I questioned things in a way that made me stand out from other kids. If I asked my schoolyard playmates, they called me weird. If I asked other adults, they would say I was too young to understand. Either way, I was always, frustratingly curious and thirsty for knowledge.

Sometimes, though, the adults in my life would tell me I was too smart for my own good. Somewhere along the way I had picked up an understanding of things they felt were too grown-up for me. *My questions are not too grown-up if I'm asking them.* How or where I had acquired this knowledge was a mystery to me. When I reflect on my childhood, I realize how much of it I spent observing. Anyone who knows me now finds it hard to believe I was an extremely introverted and shy child. But, up until late middle school, I rarely spoke in class and I hid behind the sofa when we had company at home.

What I did do was pay attention. While safely tucked behind our brown and orange sofa, I listened to my mother and her friends talk about everything from soap operas to politics to religion to the latest neighborhood gossip. In school, I “overheard” conversations between teachers. Perhaps I was already engaging in rhetorical eavesdropping¹. I lived for class trips to the library. And, while cutting all of the hair off the white Barbie dolls I got for Christmas, I watched whatever TV show was on in the background. The foundation for my proficiency in communication—what Logan would call my rhetorical education—developed from the combination of these experiences.

The experiences that we all accumulate direct us in conscious and unconscious, explicit and implicit ways. Royster (1996a) says that how she sees the world dictates how she views the

¹ Krista Ratcliffe, *Rhetorical Listening*. Ratcliffe explains eavesdropping as a term based on a composite of “choosing to stand outside...in an uncomfortable spot...on the border of knowing and not knowing...granting others the inside position...listening to learn,” and as a “rhetorical tactic of purposefully positing oneself on the edge of one's own knowing so as to overhear and learn from others and, I would add, from oneself” (104-105).

teaching of language and literature and in turn, the kind of student she feels should emerge from these types of courses (p. 141). Both Logan and Royster make tangible connections between our histories, our work and the way we learn. For me, their claims connect to the work of Pierre Bourdieu. Yet, by using Bourdieu's theories in my argument, as an emerging knowledge producer, I circle back to Bourdieu's notion of reflexivity (Deer, p. 197) which states that all knowledge producers must recognize their own internal influences in regards to the object of the research. That, then, leads me to Christian's (1987) point that I am using Western scholarship to critique the use of a Western lens and the silencing of women of color (p. 56-57). However, by using primarily scholars of color in this work, I hope to bring balance to my arguments. Royster (1996b) says, "my sense of things is that individual stories placed one against another against another build credibility and offer...a litany of evidence from which a call for transformation in theory and practice might rightfully begin" (p. 30). For this project, the main voices that I draw from are Royster's and Logan's own. I also reflect on my own experiences and discourses in order to better understand how I am shaped by their work and how they shape the field.

Royster says, "Presence is being there and so certainly people like Shirley and Joyce [Middleton] and me and a lot of other people have been there" (personal communication, 2015). This statement is part of a larger argument about African American presence in Rhetoric and Composition Studies (RCS) and whether or not those voices get listened to. I will go into this commentary in greater detail throughout the dissertation but it certainly resonates as one of the key points this work is trying to make about the need to critique RCS's engagement with African American scholars (and scholars of color in general) and for that critique to take place from a variety of perspectives, especially an African American one.

1.3 CONNECTIONS, CIRCULARITY, AND...*HABITUS*

My first exposure to Pierre Bourdieu came in graduate school. His concept of *habitus* was what my little-girl-self had been trying to say for years but could not express. *Habitus* is an objective relationship between two objectivities, [that] enables an intelligible and necessary relation to be established between practices and a situation, the meaning of which is produced by the habitus through categories of perception and appreciation that are themselves produced by an observable social condition. (Bourdieu, 1979, p. 101).

In other words, *habitus* allows us to understand a situation even if we have never had that lived experience. It enables us to make a connection between practices and a situation. It is “history turned into nature” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 78). It encompasses our history, that history’s effect on our present circumstances, and the resulting choices we make. It focuses on the ways we act, feel, think and exist (Maton, 2012, p. 51). It is circular, forming around who we were, who we are, and who we will be—what we did, what we do, and what we will do.

In connection with our *habitus* is the relationship between other concepts presented by Bourdieu. Both simple and complex relationships exist between past, present, and even future experiences that make up social space (*fields*) (Thomson, 2012, p. 65-66), an actor’s personal desires and investments (*interests*) (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 39-40), unconscious pre-dispositions (*doxa*) (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 164-165), and discrepancies (or shake-ups) within these contexts (*hysteresis or hysteresis effect*) (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 78). The relationship between a person’s (or actor’s) *habitus* and their current circumstances are completely intertwined (Grenfell, 2008, p. 51). The experiences of Royster and Logan interact with the experiences of their peers, students, and the history of the discipline itself. As such, Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus* can be used to

examine how those experiences affected and continue to affect Royster and Logan's roles in Rhetoric and Composition studies.

Each of Bourdieu's concepts contains a more central, inter-dependent relationship. According to Bourdieu, "social fields are not fixed" and "collectives of people [actors] occupy more than one social field at a time" (Thomson, 2008, p. 68). For example, educational, political, and economic fields interact at a university in which students, faculty, and administration are affected. And, each of the actors involved brings their own *habitus* into the fields. Royster and Logan have served in multiple capacities (faculty, scholar, and administrator), usually overlapping, and looking at the decisions they made in order to navigate these fields simultaneously will help shed light on how the discipline reacted to their interactions.

Inside of the contexts of an actor's *interests*, *fields*, and *habitus* are the limitations imposed by what Bourdieu refers to as *doxa* whereby

any common-sense reflection on existing rules is necessarily mediated – and therefore restricted – by day-to-day experience, by established practice, in short by what is; as such it is stifled by the lack of means to express and therefore appropriately question what is implicit and taken for granted" (Deer, 2008, p. 118).

Without that ability to question it is difficult for an actor to obtain an accurate view of other actors and their relationships with the many social *fields*. But, change in the form of disruptions does happen within *fields* and the result cascades throughout an individual's, group's, or institution's *habitus*. That disruption is called *hysteresis* and the resulting altered *field* structures exist temporarily in the context of an unknown future (Hardy, 2008, p. 144). Due to the interconnectedness of these concepts, a change in one affects them all. Royster and Logan

continually find ways to ask questions about the field of RCS in their scholarship. Not only do they call for disruptions, they cause disruptions. In this dissertation, I bring attention to those disruptions.

1.3.1 Arguing Against Myself (Or, My Own *Hysteresis*)

If someone asked me if I were a “Trekkie” I would say, “No. But I do watch Star Trek.” The reality is, I’m a bit of a Trekkie. Have I ever been to a convention? No. Do I have a Star Trek uniform hanging in my closet? No. Have I seen almost every episode of the franchise and all of the movies more than once? Yes. And, in just about all of those episodes, there is contact between humans and aliens. Connections made between races and species. Often, it is not just some humanoid lifeform, but random shapes that represent matter, other types of life forms. What stands out in my mind are the times when the camera pans out and all we see are circles connecting...well, connecting everything—from planets and solar systems to space ships and satellites. Let’s not forget about the space-time continuum. Not that I know what that means. It just sounds cool. The thing is, if that all seems cool to me, why don’t I just say yes when asked if I’m a Trekkie? Well, I’m not quite sold on the entirety of Trekkie-ism (is that a word?). And, I’m not quite sold on the entirety of Bourdieu-ism; at least, not in the modern context.

For Bourdieu, actors are influenced by and make decisions based on everything around them—their *habitus*, *fields*, *interests*, *doxa*, and *hysteresis*. According to Bourdieu, the only way to undermine *doxa* is through access to knowledge – which usually would come through the State or scientific institutions (Deer, p. 124). Those with positions of authority are the ones who get to determine truth. Bourdieu often places somewhat strict limitations on those without positions of authority, the less authentic voices—and asserts that the restrictions are reinforced

by those with less authentic voices. He states, “It is an integrative struggle and, by virtue of the initial handicaps, a reproductive struggle, since those who enter this chase, in which they are beaten before they start, as the constancy of the gaps testifies, implicitly recognize the legitimacy of the goals pursued by those who they pursue, by the mere fact of taking part” (Bourdieu, 1979, p. 165). Here Bourdieu does not make allowances for the dominated to experience *hysteresis*, which seems contradictory to the very notion of *hysteresis*.

Consider this. Just as Royster and Kirsch anchor *Feminist Rhetorical Practices* to geological² processes, I use the metaphor of a neutron star³. A [neutron star](#)⁴ is formed “when a



Figure 1: A rupture in the crust of a highly magnetized neutron star... can trigger high-energy eruptions.

massive star runs out of fuel and collapses. The very central region of the star—the core—collapses, crushing together every proton and electron into a neutron... This collapse leaves behind the most dense object known—an object with the mass of a sun squished down to the size

of a city” (Imagine the Universe, NASA, 2017). Bourdieu acknowledges the importance of reflecting on the influences *on* people, groups, and institutions and influences *by* people, groups, and institutions. However, Bourdieu’s theories make it more difficult for the dominated to act within that reflection process. Instead, he considers that “the ability of the socially dominated to effectively act upon their condition is either limited to weak, non-discursive, practical means (strike action, violent bursts) or is open to “symbolic hijacking” in the transition from practice to

² In *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*, Royster and Kirsch connect rhetorical analysis to mining for gold and analytical processes to assaying; (p. 15).

³ Image Credit: NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center/S. Wiessinger

⁴ “Beaming with the Light of Millions of Suns”; X-ray: NASA/CXC/Caltech/M. Brightman et al.; Optical: NASA/STScI

verbal representation (logos)” (Deer, p. 118). If the field of rhetoric, in the traditional sense, is a massive star running out of fuel, disregarding the material of unofficialized voices, and *hysteresis* represents the collapse—the traditionally silenced *effectively*⁵ acting upon their condition--what is the neutron star? Rhetoric and Composition Studies becomes rich and dense. It becomes more than the weight of the world.

Generations of Star Trek fans, including me, have imagined the possibilities of space travel and life in, and beyond, the stars. By reflecting on and examining generations of past work and power relations/relationships, rhetoric and writing scholars can then open their minds to the transformation of discourses over time. An historical analysis of the discursive practices of those in power can teach us how to operate rhetorically within the current power structure – in order to disrupt it. That is ultimately where this project aims to go. The disruption—the collapse of one star that leaves behind a new, weightier one. If the acknowledgement and inclusion of the voices of the traditionally silenced can be represented by a neutron star, consider the weight of what they have to say.

While Bourdieu’s theories provide an understanding of how the relationships between experiences play a role in the social, political, economic, and academic context, scholars of color are able to contradict his claim that the socially dominated are “limited to weak, non-discursive, practical means” (Deer, p. 118). The scholarship of Royster and Logan examines those voices that traditionally have been powerless, voices relegated to back pages with limited access, and gives them weight. This is why highlighting the work of Royster and Logan is important. We, the field of Rhetoric and Composition Studies, can look at the discourses they have examined, to learn about discourses by people of color now. Knowledge-making.

⁵ In other words, using rhetoric.

1.3.2 Otherness

Homi Bhabha (1994) says that the recognizable Other is a “subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite” (p. 86) and that Otherness is simultaneously an “object of desire and derision, an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity” (p. 67). In this project, as it relates to U.S. society, I define Others as people who are not part of the dominant, white male, group—where race, gender, sexuality, and disability come into play, for example. Bhabha brings into question how Otherness is represented and the role of stereotypes in that representation. This speaks directly to Royster’s commentary about the reaction to her work. When she speaks or writes about the contributions of African American women, the blank and confused looks she receives are reflective of the social expectations related to Others.

Royster says,

Reflected on their faces and in their questions and comments, if anyone can manage to speak back to me, is a depth of surprise that is always discomfoting. I sense that the surprise, or the silence, if there is little response, does not come from the simple ignorance of unfortunate souls who just happen not to know what I have spent years coming to know. What I suspect is that this type of surprise rather "naturally" emerges in a society that so obviously has the habit of expecting nothing of value, nothing of consequence, nothing of importance, nothing at all positive from its Others, so that anything is a surprise; everything is an exception; and nothing of substance can really be claimed as a result (1999b, p. 35).

Logan touches on this same topic in her NCTE Chair’s address (2011) when she discusses the slipperiness⁶ of the term diversity in relation to the term different (p. 66). Different often comes

⁶ Logan references Joyce Middleton’s “Against Diversity” (2003) here to support her argument about the challenges that must be acknowledged when attempting to define the term diversity.

to mean simply not white, other people who are not part of the dominant group. In my examinations of and personal interactions with Royster and Logan I examine them in the context of Otherness—their experiences as Others as well as their work related to Others.

According to Victor Villanueva (1993) people of color carry the colony wherever they go (xiv). That claim certainly applies to his experiences and role as an academic. Although he does state that institutions and organizations are working to make conditions better for people of color, his overall claim is that racism is embedded systematically (p. 120). As such, every aspect of participation in the academy—scholar, teacher, student, administrator—is affected by race. Villanueva writes of an experience in which a decision regarding his career was based on the number of minorities already appointed in a similar capacity saying, “The committee threatened to have representation rather than tokenism...He reads like never before, more careful than ever before, at pains to demonstrate his thorough understanding of rhetoric, composition, literacy, philosophy—his competence despite his color” (p. 119). Villanueva’s (re)telling of this experience has a multi-fold impact. If his colleagues, for instance, read his work, will they see this as a “simple story” or will they see it as an “unmasked truth”? That is the question that Royster asks. She believes that transformations to the histories and theories surrounding Others can take place if the import beneath the narratives of Others can be understood (1999b, p. 35).

Royster and Logan, like Villanueva, exist as both minorities and academics. An examination of their scholarly works reflects their understandings of their dual existences and the various ways in which their professional lives have been impacted by this duality. According to W.E.B. Du Bois (1903), “One ever feels his two-ness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.” Bhabha, Villanueva, and Du Bois state that

being Other is always recognizable and is always a struggle. Yet, they also present theories that allow the Other to navigate through the various power structures in place. In examining the positions of Royster and Logan within the academy, I hope to learn how and where the Other “fits” and does not “fit” in the past, present, and future of rhetorical studies

According to Patricia Hill Collins (1991), “Black feminist thought encompasses theoretical interpretations of Black Women’s reality by those who live it” (p. 155). An important aspect to Hill Collins’ definition is the distinctions between a Black *woman’s* thoughts and Black *women’s* thoughts. Her argument is that Black and feminist do not always coexist; that not all black women are feminists and that not all black women deal with the struggles of being both black and women in the same ways. While black women share many of the same experiences that does not mean that all African-American women share a group consciousness. Hill Collins (1991) says that, “this connection between experience and consciousness that shapes the everyday lives of African-American women pervades the works of Black women activists and scholars” (p. 159). Much of the scholarly work of Royster and Logan examines the different ways in which Black women have navigated the Black female experience and how they have talked about it. In order to understand better Royster and Logan’s positions within Rhetoric, it is necessary to examine how being both Black and female affects their engagement with Rhetoric and Composition Studies.

1.4 (RE)SEARCH METHODOLOGIES

The methods for collecting the data included personal interviews and observations of the participants⁷, a review of published scholarship, research regarding the need for and importance

⁷ See Appendices A and B for interview questions and IRB information

of the study, and field notes. A key addition to the research comes from those face-to-face interviews with Royster and Logan. It is crucial to hear, first-hand, about their experiences as scholars, teachers and administrators in the academy and within Rhetoric and Composition Studies. Through the interview process I hope to understand their lived experiences and make meaning of that experience.

The interviews and time spent with Royster and Logan were fairly unscripted. Our conversations took on more of a discussion format. Feminist scholars argue that the interviewer should employ strategies such as responding to questions from the interviewees and making the purpose of the research visible to the interviewees (Kirsch, 1993, p. 33-34). The overall strategy should be to outline the topics but have enough flexibility to allow the interaction to go in unanticipated directions. According to Alby and Fatigante (2014), interviewing means “engaging in a conversation that unfolds moment by moment and that is oriented toward an institutional end” (p. 240). For the official sit-down interviews with Royster and Logan, questions were prepared in advance⁷ and based on the responses received, I changed or removed subsequent questions or asked additional questions. I also allowed them to ask me questions. For time spent together at conferences and on visits, I wanted to have organic conversations and, although I took notes, recordings, and photographs, I usually did not attempt to direct the conversations or apply an academic lens over the discussions.

