

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Laurie Grobman
Pennsylvania State University–Berks

I am pleased to present Volume 5 of *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric*, which continues the tradition of publishing outstanding undergraduate research in writing and rhetoric. *Young Scholars in Writing* has undergone several changes. First, it has for the first time a faculty editorial board comprised of dedicated teacher-scholars in the discipline: Linda Bergmann, Shannon Carter, Doug Downs, Heidi Estrem, Helen Foster, John Gravener, Jane Greer, Carmen Kynard, Kelly Ritter, Amy Robillard, and Susan Thomas. Each board member is a faculty advising editor who works with student submitters throughout the revision process. I am deeply appreciative of the time and commitment each board member has put into the journal, particularly the energy and enthusiasm with which they have worked with student contributors. Volume 5 would not have been the same without their work.

Equally exciting is the addition of a new feature, “Young Scholars in First-Year Writing,” led by Shannon Carter and Doug Downs. The four first-year writers’ articles in Volume 5 attest to the excellent scholarship first-year writers can produce on topics tightly related to composition, rhetoric, and/or literacy studies (see Carter and Downs’s introduction to this feature later in this volume, which includes a short summary of each article). Finally, please note that the editorial board elected to change the date of Volume 5 to Spring 2008 (rather than Fall 2007, which would have followed the pattern of previous volumes) to accurately represent the date of publication.

What has remained the same in Volume 5 is the quality of student scholarship. Volume 5 begins with “A Look Back from Two Young Scholars” by Heather Bastian and Lindsey Harkness, whose work in Volume 1 of *Young Scholars in Writing* has been cited in Amy Robillard’s article in *College English*.¹ We begin with five articles on the discourses of women and people of color. Anna Rae Kathryn Mitchell argues that the rhetorical strategies that Pauli Murray and Patricia Williams, two African American feminists, have used to gain voice in legal discourse and in the women’s movement have been groundbreaking for African American women in legal discourse, despite multifaceted oppression and legal discourse neutrality’s limiting effects on black women’s voices. Laura Northcutt explores the postsuffrage-era rhetoric of Myra Page, who reconciled her Southern heritage and socialist ideology, expanding the sphere of women’s rhetoric. Gavin Payne argues that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice’s consistently high approval rating is in large part due to her strong use of *ethos* construction, which she achieves through citing specific historical examples in her speeches. In her study of controversial media celebrity Nancy Grace, Emily Mullins argues that although Grace’s rebellion against traditional gender roles has paved the way for women rhetors in the public sphere, Grace’s style is ultimately counterproductive for women because it identifies female rhetors with controversy rather rhetorical skill and leadership ability. Finally, Andrew Noel, in a study he refers to as an “intellectual discursive examination,” analyzes Western and indigenous discourses and exposes problems regarding the representation of oppressed indigenous groups.

Two articles in Volume 5 address writing center theory and practice. “The Expanding Center: Creating an Online Presence for the UMBC Writing Center” by Bill Chewing describes the results

of a year-long pilot study of an online tutoring program for the University of Maryland–Baltimore County. Chewing argues that online tutoring programs must be developed with faculty views and perspectives in mind and that online tutoring efforts should complement, but not replace, traditional f2f tutoring practices. Through their study of writing consultants and engineering students, Ruth Johnson, Beth Clark, and Mario Burton argue that writing consultant training should account for subject-area “experts” and “nonexperts.”

Two contributors focus on teaching and learning writing. In a study involving 329 high school juniors and seniors, Amber Watson surveyed students about their beliefs in giftedness and teacher competence, concluding that the relationships between these beliefs and students’ self-assessments of their own writing ability are very complex. Jacob Rees, who first wrote his article as a student but revised it as a student teacher, focuses his study on both learning to “write with style” and teaching students to develop their own style.

Rebecca Simon and Rachel Share conduct two very different rhetorical analyses. Simon utilizes visual rhetorical theory to understand the development of meaning in museum exhibitions, closely examining three museum exhibits about the famous King Tutankhamen. Share’s rhetorical analysis of Geoffrey Chaucer’s *The Canterbury Tales* suggests that Chaucer becomes a rhetor himself, critiquing his medieval British society and in doing so, hinting at the importance of using rhetoric for the common good. Simon and Share each include a unique feature to their undergrad research; Simon creates sketches of Tut exhibits, and Share includes her own translations of Chaucer’s text.

Volume 5 includes five “Comment and Response” entries, all in response to articles in Volume 3 of *Young Scholars in Writing*, from students of Dr. Sean O’Rourke at Furman University. In response to Amanda Marshall’s “Rhetoric of Anorexia: Eating as a Metaphor for Living,” Hailey Carmichael compares the virtual world of the Internet with the world of Platonic thought to demonstrate the dangers to anorexic patients when reality is distorted. Diana Maley argues in response to Olga Zaytseva’s “Beslan School Tragedy: The Rhetoric of the Russian Media” that due to the Russian media’s complete advocacy of the government’s agenda, we cannot accurately gauge the unity of the Russian people through analysis of media content. Meredith Neville argues that the Truth campaign, the topic of Rebecca Feldmann’s article “Discovering the Truth: The Operation of Ethos in Anti-Smoking Advertising,” employs the same manipulative rhetoric that cigarette companies use in their advertisements. John Newby disputes Patrick W. Belanger’s criticism of President George W. Bush for using rhetoric in his September 20, 2001, address to the nation, arguing that presidents have long used similar rhetorical strategies and, in strong language, claiming that he does not “believe that President Bush has either the skills or the guile to endanger the continuation of our Republic.” Finally, Emily Parsons, through a close examination of Calvinist theology, offers a broader theological and historical context to augment Rob Goodman’s article, “The King James Bible and the Rhetoric of Authority.”

Several people at Penn State Berks deserve thanks for their support of the journal. Penn State Berks Chancellor Susan P. Speece; Associate Academic Dean Dr. Paul Esqueda; and Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences Division Head Dr. Ken Fifer continued to provide financial support for the journal. Students in the Professional Writing Program at Penn State Berks and many of the contributors from the first four volumes served as peer reviewers. Dr. Sandy Feinstein and Dr. Michele Ramsey, my colleagues at Penn State Berks, again offered their advice on submissions. And as always, my thanks go out to all faculty who encouraged their students to submit their manuscripts to the journal and to the students who did so. Although we at *Young Scholars in Writing* do not have

the financial means to publish all student submissions, we urge *all* students in writing and rhetoric to pursue scholarly work.

Notes

- ¹ Robillard, Amy E. “*Young Scholars* Affecting Composition: A Challenge to Disciplinary Citation Practices.” *College English* 68.3 (Jan. 2006): 253–70.