Along with the interviews, I observed the participants at conferences, workshops, in the classroom setting, and at other speaking events. In Royster’s case, I watched online videos of speeches and presentations she has given. For Logan, I traveled to the University of Maryland College Park and attended her class during finals week. The class I attended was the last class she taught prior to retiring. Collecting field notes along with the face-to-face interviews enabled

me to see Royster and Logan put their philosophies (and experiences) into practice. It gave me an opportunity to observe their personal and professional interactions with both students and colleagues. The use of observation is “often combined with the qualitative interview to acquire more perspectives or in-depth information on a phenomenon” (Strom and Fagermoen, 2012). Strom and Fagermoen (2012) argue that combining the two methods clarifies the distinctions between them, highlights their complementary natures, and allows for increased transparency (critical to the feminist research methods) in the theoretical analysis and interpretation process.

The comprehensive review of published scholarship consists of publications *on* Royster and Logan, work authored and co-authored *by* them, and some literature that cites them. Feminist scholars contend that research studies can be enhanced due to the additional insights gained through the interactions between researcher and participant (Kirsch, 1993). These interactions lead to increased self-awareness for the researcher and help to limit “cultural, class and gender biases” (Kirsch, 1993, p. 29). Royster and Logan’s participation in the project has helped to support my assertions regarding their influence on African American women entering the field.

1.5 (RE)SEARCH SCOPE AND CONSTRAINTS

The scope of the inquiry into Royster and Logan’s participation and influence in RCS does not include a separate analysis of their co-authored work. Instead, co-authored pieces are a part of the general argument and their list of accomplishments. Additionally, this project does not contain an in-depth citation analysis of their scholarship. Initially, I planned to include statistical data about who is citing Royster and Logan and why. After much frustration, I finally conceded that the citation work would have to come as a separate project post dissertation.

Existing tools are woefully inadequate to do the kind of work that I wanted to do. While certain tools are available that provide citation analysis and an attempt was made to utilize those tools, they were limited in date span and the number and type of journals and books accessed (especially texts in the Humanities), they contained duplicate information, and there were inconsistencies across tools. Instead, I found references where I could and thought about how those references were used. Future work can be done in this area, either manually or with the development of more sophisticated tools.

1.6 OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

I begin this project, in chapter one, by discussing an overview of the inquiry and a description of the problem. I describe the theoretical frameworks and methodologies used and reasons for these methods. Next, the importance of the research is explained and I provide background information on aspects of Royster and Logan's scholarship, teaching, and administrative positions. Chapter two explores Royster as a knowledge maker in four categories of Royster's work: African American's and Rhetorical Studies; Global Citizenship; Feminism and Rhetoric; and English Composition and Literacy. Chapter three examines four categories of Logan's knowledge-making work: Sites of Rhetorical Education; Nineteenth Century Feminist Rhetorical Practices; Race, Gender and Civic Engagement; and English Language and Literacy. Chapter four places Royster and Logan in conversation with each other. Where and how does their work converge? How is made knowledge by them reflected in the field? It also weaves in the voices of other women in RCS, in particular, women who are emerging scholars in the field. Chapter five concludes the inquiry and considers the implications of the research. It also suggests directions for future study of not just Royster and Logan, but of African Americans in RCS.

1.7 I, JOURNAL – *EVERYTHING MEANS SOMETHING*

In attempting to write a dissertation about two such incredible women, I found myself doubting everything. Their work examines Black women rhetors. I'd never studied Black women rhetors. They looked at women's studies and feminist research practices. I've never taken even one women's studies class (or a research methods course). They examine literacy. I'm not sure I know what literacy means. I guess one of my questions is the same as Royster's, "Why is it that the learning process [about remarkable African American women] has to be extracurricular?"

Every time I sat down to write about Logan and Royster, I felt overwhelmed by how much I did not and do not know. I was paralyzed by gaps. How can I write about Black women rhetors without studying all of them myself? How can I write about feminist studies without fully understanding feminist research? Literacy? Does anyone know what the term "literacy" means? I told myself that I needed to be an expert in all of these subjects in order to write about two women who engage in these subjects. Then, I began to realize that I at least know what Logan and Royster say about these subjects? Maybe I do not need to be a learned scholar about these subjects in order to write about how Logan and Royster address these subjects. So, I went back to the beginning, determined to take one step at a time. Why do I want to write about Logan and Royster? What do they have to say that makes me want to bring the rest of the field into conversation with me? "Last Words" is a chapter at the end of Royster and Simpkin's edited collection, *Calling Cards* (2005). In it, Logan (who has a chapter in the book) makes a comment that led to a free writing session for me that became the catalyst for chapter four of this dissertation. Royster introduces "Last Words" defiantly,

We, the contributors to this collection, imagine ourselves in a well-lighted space, open, airy, pleasing to the eye. We are surrounded by others who have set the conversation in ways that are neither accommodating to our insights and interests nor invitational to our voices. They speak to each other as if we are not there, suggesting that we are intruders, or even worse that we are imperceptible to them—too far away, perhaps, or maybe too close. How can this be? We are here. We have been here. Others, like us, were here before us. We are not intruders. We are not imperceptible.

In small acts of resistance, we speak as our intellectual ancestors have done, amplifying our voices, presenting ourselves one by one, each in her or his own turn, tossing our cards about the room, claiming space, creating visibility—without microscope, without telescope—for the naked eye. Amid such boldness, we see each other and recognize, as Alice Walker predicted, joy in resistance. We grab chairs, draw closer, clustering as we like, rearranging the furniture—a bit, disrupting the scene—a bit, setting our belongings in plain sight. We find ways to speak our minds and our lives. We share our written words, and then we speak, an opportunity for a few last words (p. 255).

Wow! And now I write and speak.

Chapter 2: Jacqueline Jones Royster

2.1 Curious Things

Because I think part of the ultimate answer that you're trying to get about African American women in rhetorical studies, is that the presence, our presence and non-presence is part of what [Adam](#)⁸ was saying today – will we be cited? And so I think there is a problem of citation for African American women's intellectualism 'cause if we did not have a problem of citation there would not be people in our profession who didn't get the reference to Anna Julia Cooper. It's a problem of citation... Who's actually reading it instead of just putting their Black authors on the list? You know, that kind of thing... I was very surprised today that the article that Adam cited was 'Small Boats'⁹ 'cause most people don't know that one. 'Cause they don't always read what we write. We, meaning African American women scholars."

Royster – personal interview, 2015

The first time I met Jacqueline Jones Royster was at the [Feminism and Rhetorics 2013](#) Conference at Stanford University. [Dr Maceo Dailey, Jr.](#), who was a member of my dissertation committee, had given me a personal message to deliver to her. They were former colleagues. When I walked up to her I was so nervous that I did not even introduce myself. I just blurted out the message from Dr. Dailey. She put her hand on my shoulder and said, "Oh, you've made my day." I was beaming inside (but trying to play it cool on the outside) and immediately ran back to my computer to e-mail Dr. Dailey.

Alright, I admit it. That's a very simplified retelling of that meeting. In reality, she and Dr. Dailey had made my day. As I stood there waiting for my chance to talk to her, the echos of "When the First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own" ringing through my head, I thought about being able to talk about feeling like an outsider the way she had in that essay. I wondered how

⁸ Adam Bank's 2015 CCCC's Chair's address.

⁹ Royster, J. J. (2002). Academic Discourses or Small Boats on a Big Sea. In C. Schroeder, H. Fox, P. Bizzell (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative discourses and the academy*. (pp. 23-30). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

she had found the words to so fully articulate my own thoughts. Would I ever be able to do that? At the time, I had not decided on a dissertation topic. Up until that point, I believed that I would do something that connected RCS to my MFA in Creative Writing. I was also still an infant, not new to rhetoric, but to the field of RCS. After all, creative writing is almost all rhetoric. How else do we convince an audience to suspend beliefs and step into a new world for four hundred pages?

But, the Feminism and Rhetorics conference and the incredible women I met there convinced me that my voice could join with other voices, other Other voices, and be part of a transformation in RCS. Dr. Maceo Crenshaw Dailey, a historian and Director of the African American Studies Program at UTEP, asked me many questions about African Americans in RCS – questions I couldn't answer. And so, I set out to do the research necessary to find those answers. It was overwhelming because I did not know where to start – until I mentioned an



Figure 2: Jacqueline Jones Royster; Georgia Institute of Technology

article I'd read by a Dr. Royster and he told me about their friendship. Later, as the dissertation progressed and I read more of Royster's work, I discovered that Dr. Dailey's commentary on the direction of Black women's studies was cited in the Bell-Scott, Guy-Sheftall, and Royster (1991) co-authored piece "The Promise and Challenge of Black Women's Studies." Things come full circle. Now, I miss Dr. Dailey, who passed away in 2015, and his stories and I am so thankful that he gave me that message to pass on. For, what I

have learned from spending time with Royster, in print and in person, has completely altered *me*. Royster was a *field* and an *interest*.

In *Feminist Rhetorical Practices* (2012) Royster and Kirsch state, “at the hands of teachers and scholars in feminist rhetorical practices, research and practice in rhetorical studies have changed – and to the benefit of the whole” (p. 14). This is what I mean by the circularity of the work. For each of these women and men who advocate for the inclusion of women’s voices, who advocate for the disruption and do the disrupting, the field becomes *more*. Royster and Simpkins (2005) suggest that as the field engages in research about race, gender, and culture that it is important that that work be done “in the company of others” (p. x-xi) so that there is a meta discussion of what is being discovered and that discussion needs to include “colleagues across related fields in English studies” (p. xi). All of us go into our work, projects, academics, and families with pre-determined ideas- experiences, beliefs, biases, and personal connections that influence the directions we take in all of these areas. Our *habitus* leads us into our current and future experiences.

Royster (2005) says that no one is objective in their knowledge-making work and that those who engage in non-traditional work such as race, gender, and culture studies, are going against the grain of traditional academic values. That work and those people then become politicized but changes within RCS have allowed this work and these voices to participate (p. 4). But we also, as scholars speaking from the margins, can tell our stories and situate them whether or not a place was established for them. As I have been arguing, much of Royster’s work is about visiting and re-visiting the work of previous scholars so that a learning takes place from their experiences, observations, judgements, and wisdom—their *habitus*. At the heart of my argument is that Royster teaches and then learning takes place by visiting her work.

Interestingly, she revisits her own work and writing. Not only does she cite herself but she will

often reflect on prior speeches, books, and articles as well as engagement with colleagues and comment on what she was thinking about during that writing space and time. She'll discuss her



own personal growth as part of the new work she is doing and then express her hopes for her future self. In *Calling Cards* (2005), Royster explains the importance of (1) re-examining her concerns about how the changes within RCS, in terms of how

knowledge is made, impact researchers and scholars and (2) (re)situating her particular argument about revising and reshaping what gets defined as knowledge in rhetorical studies . She says that she is trying to follow in the footsteps of (within the tradition of) DuBois and those of his generation (p. 6).

When I sat down for my first interview with Royster I asked her about the number of things she's accomplished and her drive. Her response was surprising. She said,

I would say that for me it's about curious things. It's for me about doing things that bring me some pleasure or affirmation or sense of contribution. It hasn't been about being driven in a way that people talk about being driven, you know. I didn't do stuff because I thought it was going to tick off a box. I did stuff because I thought it might be interesting. (personal communication , 2015)

That interview went in a completely different direction than what I had imagined. Her answers to my initial questions were so unexpected that I discarded the rest of them. The interview was raw and honest. When I re-watch the recording of that meeting, in her hotel room at CCCCs 2015, it feels like a very private conversation about women and African Americans and

experience. I learned so much from that moment in time. In this chapter, I share some of that private learning along with the public lessons she has given to the field.

2.2 AFRICAN AMERICAN'S AND RHETORICAL STUDIES

Royster's work addresses both African American's use of rhetoric and African American's presence in Rhetoric and Composition Studies. From *Southern Horrors* (1996c) and "Sarah's Story" (1999) to *Traces of a Stream* (2000b) and "Disciplinary Landscaping," (2003b) she delves into the rhetorical practices of people of African descent and she makes no distinct line between their use of rhetoric and their engagement in the field. Instead, the literacy practices of African Americans and their roles in the study of the practice of literacy are woven together in her work. There are times in which she focuses on the rhetorical work of a particular figure such as Ida B. Wells or Sarah Kinson or Charlotte Forten Grimké and times when she argues for African American's voices in Rhetoric and Composition studies. She not only highlights the original works of historical figures, she analyzes it and applies it to today's notions of rhetoric, rhetorical studies, race, and gender. For example, in *Southern Horrors*, she provides an edited collection of the work of Ida B. Wells' campaign against lynching. Then, in "To Call a Thing by Its True Name: The Rhetoric of Ida B. Wells" (1995) she crafts an essay that argues that,

our ability to understand the rhetorical strategies of Ida B. Wells and other African American women rhetors rests to a great extent on the task of thinking more deeply and broadly about more traditional definitions of rhetoric as a 'public' enterprise, about the acquisition of rhetorical competence, and about the ways in which we analyze rhetorical events. (176)

She asserts (2000b) that an examination of African American women's literacy practices reveals that it is a "story of visionaries, of women using sociocognitive ability to re-create themselves and to re-imagine their worlds" (p. 110). What comes through most clearly in Royster's scholarship is that African American's presence in RCS is due, in a large part, to the rhetorical practices and work of historical voices.

In the epigraph above, from our first interview, Royster is expressing a concern that resonates with African American scholars in RCS – that Black voices are often included for their Blackness and not for their actual intellectual contributions to the field. Krista Ratcliffe, in *Rhetorical Listening* (2005), tells a story about writing *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges*¹⁰ and her dilemma about adding a chapter on Alice Walker. I take the liberty to sum up her telling of the story to my takeaways. Should she include the chapter for Blackness's sake? Some editorial advice suggested that she contact Shirley Wilson Logan to get her opinion on the matter. However, Ratcliffe at once recognized that "such a 'white' move would have been insultingly essentializing, making Logan a spokesperson for an entire ethnic group" (p. 5). Principally, Ratcliffe's struggle was an issue of tokenism. However, Ratcliffe's awareness that Black voices matter in scholarship and that the voices need to be recognized responsibly does come through. [Adam Banks \(2015\)](#) says that "The moment when we will be free or represent freedom as an organization [referring to NCTE], as a group of scholars, will be not just when the demographics of our conferences and our faculties look like the demographics of our society, but when our citation practices and works cited lists do too" (Funk, Flight, and Freedom). So, how does RCS get to the point that citation of Others' voices happens without it being an

¹⁰ Ratcliffe, K. (1996). *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges to the Rhetorical Traditions: Virginia Woolf, Mary Daly, Adrienne Rich*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

afterthought? Without it being tokenism? Without it being false representations of freedom? As indicated in the above quote from “To Call a Thing by Its True Name,” Royster (1995) argues for a disruption in what gets to be defined as a part of rhetoric.

Royster (1996b) calls out those who would seek to speak for her, our, any ethnic group without actually including them in the conversation – as if those voices are less authentic than their dominant, official, and knowledgeable ones. She says “when the subject matter is me and the voice is not mine, my sense of order and rightness is disrupted” (p. 31). But, she does not accept that disruption in silence. She flips the script and produces her own disruption of that unenlightened point of view by stating that she will raise her “voice in the interest of clarity and accuracy” (p. 34). Citing Du Bois, she goes on to acknowledge that she will face “the power and function of deep disbelief” (p. 34) because she is engaged in a culture that has a “habit of expecting nothing of value, nothing of consequence, nothing of importance, nothing at all positive from its Others, so that anything is a surprise; everything is an exception; and nothing of substance can really be claimed as a result” (p. 35). Villanueva (1993) tells a similar story that makes the same argument. When he received the book contract for *Bootstraps*, a colleague congratulates him and then adds on, “Still, I have a hard time seeing you as someone of color.” Villanueva says, “My guess is that he meant that as a compliment, likely having something to do with competence. The colleague must see ‘color’ as brown and black and not quite as able” (xii) – skin color having a direct link to qualifications.

Royster and Williams (1999) address the officialized narratives and those voices that are traditionally left out, specifically African American voices. They assert that “these official narratives have social, political, and cultural consequences, a situation that is exacerbated by the ways in which the officializing process itself grants the privilege of primacy to texts” (History, p.

580). However, their argument does not just focus on how African American's presence has been misrepresented or made invisible; they also suggest alternate ways to view that presence such as including nineteenth century voices and the voices of students not designated as basic writers. Logan (1999a) contributes to the discussion stating, "[a]s we move towards a more inclusive rhetoric, we need to be clear about who is being included into what already existing discursive community" (p. 10). Instead of focusing on Western influence on other cultures, rhetoric can be studied for its multicultural aspects (Logan, 1999a). Another suggestion by Royster and Williams, one demonstrated in much of Royster's other work, is to recover the contributions that demonstrate that African Americans do already have a history of scholarship and professional engagement (579). Royster (2000b) says that many who respond to presentations of her work,

have consistently demanded, subtly and not so subtly, that I prove my worth and the worth of my subject matter using measures that seem to me to suggest the reader's or listener's own needs to contain, limit, and control both definitions of authenticity and rights to interpretive authority (p. 252).

This is a topic that gets repeated often throughout her works and over the years (1996b, 2003b, 2005). Here is where she again demonstrates the overlap between African American rhetoric and being an African American scholar in RCS. For both, there is a lack of understanding of the role of rhetoric in African Americans' fight for freedom, for civil rights, by those intellectuals who are so intellectual that they get to determine what is officialized, often excluding the rhetoric of scholars of color, allowing RCS to run out of the fuel provided by the inclusion of *all* voices and the experiences and knowledge they bring to the field. Villanueva (1993) reinforces this idea and the frustrations he experiences "working within an institution that constantly seeks

change and continually impedes change, of my respect and affection for nice people who are too often unwittingly unkind to people of color” (p. xvii). This unkindness is reflected in an unwillingness to be self-critical—uncritical of teaching, treatment of students, search and hiring practices, the department, administration, and the university as a whole. And, uncritical of colleagues who do and say things that Other others.

In *Calling Cards*, Royster ties “two-ness” between hooks and DuBois but her work can also be connected to this idea. She makes the claim that dualities are “more often than not multiplicities” (2005, p.3). As demonstrated, Royster is African American, woman, scholar, researcher, teacher, writer, speaker, mentor, and more. She often says that she is aware that her work and her voice come from a place that is rooted in the works and voices of others (1996b, 1999a, 1999b, 2000b, 2003b). Some of those multiplicities come from other Others and some from her own experiences and interactions. It is all of those things that come together as insight, as knowledge made, and are then used to situate her scholarly self and her work. She presents herself (2005) as a “scholar who sustains an abiding professional commitment to the rhetorical history of African American women but who also understands that the context for critical engagement requires a transformative vision, one that imagines the possibility of things currently unseen” (p. 9). Imagine the field of rhetoric as a neutron star.

2.3 FEMINISM AND RHETORIC

From her work in Black Women’s Studies to her scholarly pursuits in Rhetoric and Composition Studies, Royster has always researched women rhetors and advocated for their inclusion into what gets defined as contributions to the field of rhetorical studies. She has spoken

and written about women's roles as global citizens, rhetorical scholars, teachers, and researchers—with a focus on how feminist scholars and their work is perceived and received.

In Laura Micciche's (2010) "Writing as Feminist Rhetorical Theory"¹¹, she asks the question "What would it mean to read feminists as rhetorical theorists of writing, rather than predominately as social theorists?" (p. 173). She goes on to discuss the essentiality of writing to feminist work and argues that "writing is fertile material for doing feminist rhetorical work because it establishes links between language, action, and consequences" (p. 176). In their 2012 collaborative work *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy Studies*, Royster and Kirsch identify four critical tasks they pursued in writing the book. The first of those tasks was to examine major disruptions in rhetorical inquiry, seeing the landscape of the history of rhetoric differently. The application of *critical imagination*¹²—seeing connections and possibilities, seeing the noticed and the unnoticed—to feminist rhetorical work brings that new landscape into view (p. 13). Micciche (2010) says that, "Interruption creates a pause in discourse, often allowing for seemingly tangential ideas to move to the center, whereas disruption, another of writing's capabilities, breaks discourse apart, creating lines through which new meanings can emerge" (p. 178). Micciche does take the time to explain the positives and negatives of interruption and I do acknowledge that there are two sides to this coin. However, my focus here is on how interruptions and disruptions (*hysteresis*) related to rhetorical inquiry allow for the recognition of women's (and other marginalized voices') contributions to RCS. As Royster and Kirsch (2012) go on to discuss the major disruptions in the field, they list dozens of publications related to feminist rhetorical practices categorized by *Reframing Westernized*

¹¹ In *Rhetorica in Motion: Feminist Rhetorical Methods and Methodologies* (2010).

¹² First used by Royster in *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change among African American Women* (2000).

traditions; The nature and sponsorship of literacy, reading and writing practices, rhetorical education, and the nature of authorship; Rhetorical and literate practices in various contexts and communities; Individual women rhetors; Practices in technological environments; and ways in which feminist scholarship in rhetoric and composition is being done and transforming the field (p. 32-34).

One particular focus of their argument is Schell and Rawson's (2010) *Rhetorica in Motion: Feminist Rhetorical Methods and Methodologies*. Royster and Kirsch (2012) use this text to discuss Rawson's suggestion that "we might benefit from using gender as an analytic, rather than an identity category" (p. 46). For them, Rawson's approach disrupts "one of our most basic and underinterrogated assumptions, the concept of 'woman/female-man/male' and helps us notice new terrains for exploration, documentation, analysis and interpretation that put us to a more richly rendered view of rhetoric as a diversely articulated human enterprise" (p. 47). This leads into Royster and Kirsch's next task which is to argue that feminist rhetorical practices have, in fact, changed rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies (RCS) and caused the expansion of the numbers and types of elements used to determine excellence in performance and professional practice (p. 13).

Those new elements are reached through what Royster and Kirsch (2012) call *strategic contemplation*. The space created through the meditative process allows for deeper, critical thinking to happen which connects to scholarly productivity. As researchers and scholars, strategically meditating on our work allows us to "stretch beyond anointed assumptions about the ways and mean of rhetorical performance" (p. 21). Citing Cheryl Glenn's work on the rhetoric of silence, they assert that strategic contemplation "involves recognizing—and learning to listen to—silence as a rhetorically powerful act" (21). Feminist work often engages in the

documenting of women's experiences, rhetorical subjects whose stories are often missing or misrepresented. As such, using strategic contemplation in research opens pathways to access those stories. Feminist rhetorical scholars can interrogate how lived experiences "shape our perspectives as researchers and those of our research subjects" (Royster and Kirsch, 2012, p. 22).

Royster and Kirsch's (2012) assertions about critical imagination and strategic contemplation link directly to their third and fourth critical tasks in writing *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*—to make connections between feminist rhetorical practices and how researchers and scholars are using those practices to form new paradigms for feminist work and how it can be knowledge-making and knowledge-using and to propose, based on this new way of looking at RCS, a multipronged framework for "understanding, interpreting, and assessing feminist practices" (p. 13-14). Tying all of this together, their concept of *social circulation*

invokes connections among past, present, and future in the sense that the overlapping social circles in which women travel, live, and work are carried on or modified from one generation to the next and can lead to changed rhetorical practices. (2012, p. 23)

Their goal is to disrupt the divisions between public and private space in order to make women more visible in the social spaces that they have long functioned in. This includes women's active engagement in the *globalization* of rhetoric and writing—recognizing RCS as transnational.

I have provided an overview of the arguments laid forth in *Feminist Rhetorical Practices* to demonstrate the circularity of Royster and Kirsch's work within the text and with Royster's scholarship at large. Each of these methodologies are interwoven with each other and as demonstrated throughout this dissertation, interwoven (as precursors and follow-ups) in Royster's work. There is no way to discuss the assertions about social circulation without seeing

its connection to critical imagination or strategic contemplation. Viewing rhetoric as a global enterprise in the way that Royster and Kirsch explain it leads back to social circulation as well as Royster's work on social change and global citizenship. For Royster, her work went/goes beyond the ways in which women of African descent were/are using rhetoric but also include(ed) the "disciplinary reformation in RCL that would make more and better breathing room for the types of work in the field that I (and others) wished to do" (2012, p. 11).

2.4 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP (CIVIL/HUMAN RIGHTS)

In "Literature, Literacy, and Language" (1996a), Royster says, "So, what kind of person, essentially, would I like to see emerge annually from our literature courses across the nation? The answer begins, of course, with the way that I see the world. What's out there?" (p. 141). In 2015, I attended Royster's workshop "[Human Rights, Civil Rights, and Global Citizenship](#)¹³" held at the Rhetoric Society of America (RSA) Summer Institute. During the workshop, she explained that she wanted to plant a seed in each of the participants. She wanted us to come away with an increased motivation for what she calls the four C's (1996a): compassion, communication, cooperation, and courage. Two of the main documents used for the workshop were the United Nations' [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) (UDHR) and the [United States Constitution](#). Royster gave us homework and asked us to compare the two documents and bring

¹³ Workshop description: This workshop will explore three terms and various intersections among them: human rights, civil rights, and global citizenship. The central objective is to bring some specificity to these concepts as ideas and practices and to the general discourses in which they are functioning in our times, an era in which we tend to speak quite glibly about "globalism" and "globalization" without adequately accounting for--typically--the assumptions, terms of engagement, processes, or values that are embedded within our actual use. The workshop will combine the reading and discussion of assigned texts with sharing and discussion of the participants' own writing and with the collaborative research that they will be doing in the workshop in one of the three focal areas. The basic questions that will anchor these activities are: What does it mean to be a "global citizen"? How do our perspectives on global citizenship raise questions and implications for how we define, deploy, and value the concepts of "human rights" and civil rights"? What examples of a given concept, as idea and practice, do we find compelling as we think forward about ever-evolving definitions of national and trans-national identities?

our thoughts to the discussion. One of the key distinctions I noticed was that the UDHR is about protecting *humans* and the Constitution focused more on protecting *stuff* (as property). This led to some of the most insightful and thought provoking conversations as we explored the question of what it means to be a global citizen. Since then, Royster’s seed has taken root. A group of us from the workshop created a panel on Global Citizenship and presented at RSA 2016. I have adapted my teaching to include course themes surrounding human rights and social justice. I have interrogated the controversy surrounding the need for a declaration of human rights (cultural imperialism versus the protection of humans) and the desire to engage my students in global discussions and the idea of citizenship. Royster’s workshop and her scholarship ask all of us to consider these concepts.

According to Foss, Foss, & Griffin’s *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* (1999), feminism was expanded by some to include “eliminating the oppression of all people who are marginalized by the dominant culture, including but not limited to people of color, people with disabilities, people of different ages and socioeconomic classes, and lesbians and gay men” (p. 2). In “Human Rights and Civil Rights: The Advocacy and Activism of African-American Women Writers” Royster and Cochran (2011) argue that civil rights, within the United States, get overshadowed by the global view or nation-state understanding of human rights. However, those two should be seen as a “coherent and rightful universal concept” (p. 214). In [*The Autobiography of Malcolm X*](#), Malcolm X states,

“Anything that tries to neaten up people is a messy thing.”

-Royster,
Human Rights, Civil Rights, and Global
Citizenship Workshop

The American black man is the world’s most shameful case of minority oppression.

What makes the black man think of himself as only an internal United States issue is just

a catch-phrase, two words, ‘civil rights.’ How is the black man going to get ‘civil rights’ before first he wins his *human rights*? If the American black man will start thinking about his *human rights*, and then start thinking of himself as part of one of the world’s great peoples, he will see he has a case for the United Nations.”

Similar to Malcolm X’s point, Royster and Cochran’s main argument is that international human rights discourses and United States civil rights discourses occupy the same space and that by examining the civil rights rhetoric of African American women writers, the link between the two becomes evident. However, as Royster and Cochran (2011) state, within the United States “[a]ttention is re-directed to acknowledging annoying imperfection while sustaining national image and authority” (p. 216). In times of crises that highlight inequities, the United States acts surprised and tries to re-label the situation in terms that do not imply inequity.

As discussed during the “Global Citizenship” workshop, civil rights are often used to contain. For example, Malcom X and Martin Luther King are framed as civil rights leaders for Black people only; again highlighting the separation between human rights and civil rights. Royster spoke at the 2007 Civil Rights Symposium at the University of New Mexico.



Figure 3: Royster and Logan, RSA Summer Institute 2015. Royster workshop “Human Rights, Civil Rights, and Global Citizenship.”

In that speech, “Literacy and Civic Engagement: An Interdepartmental and Interdisciplinary Conversation on Civil Rights Reform,” Royster lists several mandates that teachers should follow. Those mandates include

documenting lives of “both extra-ordinary and ordinary people regardless of race, gender, creed, color, language or national origin” and establishing theoretical frameworks that help our society recognize and interpret actions and inactions in relation to our acknowledged value systems (2007, p. 10). According to Royster,

A fundamental task for contemporary literacy researchers is to find useful ways to envision literacy in its particulars, in this case within the lived experiences of African American women. In an examination of literacy within this group, I underscore the idea that literacy connects profoundly, variously, and inextricably with their lives in specific contexts as they have acquired literacy, used it, and become entwined in it by its benefits and consequences. (2006b, p. 45)

Royster argues that the role of teachers, as global citizens, is also one of the ways in which the separation between civil rights and human rights can be addressed. Classroom practices and classroom promises need to meet the moral and legal obligations of civic duty (2007, 2009). She discusses the importance of using literacy, in all of its many iterations to teach civic engagement on college and university campuses; to research historical voices and their practices as they themselves engaged in civil discourse; and to use one’s own voice through scholarship and action to be social engaged in the community.

Teachers should “help students interrogate and understand truth, freedom, justice, and equality for all” and to use their intellectual resources to find their own connections to the multicultural narratives around them (2007, p. 9). In “[Responsible Citizenship in a Global Environment](#),” (2009) she stresses that language and expression are at the core of who we are as human beings. Within discussions of global citizenship, “teachers have the responsibility of being agents and enablers of both stability and change.” What, then, does it mean when we talk

about engagement? Not only should we engage with our students in the full capacity of what that term means as both a verb and a noun, but how do we teach our students to be socially, ethically, and critically engaged citizens (2009)? Teachers can use their classrooms as learning opportunities to see the world through the linguistic and cultural diversity of their students (Royster and Kirsch, 2012, p. 127). The classroom is an opportunity, itself, to create a link between our own understandings and experiences of the world with others' perspectives (2012, p. 127-128). This knowledge-making process can then be (re)cycled back into the classroom. In the "Global Citizenship" workshop, Royster encouraged us to share our experiences, to make connections with the experiences of others in the workshop (including her own), and then discuss how these new connections could be used in our scholarship and pedagogical practices. Royster (2007) states, "as a researcher and scholar, I have responded to these mandates [as listed in "Literacy and Civic Engagement"] through my work on the lives of women of African descent and their participation in public discourses and nation-building agenda" (p. 10).

2.5 ENGLISH COMPOSITION AND LITERACY

In the classroom, Royster applies and experiments with theoretical concepts, always focused on how best to communicate with students, how to listen to students, and how to do these things in creative ways. Royster believes that "as teachers, we have a clearer capacity to think well about what it means to develop rhetorical expertise for a broad range of students whose identities and passions are shaped by a broad range of experiences, values, beliefs, and imperatives" (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 109). A situation in which the overlapping of scholarly and teaching experiences occurred was when she began to incorporate critical imagination as a research tool. She describes it as a turning point in her teaching career, stating that her

identity as a researcher with a primary interest in the rhetorical practices of women of African descent began to coalesce. Even so, in the beginning, what I didn't pay as much attention to was how these inquiry habits would also impact my pedagogical decisions. Using critical imagination as a persistent research practice shifted the whole paradigm within which I was working, not only as a researcher and scholar but also as a teacher. (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 81-82).

Upon realizing that students struggled with the more technical explanations of the rhetorical strategies Royster utilized an imaginative approach to teaching the concepts of ethos, pathos, and logos. She asked them to make connections with their bodies in order to understand rhetorical

“In academic arenas we find ourselves traveling in small boats on a big sea that we have virtually ignored as a sea because we could. Typically in the presence of our students who are testing our commitments to just staying where we are, some of us are being pushed to notice that life in the world of composition could occupy a different space. If we really think about it, we might not even want to limit ourselves to traveling in boats anymore. We might want to experience the sea of discourse in a different way. In other words, if we set our minds to it, the world of composition could actually turn on different assumptions. Change is possible.” (Royster, 2002, p. 28-29).

theory in a more personal manner—a manner in which “their bodies became symbolically sites of persuasion” (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 97). Ethos was connected to the backbone or the stomach, as beliefs or pleasure and revulsion respectively. Pathos was connected to the heart and logos was imagined to be the head (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 97). Through the inclusion of a variety of classroom activities based on students' use of their critical imaginations, Royster claims that she was able to better assist students to think critically and

creatively, develop a rhetorical vocabulary, write with purpose, and reflect on their writing experiences and rhetorical decision making (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 97). Royster's

theoretical philosophies and pedagogical practices interacted in a give-and-take fashion. They pushed each other with forward momentum, opening the door for even more change.

According to Royster (2000a), in RCS “the boundaries among scholarship, teaching, and service blur greatly, and they do so in such dynamic ways that from my point of view what seems important for English studies to do is rise well to a twofold challenge” (p. 1225). One challenge addresses those currently working in the field, directing them to (re)envision all pieces of the puzzle—all areas of the process—as valuable work. The other challenge is for new participants, namely graduate students and PhD programs. Departments with graduate students need to make sure that the up and coming scholars are fully aware that their programs are disciplinary learning opportunities as well as spaces for preparing to teach in general and teach writing specifically. (Royster, 2000a, p. 1225). In order to meet these challenges there needs to be critical reflection by the current participants on themselves and the field [my emphasis].

Additionally, the distinction must be made between Royster’s experiences as an administrator, teacher, and scholar. Her role as a teacher and professor is not the same as her role as a scholar and her administrative experiences are not the same as either. Of course, in some ways the characteristics and philosophies resulting from each position may overlap and even feed the knowledge base of the others – the interaction between *fields*. For example, she writes about the importance of not only improving communication with students but finding ways to connect with administrators and the public. She states (1996a),

In addition to better practices in our classrooms, however, we can also question our ability to talk convincingly with deans, presidents, legislators, and the general public about what we do, how we do it, and why. We have not been conscientious about keeping lines of communication open, and we are now experiencing the consequences of talking

primarily to ourselves as we watch funds being cut, programs being eliminated, and national agencies that are vital to our interests being bandied about as if they are post-it notes, randomly stuck on by some ill-informed spendthrift. (Royster, p. 39).

According to Royster, Curriculum changes should be considered as evolutionary instead of revolutionary. It is based on prior conditions, a proactive rather than reactive stance:

If we recognize these winds of change, and if we consider the curriculum as the entity that must modify itself in response (the tree that must learn to bend in the wind to preserve both itself and us), then this image allows us to see a particular moment of change not just as revolutionary, but perhaps more often than not as evolutionary. We are able to see that a change in shape or a shift in direction originates from prior conditions. These conditions, as they transform themselves, then, encourage change or, in some instances, demand it. Always, tensions exist, but we can use these tensions to invite, make room for, and nourish new ways of thinking.” (1996a, p. 143)

While Royster uses the image of a tree and the wind, it is similar to my neutron star analogy—the tensions that cause the massive star to collapse to create the neutron star. Bourdieu does not allow for the evolution to happen because he says that the dominated limit their own revolution—that the dominated do not experience hysteresis like those in power. However, progress itself proves the faultiness of his claim. The field of RCL is changing. More voices are recognized. Women and other marginalized voices are speaking through scholarship. Classroom practices consider the diversity of the student body. Much more change needs to happen but progress is being made. That progress is a direct result of the “dominated” revolting and experiencing hysteresis.

2.6 I, JOURNAL – “SEATED UNDER THE SAME SUN¹⁴” (2009)

Earlier, I mention that Royster is consistently (re)visiting her work and then commenting on it, including her own personal growth. That is what I have been doing during this project. What is really interesting is that each time I (re)engage with my thoughts on Royster, Logan, and the others I write about, my emotions change. Sometimes, I am proud of what I wrote. Other times I go off on tangents that I know are outside of the scope of this project. Often, I am overwhelmed by the work that needs to be done so that the voices of Others become an integrated part of the academy and not tangential. Often, I recognize that I know and understand a tiny fraction of what there is to know and understand. Often, I am angry and frustrated. Often, I am encouraged by the words and the work of others.

When reading Royster’s work, it is hard not to feel all of these things. She feels all of these things and takes you on the journey with her. It is a journey full of lessons and insights—ways to (re)visit previous thoughts and assumptions about the academy and about the work of Others; ways to recognize what has been excluded; ways to include; and ways to bring together the many scholars who are actively, consistently, and reverently fighting for inclusion in the academy. If I am truly honest with myself, I must acknowledge the days when I want to give up and step away from the academy. However, my head and my heart are grateful for the commitment of the scholars, especially Black women scholars such as Royster and Logan, who have (and still continue) to pave the roads on which I must travel.

¹⁴ From Royster’s 2009 speech, “Responsible Citizenship in a Global Environment.”

Chapter 3: Shirley Wilson Logan

3.1 Locating Listening

“Paying attention to specific practices helps us to understand how individual learners acquired various categories of literacy and rhetorical education. Not that we could or should attempt to replicate these bygone sites, but understanding them might help us to imagine rhetorical education in ways appropriate to current instruction. Students who have been historically marginalized need to be better prepared to understand and respond to the ways in which language is used to control and deceive as well as to inform and persuade.”

-Logan, *Liberating Language*, 9

Just as my first meeting with Royster occurred at the Feminism and Rhetorics 2013 conference, so did my first engagement with Logan. I was sitting at a table eating with a group of people I didn't know and waiting for one of the keynote sessions to start. A woman sat at our table and everyone nodded but conversations continued uninterrupted. Cheryl Glenn got up to speak and began to sing the praises of a woman who inspired her and whom she greatly respected. She spoke for a while and ended with an applause for Shirley Wilson Logan. I knew the name and looked around the room to see where she was only to realize she'd been sitting at the table with me the whole time. I'll admit that I had a bit of a star-struck moment. After that I wouldn't speak to her.

I can't recall the first thing I read by Logan but one of the earlier essays that made a pretty big impression on me was “By the Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak?: Black Sites of Rhetorical Education” (2005). It begins with “For centuries, curious observers have asked black speakers and writers, ‘How did you learn to use the English language so effectively?’” (p. 215). As soon as I read that sentence, I was hooked (which I will explain later in *I, Journal*). I couldn't wait to see how Logan answered that question or even if she would or could answer that question. She begins by referencing Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* and the character Brother

Jack asking the protagonist, “By the way, where did you learn to speak?” Using that question as a jumping off point, Logan defines what she means by rhetorical education—those combination of experiences influencing proficiency in communication—and then asks a question of her own: “What *were* (my emphasis) some sites of black rhetorical instruction, especially in the nineteenth century?” (p. 216).

Logan’s work in pre- and post-slavery rhetorical practices is important to her philosophies regarding current pedagogical practices and English language literacy



Figure 4: Shirley Wilson Logan, University of Maryland

understandings. What becomes obvious about her work is the attention

she pays to the disconnection between White hearing of Black voices.

That is to say, White audiences in the nineteenth century (and still

today) saw Black faces speaking “articulately” and struggled to

reconcile that with the validity of slavery and Black humanity—to see

Blacks as both slave and human enough to speak with clarity and

intelligence. I do not mean to imply or force a framework over her. But,

if one looks at her scholarship with that notion in mind, one can see how

it resonates throughout her work. For example, in “Black Speakers, White Representations:

Frances Ellen Watkins Harper and the Construction of a Public Persona,” (2004) Logan states,

The auditors found it difficult to believe that someone [Harper] with such intelligence

and rhetorical ability could have lived under the threat of slavery. Their descriptions of

these speakers reveal a shock of self-recognition. Of course, an audience’s identification

of a sense of oneness with the rhetor can be a compelling source of persuasion. The

image of Blacks as subhuman served to justify their enslavement. Being brought face to

face with a different image, an image of humanity oppressed, audiences often rationalized

this contradiction as an anomaly, rather than incorporating this new image into a broader conception of what it represented. (p. 29)

In this chapter, I briefly break down her research in (1) nineteenth-century feminist rhetoric to then demonstrate the connection to how she sees (2) race, gender and literacy in the composition classroom (3) sites of rhetorical education for African Americans and in addition, Logan's views on the role of the teacher comes from her scholarship into African American literacy practices—which then connects to her pedagogical philosophies as they matter today.

3.2 NINETEENTH CENTURY FEMINIST RHETORICAL PRACTICES

Nan Johnson (2001), in a review of *We Are Coming*, states that “Logan's valuable contribution is to reframe the canon from the antebellum period to the 1890s by establishing the persistent presence of African American women speakers throughout the important historical events of the nineteenth century” (p. 717). At the 49th annual CCCCs Convention in 1998, Logan presented a paper entitled “Late Twentieth-Century Racial Uplift Work.” The focus of the presentation was to highlight why examining racial uplift work (political action taken to better conditions for Blacks¹⁵) was/is relevant to a contemporary Black college professor. She argues (1998a) that (re)visiting the work of Black women rhetors is important for current understanding of Black women's voices because this *personal history* has everything to do with Black women's professional lives (p. 2). While Logan was on the tenure track, she worried that as a Black¹⁶

¹⁵ Here, Logan does not mean in an elitist fashion. Instead, she refers to the “activism that was a response to ‘Negro domination,’ white supremacy, and the protection of Southern womanhood” (1998, p. 2).

¹⁶ Logan, in a way, chastises herself because she then points out that there is more than one socially constructed race and that work related to non-others is not work that is unraced; referring to Ruth Frankenberg's point that “white people are raced, just as men are gendered” (1998, p. 4).

woman she would be expected to do work solely about race¹⁷ (1998a, p. 5). However, what she came to realize was that the “work did matter because history had been silent where these rhetors were concerned” and through her research and writing on their rhetorical acts her own personal history was being reshaped and rewritten (1998a, p. 6). She believes in the notion that the professional life, personal life, and political life are all intertwined. The personal, professional, and political journeys of the women who came before, such as Charlotte Forten Grimke, Ida B. Wells, and Frances Anne Rollin, are part of Logan’s personal history. As most of us working in academia can understand, our work as professionals is directly impacted by our personal and political beliefs. Our advocacy, our approach to teaching, our relationships (positive, neutral, or negative) with colleagues and the academic environment/institution in general, are informed by and impacted by our personal experiences as well as local, statewide, and national politics. As an example, Logan (1998a) says that

the personal affects my service, service on such committees as the Banneker Scholarship Committee, now defunct with the outlawing of race-specific scholarships [the political¹⁸], the Ronald McNair Seminar for Minority Students...the Steering Committee for Africa and African in the Americas, to name a few. And even when the committee is not racially marked with the name of some famous black person or some code word like ‘minority’ or ‘diversity,’ once I enter the room, I know I am there to represent the race. Now no one forces me to serve on these committees; as with my research and teaching I respond to my passions. (p. 7)

¹⁷ While on the tenure track Logan also worried about being pigeonholed as a result of her dissertation on writing technology – using computers to teach writing; as someone who could help her colleagues format their papers and therefore not as someone deserving of tenure.

¹⁸ My emphasis

According to Logan (1999b), another reason to research Black women's rhetorical history is because:

these discussions might also add to a clearer understanding of nineteenth-century culture and of the ways in which the persuasive discourse of nineteenth-century black women adapted itself to its multiple audiences and multilayered exigencies. These strategies were grounded always in African origins but adapted to rhetorical situations requiring both identification with and dissociation from those whose adherence they sought. Thus it was a discourse revealing unity in diversity. (p. xvi).

Logan defines persuasive discourse as "verbal communication directed toward a particular audience to obtain what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca call 'the adherence of minds'" (1999b, p. xvi). Based on this definition, she argues that people of African descent in the nineteenth century used their rhetorical skills for social action, to fight for the rights and freedoms Blacks deserved. And, given that "rhetorical action is initiated in response to mediated exigencies, few Americans have had a greater need to respond than have African Americans nor a greater desire to learn how to respond effectively" (2004, p. 37).

Just as Logan makes the clarifications above about literacy, she makes the same ones about Black feminist rhetoric. She says that in her work she is not arguing for a genre based on Black women's rhetoric. Instead, she wants to highlight "individual speakers and the occasions surrounding particular rhetorical acts but with an eye toward the features of that act that are shared by other rhetorical acts arising from similar but not identical rhetorical situations" (1999b, p. xiv). Most of the women in her scholarship were active participants in women's clubs, the church, and education. Black women were speaking at conventions, in homes, in newspapers, and in newsletters. They include Anna Julia Cooper, Victoria Earle Matthews, Fannie Barrier

Williams, Frances Harper, Maria Stewart, and Sojourner Truth figures also highlighted in Royster's scholarship. Logan's work helps to answer Royster's (2014) question in "Re-Framing Narratives of Nation: Women's Participation in the American Civil War"¹⁹—"With a war known as a 'brother-against-brother war,' what in the world were the women doing?" (p. 16). The Black women rhetors researched by both Logan and Royster spoke about issues such as women in politics, violence against Blacks, the education of Black women, Black women's roles in racial progress, the literary contributions of Blacks, and the protections that Black women needed.

One commonality between the work of these figures was that their discourse served multiple purposes, delivering feminist and antislavery arguments in combination (Logan, 1999b, p. 8-9). Similarly, Royster and Cochran (2011) argue that African American women activists in the midst of slavery and its aftermath had to address "their own humanity and the potential of that humanity" as a precursor to, and in combination with, calls for freedom and sociopolitical change (p. 218). Logan deems it "verbal warfare for human dignity" (1999b, p. 1) on all fronts.

As previously argued, and demonstrated by Logan's own words, Logan's pedagogical, scholarly, and administrative work is all woven together into one cyclical network. On all three fronts (*fields*), she pulls from the lived experiences (*habitus*) of historical figures to challenge and disrupt (*hysteresis*) how RCL views the contributions of African American women rhetors. Returning to my neutron star analogy and Logan's statement above about "unity in diversity," (1999b, p. xvi), if RCL can be more inclusive, consider how rich and dense the field could be.

¹⁹ The President's Address from the 2012 Rhetoric Society of America Conference

3.3 ENGLISH LANGUAGE, COMPOSITION, AND LITERACY

In her 2003 CCCC's Chair's Address, "Changing Missions, Shifting Positions, and Breaking Silences," Logan asserts that our primary purpose as teachers is to "teach effective writing and communication well. Our meetings, our research, our work to enhance learning environments for teachers and students, and our public advocacy should all support this overarching goal." Logan's work in Black feminist rhetorical practices and rhetorical sites of education is a path to the role of the teacher in the composition classroom and inclusive literacy education. Logan (2008) clarifies the connection between literacy education and rhetorical education, explaining that although the terms are often used interchangeably, literacy can be considered the overarching concept with rhetorical education developing from it (p. 4). Citing Royster's definition of literacy in *Traces of a Stream*, which states that literacy is the "ability to gain access to information and to use this information variously to articulate lives and experiences and also to identify, think through, refine and solve problems, sometimes complex problems over time," Logan circles back to state that "some manifestation of literacy, then, is implicated in one's rhetorical abilities" and that Royster's definition meshes with her own to make room for other types of experiences (2008, p. 4).

For example, conventional definitions of literacy would classify Sojourner Truth as illiterate but her discourse as well as Harpers, Wells, and others can be used as examples of rhetoric for social change (2004, 2008). From there, those examples can be used in the composition classroom as a way to teach rhetorical competence. Logan does not make this claim lightly. Cheryl Glenn (2004), in the introduction to *Rhetorical Education in America*, discusses the complexities associated with the teaching of rhetoric. For one, when Others entered the academy, their language practices and skills were not the same as those used on college and

university campuses. Secondly, with the changing student body—student demographics—the academy was unable to keep up. Glenn acknowledges the slipperiness of rhetorical education and ponders “who should receive rhetorical education, in what form, and for what purpose” (2004, p. viii) if one considers how Others could, would, or should navigate the public sphere. Logan articulates this as an uncertainty between the rhetoric of teaching and the teaching of rhetoric (2008, p. 5). Victor Villanueva (1993) says to study rhetoric is to study humans. It involves the study of people’s accomplishments and the manner of those accomplishments through language (p. 77). Therefore, to recognize the rhetorical contributions of Others, the academy as well as society at large would have to, at a minimum, acknowledge the humanity, the linguistic style (language choices), and the accomplishments of Others. But, as Glenn (2004) points out, rhetorical education was meant for White men to move into leadership positions and if Others received the same education, who would be the leaders and who would be the followers? (p. viii). Hence, the uncertainty and complexities associated with rhetorical education.

No matter how complex the definition (or attempted definitions) of rhetorical teaching, Logan (2004) argues that a greater emphasis on rhetorical training in composition classrooms would allow for a more knowledgeable and more thorough engagement with social and political action²⁰ because an enhanced ability to use rhetorical language is directly connected to the “ability to manage human affairs” (p. 38). Again, Logan is not talking about basic reading and writing skills but rhetorical education. The teaching of rhetorical education should not disenfranchise learners or result in an isolated version of basic communication skills (p. 38) that do not provide learners with the knowledge needed to engage with or respond to the many

²⁰ Note here the recurring emphasis on rhetoric for social action.

sociopolitical issues they may face—especially Other learners. To circle back to one of my overall arguments in this project about Others’ voices, if one were to put Villanueva’s definition of rhetorical study in conversation with Logan’s robust definition (taking into consideration all of the sites of rhetorical education and the manners in which African American’s used that education), the result would be something along the lines of human instinctual language practices and how those practices are used to move forward as people—as citizens, as colleagues, as students, as Others. Others, those traditionally limited from participating in public debates, have “developed their own counterpublics with their accompanying Englishes” (Logan, 1999a, p. 10). And, in terms of the acquisition of English language skills, Logan’s views are very clear. There are multiple Englishes, multiple dialects of English, and “College English should sensitize writers and speakers to the cultural implications of the communicative choices people make” (2006, p. 108). For Logan, since English is already multicultural, the focus should not be on attempting to teach a proper use of English (1999a, p. 10).

So, what *should* happen in the composition classroom? What is the role of the composition teacher? What should be taught and how should teachers engage with students? A solid look at how Logan explains African American acquisition of rhetorical skills can help to understand how these questions can be answered.

3.4 BLACK SITES OF RHETORICAL EDUCATION

When [Michelle Obama’s](#) book, *Becoming*²¹, came out in 2018 I attempted to check out the audiobook from the public library. I ended up on a waiting list. My placement on the list... number 314. I was at once frustrated by how long I’d have to wait and hugely excited that so

²¹ *Becoming* won a GRAMMY for Best Spoken Word Album at the 62nd Annual GRAMMY Awards in 2019.

many people were waiting to listen to it too. Obviously, I could have just bought the book (audiobooks being outside my budget) and been happy to read the written text but I'd listened to two of Barack Obama's audiobooks and since he was the reader, it made the experience so much better. In fact, he won [Spoken Word GRAMMYS](#)²² for both *The Audacity of Hope* and *Dreams from My Father*. I knew Michelle Obama was the reader of her book so I was willing to wait.

Months passed but *Becoming* was worth the wait. I couldn't help but make connections between her story and Logan's scholarship. Obama related how she acquired so much of her education outside of a formal academic environment. Knowing that she attended both Princeton and Harvard, I think I expected her to spend quite a bit of time on her schooling. However, even during the years when she was in school, she talks more about the lessons learned from personal experiences. Her past experiences are woven throughout the story of her new experiences, creating a vast *field*. Something I had not considered as I listened to her words that first time was the impact she had on the words of others. Gilyard and Banks (2018) pose the question, "what might we learn from a study of the speechwriters who worked with Michelle Obama during her time as First Lady?" (p. 122). I wonder, how did her use of language, as a Black woman navigating a very White, male dominated world, surrounded by those rooting for her to fall, disrupt preconceived notions about African American communication practices? In what ways did she use the combination of informal and formal literacies to navigate the political landscape? How often did people refer to her as "articulate?"

In Logan's original version of "By the Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak?," as a chapter in Royster's *Calling Cards* (2005), she lists eight sites of rhetorical education: imported

²² Barack Obama won GRAMMYS for *The Audacity of Hope* at the 50th (2006) and *Dreams from My Father* at the 48th (1995) Annual GRAMMY Awards. He received a GRAMMY nomination for *A Promised Land* for the 64th (2021) Annual GRAMMY Awards.

African oral traditions of storytelling; church-affiliated singing, preaching, and teaching; sewing circles or “at home”; literary, benevolent, and debating societies and lyceums; self-education, including private lessons in oratory and elocution; political gatherings; pamphleteering and the black press; and formal instruction in black schools and colleges. By the time she wrote *Liberating Language: Sites of Rhetorical Education in Nineteenth Century Black America* (2008), she restructured the sites into four categories: free-floating literacies; private learners; literary and educational societies and lyceums; and rhetorical education and the Black press. The introduction chapter in *Liberating Language* is an updated version of “By the Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak?” In this section, I will focus, for the most part, on the 2008 book.

I call attention to the differences between the two versions of the essay because in the original one, Logan does not include a section that “collects” the free-floating literacies. Looking at the list of eight sites, some of those are free-floating but the 2008 version of the essay is much more “connective.” However, at the end of the 2005 essay she clearly states that she is not arguing that “literacy—an essential component of rhetorical training—only comes in communities with schooling, although formal schooling is an effective source of mass literacy, for that has clearly not been the case” (2005, p. 224). She also does not subscribe to the belief a formal education or literacy is a necessary component to engage in social advocacy. And, it is important to mention that when it comes to defining literacy, Logan is quick to point out that a lack of English language literacy is not the same as a lack of literacy or a lack of intelligence, as it is something that often goes unrecognized in recountings of slavery. Not only were Africans literate in their native tongue but some spoke multiple languages acquired during their travels (2008, p. 10). Circling back, I want to stress that Logan’s interest in Black literacy is not necessarily how they acquired basic reading and writing skills but the actual sites of rhetorical

education. She says that she is “more interested in the ways they augmented that formal training outside of school or in college-based literary clubs.” (2008, p. 5). In order to make visible the circularity of Logan’s work, I provide an overview of the rhetorical sites, mainly focusing on the free-floating literacies, in order to later demonstrate how she connects them to current literacy practices as well as her assertions regarding the role of teachers in RCL.

3.4.1 Free-Floating Literacies

To revisit my earlier point, Logan references the question *By the way, where did you learn to speak?* from *Invisible Man* in her writings about White authentication of Black voices. She also uses the term “free-floating literacy” from Ralph Ellison’s response to the discovery of Wilson’s *Our Nig* (2008, p. 11). She defines *free-floating scenes of literacy* as locations that include “externally sponsored literacy initiatives and initiatives emerging from within communities of the enslaved, communities where slavery existed, or communities emerging in its aftermath” (2008, p. 11). These include: plantation literacies, pulpit literacies, battlefield literacies, political literacies, and postbellum workplace literacies.

During and after slavery, laws restricted both literacy practices and social gatherings of African Americans as one way to limit rebellious behaviors. Elaine Richardson (2004), in “Coming from the Heart: African American Students, Literacy Stories, and Rhetorical Education” says that the “Black story of literacy is one about achieving in the face of a no-win situation” (p. 169). This is what Logan, through her scholarship, proves and lays out in detail. Blacks found ways to meet in secret—away from slave owners, law enforcement, missionaries, and even other slaves. During these meetings, Blacks gathered to discuss politics, practice

religion, spread information, and socialize among other things²³. Logan refers to the exchange of literacy that took place in such locations as *plantation literacies* (2008, p. 11-15). Citing Vorris L. Nunley's construction of "hush harbor rhetoric²⁴" that includes "woods, plantation borders, churches, burial societies, beauty shops, slave frolics, barbershops, and kitchens," Logan asserts that "the discourse generated in such sites allowed a 'loosening' of expression as much as an opportunity for developing expression" (2008, 12). She particularly focuses on the religious aspects of these plantation literacies.

Fears that formal religious education would lead to thoughts of emancipation and/or rebellious tendencies kept White missionaries, particularly Christian missionaries, from seeking to convert slave populations. However, the discourse that came out of this "dilemma" did lead to African American access to Christianity and Christian literacy. As a result, sites of resistance for the slaves were created—even though White mission leaders shied away from condemning slavery. Blacks were taught doctrine using an oral method and "some missionaries argued that mission school education would actually make them more manageable slaves" (2008, p. 14). According to Logan, "the influence of the King James Bible on black expression as a result of slave mission school training is germane to this discussion of sites of rhetorical education" (2008, p. 15). One reason behind her focus on religious education may be found in the connections she makes to her next site of free-floating literacies, *pulpit literacies*. It was not just the ability to read and write scripture that made up pulpit literacies. The memorization skills of slaves allowed them to deliver long sermons "filled with biblical phrases, repetition, parallelism,

²³ This concise statement briefly touches on a much bigger topic about African American's strategies and purposes behind secret gatherings. That topic, however, is outside the scope of this project.

²⁴ Logan cites Nunley, "From the Harbor to Da Academic Hood," p. 222-223 in her notes (2008, p. 139).

and other rhetorical devices” (2008, p. 15). For those who could not read and write, this allowed them to still be considered skillful orators.

Once Blacks were allowed to serve in the military, the rhetorical skills developed on plantations and in churches provided a foundation for soldiers in attending trainings and learning their duties. Logan (2008) states,

Thus, the admission of African American soldiers into the Union army brought together in regiments black men who, although from different social classes, with wide-ranging educational levels, some recently enslaved, some never enslaved, were all motivated by the struggle for freedom and human dignity that would affect them all. The rhetorical skills developed during their military service—reading, writing, debating, keeping diaries, gathering in associations, editing newspapers—trained these black soldiers for leadership during Reconstruction and beyond. (p. 23).

Logan goes on to suggest that the multi-racial community made up of soldiers should be further examined by rhetorical scholars as a way to better understand the rhetorical education and exchange of information that occurred in these environments.

With the end of the Civil War came certain political powers and *political literacies* previously non-existent for Black men. The Republican Party sponsored Union League and legislation that led to the Freedmen’s Bureau, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, and Reconstruction acts gave Black men a new voice in their fight for civil rights (2008, p. 24-25). Like the sermons and religious practices previously mentioned, participants in the Leagues would memorize newspapers and pamphlets and used the new literacy in ways beneficial to their goals of freedom and equality. (2008, p. 25).

One final free-floating literacy that Logan introduces is *postbellum workplace literacies*. Specifically, she focuses on cigar factories in Florida. In these factories, she argues, “both black and white Cuban émigrés worked while lecturers read novels, newspapers and other material chosen by the workers. The issues these materials raised frequently generated heated discussions and thus opportunities to hone argumentative skills” (2008, p. 25). This final example sums up Logan’s overall argument about free-floating literacies—African American’s, even as enslaved people, found ways to use their physical locations, the environment, each other, and even the people who oppressed them to acquire rhetorical literacy.

3.4.2 Private Learners, Literary Societies, and the Black Press

In addition to free-floating literacies, African Americans engaged in self-education, *private learning*, as a way to increase their own rhetorical skills; not only as a personal asset but also as a tool for civic activism. Self-education, according to Logan, is the “regular, voluntary, disciplined approaches to rhetorical education, initiated and carried out for self-improvement. The key term is ‘voluntary’” (2008, p. 30). Methods of private learning included self-education manuals, critiquing other’s rhetorical performances, and private lessons. One important voluntary mechanism used was diary-keeping. Not only did it improve language skills but it also provided a space to record history. Logan asserts (2008) that diary-keeping is one of the key sites of rhetorical education because it allowed diarists to record whatever they heard, saw, thought, believed, or experienced in general. Diaries also were/are a literal record of the educational practices of the diarist—educational practices that would serve their goals of improving the lives of African Americans (p. 32-57).

In the pursuit of these goals, Black educational societies were developed, including abolitionist societies, that opened up opportunities to debate and publish for antislavery and anti-colonization causes (2008, p. 60). Logan (2008) says that she set out to question, “what was the impact of literary societies on rhetorical education among nineteenth-century African Americans?” (p. 61). What she found was that participation in terms of numbers was lower than expected but that did not negate the impact of the societies. They brought people together which permitted them to share resources and perfect their skills. Societies helped to build schools and develop other educational initiatives. They provided a space to spread their messages by sponsoring reading groups and publishing newspapers (2008, p. 58-95).

The Black press, which Logan (2008) defines as “periodical literature edited or published by African Americans, although the readership, backing, and distribution mechanisms varied” (p. 97), provided fertile ground for African American rhetorical education. Citing Ida B. Wells, Logan (2008) says that the journalist viewed their primary roles to be disseminators of information and instructors for audiences on how to read or hear, understand, and respond to that information (p. 97). The ways in which the rhetorical education happened in the press included producing a publication, reporting on public meetings, and articles that provided praise of- and direct instructions in rhetoric. This last item explains, in part, why Logan titled the chapter on the Black press as “Organs of Propaganda.” She claims (and supports that claim throughout the chapter) that throughout the nineteenth century, the sheer volume of social, economic, and political challenges faced by African Americans forced them to use rhetoric in a deliberate

manner. And, while Whites were able to use rhetoric in more performative ways²⁵, Black press references to rhetorical performances still served a deliberative purpose(p. 96-98).

Of the other “Organs of Propaganda” explored by Logan, such as commentary on political speeches, pulpit rhetoric, and commentary on performances of elocutionists, I was particularly drawn to the section on women and rhetoric in the black press. Looking beneath the surface of suggestions that women “develop the ‘mental culture’ associated with eloquence along with their womanly influence” and women “are advised to control their tempers to ensure domestic tranquility and to dissent without the passion associated with males. [Therefore] It is recommended that women receive a different kind of rhetorical education that will not destroy their natural tenderness,” one can see that the *education* of women is not rejected (2008, p. 115). Instead, women were told to be educated about “women” things such as conversational etiquette. However, women used these opportunities to devise arguments such as receiving the same education as men because they were raising the children. Black presses focused more on rhetorical education beyond the role of women. For example, articles on how to write and urgings to write about racial uplift, eventually leading Black women to start their own papers (2008, p. 116-118).

The overlap that occurs throughout all of these sites of rhetorical education serve to answer Logan’s question about how African Americans gained rhetorical prowess. Although she breaks down the sites into the various categories, the boundaries are fluid—across categories and

²⁵ Logan references Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran’s argument that, although primarily limited to White males, the authority behind oratorical culture helped to move it from deliberative to entertainment. It was African American exclusion from this authority that drove much of African American rhetoric in the nineteenth century.

within the subcategories. Logan presents us—as teachers, scholars, and researchers—with the questions we must address in order to improve our individual and collective contributions to RCS. She says (2005),

We need to recognize the various ways in which people can acquire and have acquired rhetorical knowledge. A broader definition of rhetorical education might help us answer important questions: What are the sites of rhetorical education today? What new sites have replaced those no longer in existence? How confidently can we as teachers and scholars of rhetoric and composition answer the question, ‘Where and how will our students learn to speak?’ (p. 225).

Richard Wright (2003) says that people(s) who are different experience the world differently and much of African American rhetoric demonstrates navigating that difference (p. 86). If teachers, scholars, and researchers in RCL can acknowledge different voices and different ways of acquiring literacy skills, acknowledge that the officialized canon does not represent all that various voices have to contribute, then they will be able to take advantage of previously unrecognized sites—sites that may or may not have existed previously. Going back to Bourdieu, his theories do not seem to take Wright’s point into account which may be why they seem contradictory. By overlooking the different world views of the oppressed, Bourdieu overlooks how they can disrupt. Bourdieu’s theories are based on the fact that he experienced the world from a position of authority, unable to fully understand or recognize how the dominated navigate(d) their existence and use(d) their experiences to act upon their condition. He ignores the tools used by dominated groups to disrupt the dominant power structure.

Adam Banks (2004) asserts that examining African American rhetorics within a technological framework helps to highlight African American’s use of technology as a rhetorical

tool. Within his larger argument about all of the factors that affect African American's access to computers and how the academy, governments, and corporations view access, overall, his claims are similar to Logan's (p. 199-202). Although he provides examples, from the invention of the cotton gin to M. L. King and Malcolm X's use of television, he warns against the slippery slope of African American's taking advantage of technology versus being used by technology---but he also states that by placing historical African American rhetorics within a technological framework, researchers and scholars can explore African American speeches and writings in a more nuanced manner as well as demonstrating that it has "always been multimedia, always using *all* the available means in resisting racism and pursuing justice and equal access on behalf of African American people" (p. 190). In the epitaph at the beginning of this chapter, Logan makes a similar claim. It is important to understand how language can be used by or against certain groups.

In "Diversity is Not Justice: Working toward Radical Transformation and Racial Equality in the Discipline," (2021) a group of BIPOC faculty at CCCC²⁶ have conversations about a variety of topics that include the struggle over voice in the academy, BIPOC community-based practices in the academy, BIPOC mentorship, retaining BIPOC faculty, and the marginalization of BIPOC adjuncts. In the lead up to those various conversations, the editors, Ore, Wieser, and Cedillo²⁷, argue that the academy exists in systemic racism and therefore the idealized version of what the academy could be does not really exist. However, they go on to say, "we may sound like we are 'calling out' the academy, and, by extension, the field, with this symposium. We see it as attempting to call the field 'in.' We want this conversation to be productive. We want, not to implicate, but to stimulate change" (p. 602). The disruption. The editors, by getting in front

²⁶ Conference on College Composition & Communication

²⁷ Ersula Ore, Kimberly Wieser, and Christina Cedillo

of nay-sayers and controlling the language—calling the field *in* versus *out*, wanting to *stimulate change* not *implicate*—they are addressing Logan’s (and Bank’s) point about how language can be used. Logan is talking about ways to help, to teach, students but one response to her questions is that the starting point is with the teachers and their use of language to stimulate change for themselves and the students.

Returning to Logan’s final question above, “How confidently can we as teachers and scholars of rhetoric and composition answer the question, ‘Where and how will our students learn to speak?’” (p. 225), the answer, I believe, lies in RCL’s ability to not only acknowledge, but to accept the voices of different people(s), to accept the work/contributions of different people(s), and to accept that different people(s) contribute in different ways through different means. When Logan was asked (after presenting a paper with this question), “Why spend time answering a ‘white’ question?” (2008, p. 3), she replied that “it was not solely a white question; it was a question whose answer could broaden our approaches to contemporary rhetorical education thereby help to further participation in democracy” (2008, p. 3).

3.5 I, JOURNAL –*MY LITTLE GIRL SELF*

My first real conversation with Logan occurred at the CCCCs 2016 conference in Houston. I’d emailed to ask for an interview and she agreed to do it. She later told me that she’d emailed Royster to see what she thought of these random emails they’d received from a student wanting to do a dissertation on them. They weren’t sure whether or not I was serious or legitimate. But, she said yes and I lugged video and recording equipment on the plane to Houston. It was terrible. I kept having technical difficulties and three minutes into our interview

the camera died and I didn't realize it wasn't recording until about ten minutes into the interview. I didn't bother to tell her. I just kept talking.

The thing is, I was really flustered, exhausted, and simply “over it” by the time I sat down with her. But, she was so calming that all of the other issues just faded away. I think that's why I didn't get so upset when I realized the camera had stopped. Instead, I continued to ask questions and she answered in ways that



Figure 5: Shirley Wilson Logan and Tanya Robertson, Feminism and Rhetorics Conference 2015

exceeded my questions. I was looking for information about her experiences as a Black woman in RCS but I, at that point, asked those questions in ways that allowed for generic answers. She saw what I was trying to get to and gave me the answers I needed. Now, even though I don't have those recordings, I remember feeling settled in my skin as she shared her work and her thoughts with me. At the time, I was at the beginning of this project, still reading and learning about her work. Now, I have the language to articulate the many wild ideas and visions my “little girl self” had and to recognize the many sites of rhetorical education that have been a part of my life.

Chapter 4: Synthesizing the Space Time Continuum

4.1 Weaving Spaces

In situating my own work within this historical context, my central points of inquiry have included: What difference did education, particularly higher education, specifically literacy education/rhetorical education, make in African American women's lives? How did it function? What conditions made it possible for such women in such a time, place, and context to believe in their own agency, despite contending messages that dominated in their sociocultural environment, and not only to believe in their own agency, but to act so defiantly and so courageously? What made them think that they had the capacity to do anything at all but particularly to speak and to write in the interest of social, political, economic, educational reform?

(Royster, *Calling Cards*, 10)

I had the opportunity to visit Logan on campus. She was retiring and it was her last class, during finals week. There was something really special about attending her very last class at the University of Maryland. During my visit, I hung out in her office and wondered aloud about her many books. She said I could have some. You don't have to tell me twice. She received a phone call and indicated that I should stay since it wasn't a private call. I took that opportunity to begin my new book collection. As my stack grew...and grew...and grew...I felt giddy with excitement. She glanced my way a few times but surely she was focused on her conversation and not me. I started to wonder how I'd get them all out of there without her noticing just how many I had. How would I get them all on the plane home? When she hung up, we discussed taking ice cream for the last day of class and since I'd seen an ice cream shop during my campus exploration, I said I'd go pick it up. When I returned with the ice cream she said, "I know you didn't think you were taking all of those. I've already removed the ones you can't have." Darned ice cream. It's okay though. I whined until she autographed copies of her books. I have autographed copies of *Liberating Languages* and *We are Coming*. Plus, she had extra totes in her office and I was able to fly away with my booty.

At various times throughout this project, I have talked about spending time with both Royster and Logan, on paper and in person. Those experiences were and are invaluable to me. I attended workshops and conferences where they presented. I interviewed them. I watched online speeches and presentations. They mentored me. Even if it wasn't official. That's what it was. I listened and I learned. I asked and they answered in the ways I needed not the ways I expected. It may have been Logan's last day as a full-time professor but I feel that teachers never really stop teaching, especially ones as active as Logan. The experiences I had with Logan and Royster continue to shape every aspect of my academic life.

This chapter is based on personal conversations between RCS scholars about the difficulties of being Other as an academic. Their conversations are written in a script-like fashion or as a personal narrative. I have woven together their voices, along with mine, in order to demonstrate the shared experiences, shared hopes, shared burdens, and future aspirations of Othered scholars.

4.2 WEAVING IS SYNTHESIS

In the Introduction, 1.7, I mention that "Last Words," a section at the end of Royster's *Calling Cards* (2005), became the catalyst for this chapter. I call it a section because it has no label. It is not an appendix nor is it a chapter and it certainly is not a note. It is the final thoughts of the contributors²⁸ to the edited collection. A reflection on their collective work that is formed by a conversation between the contributors that simultaneously adds new insights and (re)visits

²⁸ The contributors to *Calling Cards* are Valerie Babb, Patrick Bizzaro, Resa Crane Bizzaro, Jami L. Garlacio, Amanda Espinosa-Aguilar, Ann E. Green, David G. Holmes, Susan Applegate Krouse, Valerie Lee, Barbara E. L'Eplattenier, Shirley Wilson Logan, Joyce Irene Middleton, Joycelyn Moody, Renee M. Moreno, Akhila Ramnarayan, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Ann Marie Mann Simpkins, and Hui Wu. Biographies of the contributors can be found in *Calling Cards*, p. 287-291.

the chapter content. The contributors are African American, Native American, Female, Latina, Asian American, LGBTQ+. Their combined voices reflect one of my main objectives for writing this project. Not only do I want to highlight two amazing African American women scholars, but I also want to connect their work to what is happening in the field today. Both Royster and Logan are contributors to “Last Words,” they are part of the conversation on contradictions that allows for different perspectives on the same types of like challenges in the same types of spaces. Moreno (2005) says, “I am reminded how painful it really is to confront and then embrace contradictions—remembering that, while being ‘welcome,’ we are also rejected...it is so important to look to this contested space as one, like academe, that is both hopeful and troubling...For too long the academy has function as a community of those who listen only to themselves” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 258). In this dissertation, I am a disruptor. Coming into this project and considering my own voice, I asked, Why should the “officialized” voices tell us how and what to research? Why do I need white male voices to tell the stories of Logan and Royster? If I discuss the scholarship of Logan and Royster, why must I use white male voices to lend credibility to their work through citations? The voices of Others should be enough to lend credibility to the voices of Others. Deciding to go against the standard of what, traditionally, constitutes supported research, made me feel empowered and even considering those questions reinforced why I had to do it.

Although *Calling Cards* was published in 2005, the challenges, the hope, the frustrations, pain, and the visions for the future and the pain discussed by the contributors is similarly echoed in the more recent 2021 article, “Diversity is Not Justice: Working toward Radical Transformation and Racial Equity in the Discipline” (Ore, Wieser, and Cedillo). (A cross-Caucus symposium at CCCCs). From the title, it is easy to see that the academy is slow moving

when it comes to recognizing the contributions of Others. Much of the conversation taking place” in “Diversity is Not Justice” is about what the contributors call “white time” versus “BIPOC time” and the importance of self-care and mentorship. I will discuss this a little more later, but one key consideration is the timeline for research, publishing scholarship and curriculum development related to diversity issues, comparing this to scholarship and teaching related to canonical, traditional, and mainstream topics. There is an unrecognized challenge regarding publication access for BIPOC, LGBTQ+, and disability scholars who are researching, writing about, and teaching on diversity, equity and inclusion topics. According to Ore et al. (2021), the “emotional space” required to traverse the academic landscape and to create and produce the intellectual research of an academic is a topic that is often neglected or silenced. That silencing just increases the harm Others in academia must endure in order to remain a part of the institution. They state, “when we use energy to navigate microaggressions and gaslighting or to mentally calculate every response in meetings and conversations, it is harder to focus on our research and teaching. How can we sustainably serve harmed students while we ourselves are being harmed?”(2021, p. 617). This speaks to the real tragedies faced by BIPOC and other Othered faculty. In “Hispanic-Serving or Not: La Lucha Sigue in Academia: The Struggle Continues in Academia” (2021), Baca tells the frustratingly real story of being denied tenure based on racially biased—overt and covert—actions from white colleagues, the “gatekeepers” (p. 72-74), those voting on her value to the department. Even knowing the racism underlying the hiring process, as witnessed by serving as a member of search committees with these same colleagues, Baca believed that her record of accomplishments would lead to a promotion for full tenure (p. 74-46). Prior to being denied promotion, Baca says she remained silent about the racism in the department, thinking that her silence would benefit her path to promotion (p. 71).

What she came to realize was that “silence helps no one, and if it does, it helps the oppressor. whether the intention of those in power and authority is to be racist or not is not the point” (2021, p. 70). The frustrations of the ever present marginalization can be summed up by Shelton’s (2021) very pointed exclamation—“The irony of academics who purport to be aware of social, political, and material conditions and disparities that BIPOC face, but cannot apply these theories to the people in front of them!” (Ore et al., p. 615). Baca’s (re)telling of her experiences with the people right in front of her speaks directly to that irony.

Like many others articulate in various ways in “Last Words,” L’Eplattenier asks, “Since a ‘complete’ history can never be told, my questions become: How can we move into ‘mainstream history’ without sacrificing the uniqueness of our subject area? Can we? Can that be done? What does it take to change a historical paradigm? What does a new, multiple perspective history look like?” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 259). In response to L’Eplattenier, Logan (2005) asks the question, “How do we share our histories without othering them? Are we simply reinforcing the old hierarchies?” What if, Logan asks, we think of the types of conversations and writings in *Calling Cards* “not so much as a ‘move into’ [but more of] as a highlighting of our always already presence in mainstream history. I don’t always feel like saying, ‘Me, too; me too.’ I want to point out how my history has been there all the time” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 259). The part of this I like is that Logan reiterates the point that we, Black and/or Woman and/or Native American and/or Lesbian, etc., are not “moving into” mainstream history but that we were/are always already present in mainstream history. have always contributed, always been here. This is something, I think, that Bourdieu failed to realize and that is why I cannot fully buy into his arguments about limitations of the socially dominated. If his argument is that the

Maybe the answer to L'Eplattenier's and Logan's questions is not to spell out our history as something separate but as something woven into what has always been. Now I present a question: If we take Bourdieu's *habitus* and highlight the intersections of white male history from their perspective (as they see it) with the *fields/interests* inhabited by women, then is the point (our contributions to mainstream history) made without sacrificing our uniqueness and without Othering ourselves? Essentially, since we are already embedded in every part of what has been, can't we just highlight that as the norm? Speak of it as though it i's not even up for debate? As if to say, "oh yeah, we're women, we're BIPOC, we're transgender, Black, been there done that?" Will that speaking change how future history gets documented? Since we are part of the documenting, can't we just start composing ourselves into everything? Okay, that was a bunch of questions. I seem to ask an infinite number of questions throughout this project but now my brain is on the verge of forming a neutron star²⁹—I can synthesize the voices of these scholars and find new paths, new ways to traverse the academic space.

Maybe that is what these women are already doing and bringing them all together like this—over the course of years of scholarship—really is the process. Crane Bizzaro (2005) says, "we must revise the history of our discipline in order to make others understand how debilitating this oppression can be" (Royster and Simpkins, p. 257). In addition to making the academy aware of the harm it has caused, I believe that it is crucial to write a more truthful current history while simultaneously amending an exclusionary previous history. That is what scholars such as Royster and Logan have done. That is why they deserve to have scholarship written about them. According to Wu (2005), "research is not simply for research's sake nor for the sake of talking

²⁹ Okay, I nerded out for a second. It's the Trekkie in me. A neutron star is the dense, collapsed core of a massive star that exploded as a supernova. The neutron star contains about a Sun's worth of mass packed in a sphere the size of a large city. https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/GLAST/science/neutron_stars.html.

only to those within the academy, but for imparting transformations to society...we have no choice but to defy the we must “combat the current, available theories and research practices because they tend to put our research into a straightjacket, endangering the lives of the marginalized groups we want to honor and celebrate” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 258).

In the preface to *Calling Cards*, Royster (2005) asks the questions “How do we take this work seriously as intellectual work and set the terms of engagement flexibly and clearly enough to engender excellence? What assumptions, theories, and methodologies have enabled current work and seem viable in an ongoing evolutionary process?” (p. xi). The work she is speaking of is the consideration of race, gender, and culture and how those things converge. I am questioning why it is not already intellectual work. Why must we take a step back and consider it intellectual work when it already is intellectual? The nature of considering race, gender, and culture is intellectual work. Why do or would we accept any other way of looking at it? I keep returning to the “just do it” musings I have had throughout this project. Are we asking permission to be seen as equal or are we just going to function as equals and let those who are dominant finally catch up to our coolness? I understand the simplicity of that statement, but if we continue to ask permission or wait for recognition, we’ll always be waiting. Why would the dominants relinquish their positions or make room for Others to join. Instead, why don’t we just kindly and unkindly place ourselves in the room? If we all do it simultaneously, doesn’t that make it harder for them to kick us out...especially when they are claiming publicly that they are interested in diversity, equity, and inclusion? Can’t we force them to hold to their DEI statements and proclamations of acknowledgement that have not been backed up by action? I also understand that my questions are at once cyclical and contradictory sounding. But, the cycle of oppressive violence produces contradictory thoughts—hope and faith wrapped in anger, grief,

resentment and feelings of defeat, emotions described in *Calling Cards* (2005), “Diversity is Not Justice (2021),” and “Hispanic-Serving or Not (2021),” and other writings by those with specific race-based, gender-based, sexuality-based, disability-based experiences in RCS. I believe that this is what Ore et al. and their contributors (2021) are trying to get at. They ask, “[w]hat does it mean to exist in and speak from the margins as writers, and with different voices that may not always be acknowledged/recognized by the center? And, what does it mean for those of us who teach and eventually become inculcated with the academy’s ways of being, to keep challenging the status quo?” (p. 607). This is where the perseverance enters. I argue that there has to be a steady flow of pushback and questioning of the stubborn processes in place. The disruptions we, as Others, produce must be continuous.

I believe that this is what Ore et al. and their contributors (2021) are trying to get at. So, you say you want a more inclusive faculty, but you have written the job ad to be exclusive. The department wants a more inclusive faculty makeup but the search committees do not follow advice and guidelines from search advocates. The search committees are almost exclusively white and/or male. The job ad is written so that it only allows for candidates that teach the canon or topics that are inherently exclusive. Claiming to desire a diverse candidate pool requires a change to the traditional ways candidates are recruited. Shelton argues that “They ask what the program needs to be competitive within the field or for institutional clout. That focus is about consuming BIPOC bodies and experiences, rather than supporting and retaining them for the value they contribute” (Ore et al., 2021, p. 615). Has the search committee considered the fact that access to publishing on topics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion is not the same as access for those publishing on canonical topics? Has the search committee seriously, not just casually, considered how student evaluations are biased and overly negative for BIPOC (and

especially female BIPOC) teachers? Are you going to change it or not? When the excuses start to roll, call it out. DISRUPT. Does that put your/our job on the line? In many institutions it would. We will be seen as the disruptors. But, is that okay? Is that really such a problem? Can they make our lives miserable as we head into the office every day? Sure. Can we continue to point out the systemic white supremacy of the academy? Logan (2005) asks, “Where do we locate ourselves with respect to whiteness? Are we guilty of privileging whiteness? Do we need to make sure our essays center on the ‘us’ (however defined) rather than the ‘them’? Do we need to articulate more explicitly the unspoken default of invisible whiteness?” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 263). Here is where I go back to being contradictory. My answer to Logan is YES! But, the fact that the “Last Words” section exists is explicitly speaking. Baca having a place to publish “Hispanic-Serving or Not” is explicitly speaking. Ore et al. publishing a text with a title that starts out “Diversity is Not Justice” in CCCs is explicitly speaking. Therefore, as one considers that Logan was asking her questions in 2005 and Baca and Ore et al. were writing in 2021, there is some visible progression in addressing the issues. However, contradictorily and cyclically, the speaking is happening, and the issues persist.

According to Ore et al. (2021), “white time,” like university time, is in the service or *interests* of white desires (p. 601). It is a “white temporal rhetoric that compels our complicity as BIPOC scholars and that of our allies as the price of our participation” (Ore et al., p. 602). The needs of Other faculty require that the institution put time and care into the professional welfare of all faculty. However, institutions have historically and relentlessly been unsupportive of its diverse faculty and staff. When Baca describes her silence as the price she paid to protect her professional path, it is a demonstration of how university time acts upon Other faculty. Consider Bourdieu’s notion of *doxa*.

any common-sense reflection on existing rules is necessarily mediated – and therefore restricted – by day-to-day experience, by established practice, in short by what is; as such it is stifled by the lack of means to express and therefore appropriately question what is implicit and taken for granted” (Deer, 2008, p. 118).

As academic institutions and their time-based practices were established by whites for white, male *interests*, their ability to question their actions upon Other faculty is restricted. Bourdieu’s argument is that the dominated are restricted. Well, I argue that it is the dominants who are restricted. They have an inherent inability to truly see their oppression, their privilege. It is the actions, the disruptions, the hysteresis by Other faculty that “calls in” the institutions.

Now put university time, white time, into conversation with spacetime. Spacetime is a “mathematical model that combines the three dimensions of space and one dimension of time into a single four-dimensional manifold. Spacetime diagrams can be used to visualize relativistic effects, such as why different observers perceive differently where and when events occur” (Wikipedia³⁰). Thinking of the *habitus* of the university itself and the *habitus* of the faculty and, more narrowly, the *habitus* of the Other faculty, it is easy to see how the perceptions of the university versus the perceptions of its Other faculty would differ. Additionally, since marginalized groups have always represented a small percentage of faculty at universities, the overwhelming contributions to institutional perceptions comes from white males. Baca teaches at a Hispanic-Serving Institution and points out that “in fall 2018, only 3% of professors in degree-granting postsecondary institutions were Hispanic, with 1% of that 3% identifying as female. As for associate professors, in fall 2018, 5% were Hispanic, with 2% of those identifying

³⁰ For reference citations and additional readings on spacetime, see <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spacetime#:~:text=In%20physics%2C%20spacetime%20is%20a,where%20and%20when%20events%20occur.>

as female³¹” (2021, p. 71). How then, might a system so skewed alter its relationships with those who are part of its makeup yet excluded? According to Espinosa-Aguilar (2005), “It is BECAUSE we are different that we are noticed. We go against naturalized constructs of what authoritative faculty look, act like, etc. from the minute we walk through the door. And we can’t help it because we aren’t likely to be ‘naturalized’ until there are a hell of a lot more of us not just hired but retained and tenured throughout academe” (Royster and Simpkins, p. 262).

In Baca’s case, a passive aggressive internal letter from an administrator led to her being denied tenure (2021, p. 75-76). She later learned that even though she had “the right number of publications, a \$100,000 National Endowment for Humanities grant award, a state board of regents teaching award, and a long list of service to my department, college, university, and the field (p. 72), the male administrator viewed the majority of her work as service. Baca (2021) says that “[b]ecause my scholarship centers on community writing and community engaged work, he found it easy to state that all my scholarship, teaching, and service fall under the category of service(p. 75). Baca’s situation speaks to another irony. It is almost as if the *habitus* of officialized people promotes learning and makes significant contributions, while the *habitus* of unofficialized people is a negative and not as important to the university—according to the officialized people.

The value placed on DEI work is sorely lacking. It is Other faculty who are constantly asked to serve on committees related to our needs and the proposed goal of diversifying the university but then that distribution of labor is used against Other faculty. The irony is that we, I included myself in this, cannot have only dominants speaking and planning for us so we must have a seat at the table of these committees. But, there are not enough of us to share the load and

³¹ Baca’s data comes from the National Center for Education Statistics.

so we are overburdened with these duties. Then, our service is not recognized and its harm to our research and teaching is not recognized. In fact, we are criticized for spending too much time on the service. Then, when we still manage to do the research and teaching, it is somehow downgraded if the subject of the work is DEI related. Not only that, the use of student evaluations of Other faculty, which is notoriously flawed, is then used to grade the quality of the teaching. It is a catch-22, something Baca experienced first-hand. Bui (2021) states, “We know white-centric institutions rely on BIPOC and marginalized faculty and staff to disproportionately shoulder these burdens, rather than distribute these responsibilities collectively. Universities are, after all, the legacy of white supremacy. Consequently, even minority serving institutions can perpetuate systemic racism” (Ore et al., p. 616). As a faculty member of a Minority-Servicing Institution, I, like Baca, understand this all too well but I also refuse to have these committees have a majority makeup of oppressors. At times it will feel as though we carry the weight of a neutron star on our shoulders, but that weight spread among our many voices and within our constant disruptions can make us stronger...and the burden lighter as we find ways to change and challenge the academic space.

4.3 I, JOURNAL – *IMMERSED IN THE COMPANY OF OTHERS*

One of the main things I am struggling with as I reflect on this chapter is the citations of Others. Citations and the acknowledgement of the work of Others is of such importance to methat I placed it in the epilogue of my chapter on Royster. In the introduction to this dissertation, I explain that I wanted to include all sorts of statistics related to citations of Royster’s and Logan’s work. What I found was that the citation tools for humanities are completely inaccurate and unreliable. Many journals and sites of publications are not included.

Place these tools into context with Royster's point that we, Others, are not read and our work is not valued as it should be. The combination of these two points, citation tools and lack of acknowledgement, leads to a serious issue within the discipline—the use of citations as a determining factor in the tenure and promotion process. When Baca says that citation tools were used as part of her promotion application (2021, p. 74), it infuriated me. How does a field that purports to understand writing and citation not understand the complications associated with using automated citation tools or the social and cultural implications related to citations? We tell our students not to rely on automated citation generators because they are full of human errors. Yet, universities use an automated tool to value our and our colleagues work? This is right up there with using student evaluations in my opinion.

Initially, when I decided that I would only cite scholars from marginalized groups in the dissertation, I wasn't sure if I would receive pushback. No matter what, I knew I would fight to do it the way I wanted because I knew it would transform me. Rejecting the traditional rhetorical scholars, those cited in the majority of my research sources, put me in the position of having to immerse myself into the company of Others. This path did something for me that no amount of coursework could. The epistemological foundation it has given me has changed my teaching, the way I view the academy, and my professional goals.

Conclusion: I, Journal—*Universal Considerations and Future Study*

As I consider some final thoughts on the scholarship and work of Royster and Logan, and I try to put them into categories, it is impossible. As I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation, there are no distinct lines between their researches. For example, African American's use of rhetoric, African American rhetorical scholars/scholarship, Feminist rhetorical practices, English language and literacy, or African American's in the academy, each of these things are interconnected, circulating around one another and feeding into one another. According to Gilyard and Banks, "education, literacy, freedom, and poetry are unbreakably linked for African Americans" (2018, p. 11). That sentiment is certainly echoed in the work and lives of Royster and Logan. What strikes me is just how firmly and finely their scholarship is woven together and how that scholarship feeds and nurtures the field. From African Americans acquisition of rhetorical strategy, to their use of rhetoric to fight for their education and freedom, to their presence in rhetorical education, the connection is there—linking to the multiplicity of who they are as African Americans—who are also scholars, and teachers, and women, and administrators, and writers.

Royster says, "[a]s people who have been systematically constrained by issues of race, class, gender, culture, and so on, they have nevertheless been successful in questioning the world and constructing spaces from which to assert their viewpoints" (2000b, p. 54). While Royster's work is an examination of how African Americans and women have consistently, historically used their voices to push forward, her own work does the same thing. Royster's work on feminist rhetorical practices, in collaboration with Kirsch, was and is a major contribution to the disruptions taking place in rhetoric and composition. And, as demonstrated by *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*, *Calling Cards*, "Global Citizenship," "History in the Spaces Left," and

many others, Royster spends time “in the company of others” (2005, p. x-xi) to critically highlight the scholarship of Others and to generate a more nuanced reflection on the ways in which scholarship related to race, gender, class, and culture is conducted.

Royster’s statement about the constraints placed on Others directly relates to the same assertions made by Logan in “By the Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak?” (2005). Her scholarship regarding Black sites of rhetorical education and the work of Black women abolitionists, who merged antislavery arguments with feminist issues (1999b, p. 8-9), highlights the spaces used by Blacks to disrupt. Logan, in her analyses of sites of rhetorical education and literacy, links her own philosophy to Royster’s, stating,

Royster, in *Traces of a Stream...* offers a definition of literacy that takes into account the combined abilities it demonstrates; it intersects comfortably with my own. She defines it as the ‘ability to gain access to information and to use this information variously to articulate lives and experiences and also to identify, think through, refine, and solve problems, sometimes complex problems, over time.’ While Royster’s definition of literacy is more action-oriented than the definition of the kinds of rhetorical abilities I identify in these sites, these abilities often did lead to action. I am primarily interested in development of these abilities; Royster, as the title of her book indicates, targets literacy as a critical component of social change.” (2008, p. 4).

Here, I slightly disagree with Logan. Yes, her work is focused on the development of rhetorical abilities, however, understanding the development of Black sites of rhetorical education is a key component to determining strategies of disruption. Bourdieu claims that access to knowledge is the only way to undermine *doxa*, lived experiences and practices that allow for reflection on existing rules, and that the dominated have limited access to knowledge (Deer, p. 124). Logan’s

research on Black sites of rhetorical education thoroughly contradicts Bourdieu's theories.

Looking at her work in the context of *doxa* shows that her research, like Royster's, does lead to action.

Previously, I questioned whether taking action as an academic would lead to negative consequences. I would be naïve to think that the answer to that question is no. Yet, action is not only needed to alter the trajectory of my own personal future in rhetoric and composition but to help me function as a change agent by examining my own experiences and practices. According to Royster, “[c]ritical engagement with identities—and experiences—are indeed instructive, especially when that engagement includes ourselves” (2005, p. 26). Therefore, taking on this project, in the way that I have, is an important, personal step to that critical engagement. I had some of Logan's initial concerns—that I would be expected, as a Black woman in RCL, to only do “Black work.” And, like Logan, I have come to realize how the voice of Others must be acknowledged and that my future in the field is and will be shaped by work on race, gender, class and culture. Royster says,

As strangers, we must learn to treat the loved people and places of Others with care and to understand that, when we do not act respectfully and responsibly, we leave ourselves rightly open to wrath. The challenge is not to work with a fear of abuse or a fear of retaliation, however. The challenge is to teach, to engage in research, to write, and to speak with Others with the determination to operate not only with professional and personal integrity, but also with the specific knowledge that communities and their ancestors are watching (1996b, p. 33).

As I continue to research, write, and teach in this discipline, I have to consider how I can feed and nurture. With a background in computer science, math, creative writing, and rhetoric and

composition, I don't want to lose any of my identities, especially when their combined contributions make me, me. In reflecting on her own space in academia, Royster says, "I began to claim an interdisciplinary professional identity – in rhetorical studies... in women's studies... and in cultural studies..." (2010, p. 10). Well, I claim my interdisciplinary professional identity, too.

Now, it is time for me to consider future work. There are two topics that I mention throughout the dissertation that I would like to revisit. The first relates to African American rhetorics and technology. In *Liberating Languages* (2008), Logan touches on African American's use of technology as well as how technology can be used against African Americans in her discussions of sites of rhetorical education. According to Banks (2004), by examining historical African American rhetorics within a technological framework, researchers and scholars can explore African American speeches and writings in a more nuanced manner, demonstrating that it has "always been multimedia, always using all the available means in resisting racism and pursuing justice and equal access on behalf of African American people" (p. 190). From Black Twitter, and other social media sites, to how news and entertainment sites portray African Americans, analyzing the impact of technology on Black spaces (where we live, work, play, and pray), is an important step toward seeking the acknowledgement so richly deserved.

The second topic that I believe needs in-depth study is the mentorship of BIPOC graduate students. There is so much conversation of retention of BIPOC faculty but what about retention of BIPOC graduate students? D'Angelo (2021) says that "Family and communities of care for Black graduate students are essential to surviving academe, to matriculating" and that the village analogy to raising a child applies to graduate students. A village is critical to "develop, sustain, and cover a budding scholar as they navigate the violence of a graduate school education...an

academic landscape not designed for them to thrive. Their community...holds them up when the academy requires a pound of flesh” (Ore, et al., p. 608). My response to this is what happens if that BIPOC graduate student does not have a community outside of the academy to provide support? How much more, then, does that student need their program, their institution, their program’s faculty to be that support? The problem is, with a lack of BIPOC faculty, who can do that mentoring? Must BIPOC graduate students in RCL find mentors in other programs, other departments, other colleges, or even other universities? I think that a long-term study is needed as well as “right now” conversations that can provide some sort of support or source of information for both current faculty and students.

In reflecting on his contributions to Richardson and Jackson’s *African American Rhetorics* (2007), Gilyard says, “I hope to have amply demonstrated the richness of African American rhetoric as a field of inquiry while indicating, if only implicitly, what future work needs to be done. Numerous studies are required that will allow us to understand the import of current and emerging Black discourses” (p. 17). My hope is that this project has emphasized why learning about and teaching on Black voices, historical and current, matter to rhetoric and composition. I hope to have also demonstrated that the work is cyclical. Royster and Logan research, write, and speak about the historical contributions of African Americans and women. Yet, they are major contributors to the field and deserve to be studied for what they bring to our understandings of race, class, gender, and culture.

References

- Alby, F., & Fatigante, M. (2014). "Preserving the respondent's standpoint in a research interview: Different strategies of 'doing' the interviewer. *Human Studies*, 37(2), 239-256. Retrieved October 20, 2015, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24022224>
- Baca, I. (2021). "Hispanic-Serving or not: La lucha sigue in academica: The struggle continues in academia." *Composition Studies*, 49(2), 70-78.
- Banks, A. J. (2004). Looking Forward to Look Back: Technology Access and Transformation in African American Rhetoric. In E. Richardson and R. Jackson. (Eds.), *African American rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 273-293). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Banks, A. J. (2006). *Race, rhetoric, and technology: Searching for higher ground*. Routledge.
- Banks, A.J. (2011). *Digital griots: African American rhetoric in a multimedia age*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Banks, A. J. (2015). "Funk, Flight, and Freedom." [Video File]. National Council of Teachers of English. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EYt3swrnvwU>.
- Bell-Scott, P. & Guy-Sheftall, B. Eds. (1991). *Double stitch: Black women write about mothers & daughters*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bizzell, P. (2003). "Editing the Rhetorical Tradition." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 36(2), 109-118.
- Blackpast.org (May 20, 2022). *Maceo Crenshaw Dailey, Jr. (1943-2015)*. From <https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/maceo-crenshaw-dailey-jr-1943-2015/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.
- Christian, B. (1987). The race for theory. *Cultural Critique*, 6, 51-63.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1354255>
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Deer, C. (2012). Doxa. In M. Grenfell (Ed), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*. (2nd ed.), (pp. 114-125). Acumen Publishing.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk [ebook]*. Project Gutenberg.
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/408/408-h/408-h.htm>
- Foss, K. A., Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1999). *Feminist rhetorical theories*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Georgia Institute of Technology: Staff Bio [Georgia Tech]. (n.d.) *Biography of Jacqueline Jones Royster*. <http://www.iac.gatech.edu/faculty-and-staff/staff/royster>
- Georgia Institute of Technology: People. *Jacqueline Jones Royster*.
<https://iac.gatech.edu/people/person/jacqueline-jones-royster>
- Glenn, C. (2004). *Unspoken: a rhetoric of silence*. Southern Illinois Press.
- Glenn, C., Lyday, M. M., & Sharer, W. B. (Eds.). (2004). *Rhetorical education in America*. The University of Alabama Press.
- Gilyard, K. (1999a). African American contributions to composition studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 626-644. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358484>
- Gilyard, K. (1999b). *Race, Rhetoric and Composition*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Gilyard, K. and Banks, A. (2018). *On African-American rhetoric*. Routledge.

- Goddard Space Flight Center, NASA. (March 2017). *Objects of Interest: Neutron Stars*. Imagine the Universe. Retrieved from https://imagine.gsfc.nasa.gov/science/objects/neutron_stars1.html
- Grenfell, M. (2012). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. (2nd ed.). Acumen Publishing.
- X, M., & Haley, A. (1999). *The autobiography of Malcolm X* (2nd Ballantine Books hardcover ed.). One World.
- Hardy, C. (2012). Hysteresis. In M. Grenfell (Ed), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. (2nd ed.), (pp. 229-249). Acumen Publishing
- Jackson, R.L., & Richardson, E.B. (2007). *African American Rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jarratt, S. C., & Worsham, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Feminism and composition studies: In other words*. The Modern Language Association of America.
- Johnson, N. (2001). Review of “We Are Coming”: The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth-Century Black Women, by S. W. Logan. *JAC*, 21(3), 717–720.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20866439>
- Kirsch, G. E. (1993). *Women writing the academy: Audience, authority, and transformation*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kirsch, G. E. (1999). *Ethical dilemmas in feminist research: The politics of location, interpretation, and publication*. Retrieved from http://encore.utep.edu/iii/encore/record/C__Rb2145463?lang=eng
- Logan, S.W. (1995). *With pen and voice: a critical anthology of nineteenth-century African-American women*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Logan, S.W. (1998a). Late Twentieth-Century racial uplift work.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED420078.pdf>
- Logan, S. W. (1998b). "When and where I enter": Race, gender, and composition studies. In S. C. Jarrat & L. Worsham (Eds.), *Feminism and Composition Studies*. The Modern Language Association of America.
- Logan, S. W. (1999a). Inclusive rhetorics and lost voices. In *Rhetoric, the polis, and the global village: selected papers from the 1998 Thirtieth Anniversary Rhetoric Society of America conference*.
- Logan, S.W. (1999b). *We are coming: the persuasive discourse of Nineteenth Century Black women*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Logan, S. W. (2003). Changing missions, shifting positions, and breaking silences. *College Composition and Communication*, 55(2), 330-342.
- Logan, S.W. (2004). Black speakers, white representations: Frances Ellen Watkins Harper and the construction of a public persona. In E. Richardson and R. Jackson. (Eds.), *African American rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 21-36). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Logan, S.W. (2005). By the Way, Where Did You Learn to Speak? In J. J. Royster and A. M. Mann Simpkins. (Eds.), *Calling Cards: Theory and Practice in the Study of Race, Gender, and Culture* (pp. 215-222). State University of New York Press.
- Logan, S.W. (2006). What should college English be? Why college English? *College English*, 69(2), 107-110.
- Logan, S.W. (2008). *Liberating language: Sites of rhetorical education in Nineteenth-Century Black America*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Logan, S.W. (2011). Sustaining NCTE values. *English Journal*, 101(1), 63-68.
- Lorde, A. (1984). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches* (pp. 110-114). Crossing Press.
- Lunsford, A. A. (Ed.). (1995). *Reclaiming rhetorica: Women in the rhetorical tradition*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Maton, K. (2012). Habitus. In M. Grenfell (Ed), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. (2nd ed.), (pp. 48-64). Acumen Publishing.
- Micciche, L. R. (2010). Writing as feminist rhetorical theory. In E. E. Schell & K. J. Rawson (Eds.), *Rhetorica in motion: Feminist rhetorical methods and methodologies* (pp. 173-191). University of Pittsburg Press.
- Morrison, T. (2000). Unspeakable things unspoken: the Afro-American presence in American literature. In J. James & T. D. Sharpley-Whiting (Eds.), *The Black Feminist Reader* (pp. 24-56). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.
- Obama, M. (). *Becoming*.
- Ohio State News. (March 20 2005). University names internal candidate Executive Dean. <https://news.osu.edu/university-names-internal-candidate-executive-dean/>
- Ore, E., Wieser, K., & Cedillo, C. (2021). Diversity is not justice: Working toward radical transformation and racial equality in the discipline. *College Composition and Communication*, 72(4), 601-620.
- Ratcliffe, K. (2005). *Rhetorical listening: identification, gender, whiteness*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Richardson, E. (2004). Coming from the heart. In E. Richardson and R. Jackson. (Eds.), *African American rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 155-169). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Royster, J. J. (1995). To call a thing by its true name: The rhetoric of Ida B. Wells. In A. A. Lundsford (Ed.), *Reclaiming rhetorica: Women in the rhetorical tradition* (pp. 167-184). University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Royster, J. J. (1996a). Literature, literacy, and language. In J. F. Slevin, & A. Young (Eds.), *Critical theory and the teaching of literature: Politics, curriculum, pedagogy* (pp. 140-152). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Royster, J. J. (1996b). When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(1), 29-40.
- Royster, J. J. (1996c). *Southern horrors and other writings, the anti-lynching campaign of Ida B. Wells, 1892-1900*. Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Royster, J. J. (1999a). Sarah's story: Making a place for historical ethnography in rhetorical studies. In *Rhetoric, the polis, and the global village: selected papers from the 1998 Thirtieth Anniversary Rhetoric Society of America conference*.
- Royster, J. J. (2000a). Shifting the paradigms of English studies: Continuity and change. *PMLA*, 115(5), 1222-1228.
- Royster, J. J. (2000b). *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and social change among African American women*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Royster, J.J. (2002). Academic discourses or small boats on a big sea. In Schroeder, C., Fox, H., & Bizzell, P. (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy* (pp. 23-30). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

- Royster, J. J. (2003a). *Profiles of ohio women, 1803-2003*. Ohio University Press.
- Royster, J. J. (2003b). Disciplinary landscaping, or contemporary challenges in the history of rhetoric." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 36(2), 148-167.
- Royster, J. J. (2007). Literacy and Civic Engagement, Civil Rights Symposium: An Interdepartmental and Interdisciplinary Conversation on Civil Rights Reform. University of New Mexico.
- Royster, J. J. (2009). [Responsible Citizenship in a Global Environment](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pszJ_AgRAzE) [Video]. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pszJ_AgRAzE
- Royster, J. J., & Williams, J. C. (1999). History in the spaces left: African American presence and narratives of composition studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 563-584.
- Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2010). Feminist rhetorical practices: In search of excellence. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(4), 640-672.
- Royster, J. J., & Cochran, M. (2011). Human rights and civil rights: The advocacy and activism of African-American women writers." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 41(3), 213-230.
- Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical practices: New horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Royster, J. J., & Simpkins, A. M. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Calling Cards: Theory and Practice in the Study of Race, Gender, and Culture*. State University of New York Press.
- Schell, E. E. and Rawson, K. J. (2010). *Rhetorica in motion: Feminist rhetorical methods and methodologies*. University of Pittsburg Press.
- Schroeder, C., Fox, H., & Bizzell, P. (Eds.). (2002). *ALT DIS: Alternative discourses and the academy*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

- Strøm, A., & Fagermoen, M. (2012). Systematic data integration—A method for combined analyses of field notes and interview texts.” *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(5), 534-546.
- Thomson, P. (2012). Fields. In M. Grenfell (Ed), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*. (2nd ed.), (pp. 65-80). Acumen Publishing
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>
- University of Maryland Department of English. (2022). Shirley Wilson Logan. Retrieved October 9, 2022 from <https://english.umd.edu/directory/shirley-wilson-logan>
- Villanueva, V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Wright, R. L. (2003). The Word at Work: Ideological and Epistemological Dynamics in African American Rhetoric. In R. L. Jackson II and E. B. Richardson (Eds.), *Understanding African American Rhetoric: Classical Origins to Contemporary Innovations*, (pp. 85-97). Routledge.

Appendix

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Career/Academic Trajectory

Previous Positions

1. What led you to Rhetoric and Composition studies? As a student? As a scholar/teacher?
2. What was your first position and how did you get that position?
3. What were some of the main obstacles you faced starting out in the field?
4. Did you have a mentor? If so, who and why? If not, why do you think that happened?

Current Position

1. How did you get this position? What events occurred to get you to this point?
2. Who supports your efforts? How is your role viewed by others in the department/program/college?
3. Compare your role now to previous roles. Do you think your work had a greater impact/influence then or now?
4. For someone just beginning in this field, do you think it would be harder to have a significant impact then someone who began in the 1980s?

Service (Administrative and Leadership) Questions

1. How has/does your RCS background influence your decisions as an administrator and leader in both your local (university) roles and national organization roles?
2. How has/does your experience as a teacher influence your decisions as an administrator and leader in both your local (university) roles and national organization roles?
3. What do you think are your most significant contributions from your roles as Chairs of CCCCs? NCTE? MLA?
4. What advice would you give to someone thinking about a WPA position?

Teaching Pedagogy and Philosophy

1. Who are your biggest influences as a teacher?
2. What is your teaching philosophy? Why?
3. How has it changed over time and what has caused those changes?

Race and Gender

1. You collaborate with white men and women in your scholarly work. How would you compare your opportunities and struggles with those of your
2. White male colleagues?
3. White female colleagues?
4. Black male colleagues?
5. Black female colleagues?
6. Other minority colleagues?
7. What are some of the most common microaggressions you face as a woman? As an African American?
8. How do you think being a black woman has shaped your professional life?

9. As I think about the notion of Other in relation to the rhetorical tradition, how do you think that term applies to you?

Views on the Discipline

1. How do you think you fit into the discipline?
2. If you have to name your biggest accomplishment, what would you say that is?

Views/opinions on my research questions

1. Do you think I am asking the right questions?
2. Are there particular items or topics you think I need to include in this project?
3. What advice do you have for an African American woman just starting out as a scholar in rhetoric and composition?

APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD INFORMATION

1. Project Title: African American's in the Rhetorical Tradition: An Analysis of Jacqueline Jones Royster and Shirley Wilson Logan's Participation and Position in Rhetoric and Composition Studies

2. Principal Investigator(s)/Co-PI Contact Information

Name (Last Name, First Name, MI) Robertson, Tanya, M	Highest Earned Degree Master of Fine Arts
University Title Ph D Student	Department English
Campus Phone No. (915) 747-5128	E-Mail Address tmrobertson2@utep.edu

Faculty Staff Student Other:

Name (Last Name, First Name, MI)	Highest Earned Degree
University Title	Departments
Campus Phone No.	E-Mail Address

Faculty Staff Student Other:

If PI is a student, list Faculty Advisor or Committee Chair

Name (Last Name, First Name, MI) Mangelsdorf, Katherine W.	Highest Earned Degree Ph D
University Title Director of Rhetoric & Writing Studies	Department English
Campus Phone No. (915) 747-5543	E-Mail Address kmangels@utep.edu

3. Type of Project (check all that apply)

- Thesis
- Dissertation
- Class Project
- Capstone Project
- Quality Improvement Project
- Faculty Research
- Internal Evaluation/Non-Publishing
- Presentation/Conference

<input type="checkbox"/> Publication [Specify]: <input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify]: <input type="checkbox"/> Funded Project (funding source: _____)

4. Check if applicable			
	Yes	No	
1.	Does the protocol include children (see exception 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) below)		X
2.	Does the protocol include prisoners, fetuses, pregnant women or human in vitro fertilization?		X
3.	Does the protocol involve more than minimal risk?		X
4.	Does the protocol involve deception?		X
5.	Does the protocol include cognitively impaired participants?		X
If you answered yes to any of the above, the submission does not qualify for exemption. Please fill out IRB Form 12-IRB Application Template for Expedited Review.			

5. Exempt Research Categories (Please read through the six allowable categories and check the applicable category below)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, <i>such as</i> (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, <i>or</i> (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods. [45 CFR 46.101 (b)(1)]</p> <p>a. Will the researchers use their current students or trainees as participants?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>X No</p> <p>b. Have you received permission from the instructor, department head, or facility where the participants will be recruited?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No. I will seek permission before initiating the research.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A. Please explain:</p>

X	<p>2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:</p> <p>(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. [45 CFR 46.101 (b)(2)]</p> <p>a. Will you or any investigators use your current students or trainees as participants?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Please explain what additional measures will be taken to ensure participants do not feel pressured or coerced during recruitment for or participation in the research:</p> <p>b. Will your research involve children in survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior when the investigator(s) participate in the activities being observed?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <i>This study does not meet the criteria for exemption. This application will be forwarded for Expedited or Full Board review.</i></p> <p>c. Will you record information in a way that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>d. Could any disclosure of the subjects' responses outside the research reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, insurability, or reputation?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If you answered Yes to BOTH (2c) and (2d), <i>the study does not meet the criteria for exemption and this application will be forwarded for Expedited or Full Board review.</i></p>
---	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under category 2 above, if either:</p> <p>(i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or</p> <p>(ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter. [45 CFR 46.101(b)(3)]</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. [45 CFR 46.101 (b)(4)]</p> <p>a. What is the source of the data?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Publicly available database (include link)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commercially Obtained (state from where samples/tissue obtained)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student Records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Medical or Private Records</p> <p>Please note that HIPAA prohibits the collection of specified identifiers such as name, street address, telephone/fax numbers, e-mail address, URLs & IP addresses, social security numbers, certificate/license number, vehicle/serial identifiers and full face photos. Information such as admission, discharge & service dates, date of death, age and zip codes are allowed. For further information on HIPAA/PHI regulations, please see http://privacyruleandresearch.nih.gov/pr_08.asp</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Another PI/Researcher collected it in the past</p> <p>If the data was collected by someone else, do you have permission to use this</p>

	<p>data? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes-describe how or attach documentation indicating permission <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Will this data be stripped of any identifiers? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No-explain how anonymity will be maintained</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> Will you be using a data collection form? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes-it is included with this submission <input type="checkbox"/> No-Here is a list of my data points (e.g. test scores, gender, race, age, etc)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. [45 CFR 46.101 (b)(6)]</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>None of the above categories apply to the proposed research</p>

<p><u>6.Summary of Research Activities</u></p>	
<p><i>Attach copies of all written materials that will be used in the interaction with the participants.</i></p>	
<p>6.1 Briefly state the purpose of this research/project and your research question(s):</p>	
<p>6.2 What is the goal of the investigation?</p>	
<p>Anticipated Start Date:</p>	<p>Anticipated Date of Completion:</p>

6.3 How will the research be conducted?

- In person (interviews, surveys, focus groups)
- Online
- Telephone
- Observational
- Secondary and/or Archival Data
- Publicly available media
- Other: (please describe)

6.4 Will you also submit application(s) to other IRBs for approval of the same project?

- Yes No

If yes, provide the following for each IRB that is expected to review any part of this project:

Institution	IRB Contact Person	Phone Number

7. Research Participants and Recruitment Procedure

Include all study materials that will be used in the interaction with participants with your submission.

7.1 Maximum number of participants : 2

7.2 Expected Age Range:

7.3 Participant Recruitment Procedure

- Advertisement
- Verbal scripts for face-to-face meeting
- Letters to potential participants
- Other, please list:
- Telephone Script
- E-Mail (publicly available)
- Web-Based (social media)

7.4 How many participants from UTEP will be included? 0

7.5 Will participants be recruited from other locations?

- Yes No

If yes, state the site(s) and number of participants anticipated at each site:

7.6 Describe the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of subjects in this research study:

7.7 Does your survey, interview, or questionnaire deal with sensitive and private aspect of behavior, such as sexual preference, substance abuse, or illegal conduct?

Yes No

If yes, please describe and include a copy of survey, interview questions, or questionnaires.

7.8 Describe the task(s) subjects will be asked to perform.

Describe the frequency and duration of procedures, psychological tests, educational tests, and experiments; including screening intervention, follow-up, etc. *Reminder:* No personal or sensitive information can be sought under Minimal Review guidelines. (If you intend to pilot a process before recruiting for the main study, please explain.)

7.9 Explain how participants will be fully informed of this research prior to their participation (through use of a study information sheet, letter, e-mail invitation, etc.) **Note:** Please SUBMIT a copy.

7.10 Will you be audio or video recording?

No

Yes. Please ensure to complete the Confidentiality Section below.

7.11 Will identifiers or links to an identifier of the participants be recorded?

Yes No

If yes, what information that could be linked to the participants will be recorded?

Name, professional/career information

7.12 Will the participants be paid?

No Yes. State the type and amount of compensation:

7.13 Are the risks to the participants associated with the research known? What is your estimate of the risks?

7.14 How will you help to minimize potential risks that individuals may be exposed to while participating in the research? Potential risks may include psychological, social, legal, physical, etc.

8. Confidentiality

8.1 Describe provisions that will be taken to maintain confidentiality of data. Will they contain subject names or images? (e.g., surveys, video, audio tapes, database):

8.2 Could the information obtained or recorded about subjects place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, employability, insurability, or reputation?

No

Yes. Please explain:

8.3 Describe the security plan for data, including where data will be stored, and for how long, noting that you may not keep identifiable data indefinitely (i.e., password protection, encrypted, locked filing cabinet, etc.):

8.4 Will identifiable data be made available to anyone other than the PI?

Yes No

If yes, explain who and why they will have access to the identifiable data?

8.5 With whom will the results of the project be shared?

ASSURANCES

With this submission I certify that:

I agree to fully comply with the ethical principles and regulation regarding the protection of human subjects in research.

I agree that the information provided in this form and all other supporting documents and forms are accurate and complete.

Copies of all required documentation of Consent (if applicable) and any data related to this research are securely stored at

Vita

Tanya Marie Robertson earned her Bachelor of Science Degree in Computer Science and Math and her Bachelor of Arts Degree in Spanish from the University of Kentucky in 1992 and 2005, respectively. She earned her Bachelor of Arts in English from the University of Louisville in 2007 and her Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing from the University of Texas at El Paso in 2011.

Tanya has presented her research at national and regional conferences such as Feminisms and Rhetorics and the College Composition and Communication Conferences and was accepted into the Rhetoric Society of America Summer Institute in 2015 and 2017. She has received multiple grants, scholarships, and awards including the UTEP Library Information Literacy Course Enhancement Grant (2014) and the Strauss Professional Development Scholarship (2015) from The University of Texas at El Paso as well as the and Part-Time Lecturer Excellence in Teaching Award (2017) from the University of Louisville.

Tanya is currently an Assistant Professor in Residence in the English Department at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.