Underlife and Writing Instruction

Robert Brooke

This article uses the sociological concept of underlife to explain several aspects of writing instruction. In sociological theory, "underlife" refers to those behaviors which undercut the roles expected of participants in a situation—the ways an employee, for example, shows she is not just an employee, but has a more complex personality outside that role.

In contemporary writing instruction, both students and teachers undercut the traditional roles of the American educational system in order to substitute more complex identities in their place. On the one hand, students disobey, write letters instead of taking notes, and whisper with their peers to show they are more than just students and can think independently of classroom expectations. On the other, writing teachers develop workshop methods, use small groups, and focus on students' own "voices" in order to help students see themselves as writers first and students second. Both sets of behaviors are underlife behaviors, for they seek to provide identities that go beyond the roles offered by the normal teacher-as-lecturer, student-as-passive-learner educational system.

These forms of underlife, moreover, are connected to the nature of writing itself. Writing, in the rich sense of interactive knowledge creation advocated by theorists like Ann Berthoff in *The Making of Meaning* and Janet Emig in *Web of Meaning,* necessarily involves standing outside the roles and beliefs offered by a social situation—it involves questioning them, searching for new connections, building ideas that may be in conflict with accepted ways of thinking and acting. Writing involves being able to challenge one's assigned roles long enough that one can think originally; it involves living in conflict with accepted (expected) thought and action.

This article will explore student and teacher behavior in writing instruction as the underlife of the current educational system, and will suggest that the identities which may be developing for students in writing classrooms are

Robert Brooke, an assistant professor of English at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, has published essays in *Empirical Studies in the Arts* and in the recent collection, *The Acquisition of Written Language.* He is currently directing a year-long study of student culture at his university.

more powerful for real academic success than the traditional identity of the successful student. It may be that the process of allowing a particular kind of identity to develop is what contemporary writing instruction is all about.

The Concept of Underlife

My understanding of "underlife" stems from Erving Goffman's books *Asylums* and *Stigma,* although the concept has long been accepted in sociology. As presented in these books, the concept of underlife rests on three assumptions about social interaction. First, a person's identity is assumed to be a function of social interaction. Second, social interaction is assumed to be a system of information games. Third, social organizations are assumed to provide roles for individuals which imply certain kinds of identities. With these assumptions in mind, "underlife" can be understood as the activities (or information games) individuals engage in to show that their identities are different from or more complex than the identities assigned them by organizational roles. In this section, I will describe these assumptions and the concept of underlife that emerges from them.

   Identity as Social Interaction. In *Stigma,* Goffman explains that we understand another person's identity as a product of (1) how they immediately appear to us through dress, bearing, accent, physical features, and the like; (2) what we know about their history; and (3) the stances they take towards the groups we assume they belong to. We may initially assume, for example, that the young man in the front row of a new class is a typical "fraternity boy" because of (1) his haircut, his polo shirt, and his brand name tennis shoes. As we get to know (2) his history, we may find out that he comes from a wealthy family, that his parents hope he will become a doctor, and that he struggles with this because he has a hard time keeping up his grades. We will also begin to get a sense of him as a unique individual when we find out (3) he is troubled by his relationship to his family, more interested in English than in medicine, and feels in conflict because he would like to drop medicine, reject the family, and go into graduate school, but also wants to marry his sorority sweetheart, keep the family fortune, and lead a "successful" life. We (and he) use all three forms of information in assigning to him a particular identity.

   Information Games. The identity we assign such a young man is greatly determined, however, by the kinds of information he chooses to give us. If he dressed differently, we would see him differently. Perhaps if we knew more of his history we would see him in a different light. Perhaps we may think that his choice to tell us of his interest in English is a calculated choice, intended to get us to grade easier. The identity assigned an individual by other people is largely the product of the "information games" people play when interacting with each other. By what each person chooses to reveal about himself in each context, we develop a sense of that person's identity. Central to

Goffman's conception of the human person, then, is a sense of the "informa-
tion games" nature of interaction—people are assumed to attempt to develop
the best defensible portrait for themselves in social interactions.

Organizational Roles. The kind of portrait a person can develop for herself,
however, is a function of the organizations (businesses, families, clubs, hospi-
tals, etc.) she operates in. As Goffman explains, social organizations are places
where individuals are placed into certain roles. Appropriate activity in these
roles carries with it implications about identity. In a school classroom, for ex-
ample, prompt and accurate completion of tasks set by the teacher carries with
it a "good student" identity, and a student who always complies pleasantly
will be understood as smart, well-mannered, possibly a teacher's pet.

Underlife. Exactly because organizations offer definitions of identity, they
also offer individuals the opportunity to respond to the definitions in creative
ways. Because definitions of self exist in organizations, individuals can give
information about how they see themselves by rejecting the definition offered.
Institutional underlife is exactly such a case: actors in an institution develop
behaviors which assert an identity different from the one assigned them.

In *Asylums,* Goffman studies the underlife of a major American mental hos-
pital, and comes to the conclusion that underlife activities take two primary
forms. First, there are *disruptive* forms of underlife, like those engaged in by
union organizers, "where the realistic intentions of the participants are to
abandon the organization or radically alter its structure." Second, there are
contained forms of underlife, which attempt to fit into "existing institutional
structures without introducing pressure for radical change" (199). Most forms
of underlife are of the second kind—they work around the institution to assert
the actor's difference from the assigned role, rather than working for the elim-
ination of the institution. In the mental hospital, Goffman finds many exam-
ples of such contained underlife patterns, including identity jokes and chal-
lenges (where staff and inmates would kid each other about having attributes
of the other class), attempts to "get around" established procedures (such as
dumping dinner in the garbage and having a friend who works in the kitchen
smuggle out a plateful of boiled eggs), and explicit attempts to express rejec-
tion of inmate status (like withdrawing from interaction with other patients,
parodying psychological theory, claiming it was all a mistake, and engaging
in violent behavior). The point of each of these behaviors, claims Goffman, is
to show that one has a self different from the patient-self assigned by the hos-
pital.

The prevalence of such behaviors throughout the hospital and other institu-
tions leads Goffman to conclude that underlife behaviors are a normal part of
institutional life. All members of the institution—staff, patients, technicians,
janitors, doctors—engaged in such behaviors. Consequently, Goffman claims,
institutional underlife must be understood as an activity closely related to in-
dividual identity. "I want to argue," he writes, "that this recalcitrance is not

an incidental mechanism of defense but rather an essential constituent of the self" (319). For Goffman, looking at those activities through which individuals resist or reject the identity assigned them by institutions is a way of looking at how individuals form their sense of identity. No one but the complete fanatic completely associates herself with only one role—instead, the self is formed in the distance one takes from the roles one is assigned. In such an analysis, activities which aren't "on task" become as important as activities which are, for besides the task itself there is also always the formation of identity.

Underlife in a Writing Class

Underlife activities, as Goffman describes them, are the range of activities people develop to distance themselves from the surrounding institution. By so doing they assert something about their identity. Underlife allows individuals to take stances towards the roles they are expected to play, and to show others the stances they take. When the kinds of student behaviors normally seen as misbehavior are examined in writing classrooms, what appears is exactly this sort of constructive, individual stance-taking. It is exactly in these underlife behaviors that students are developing their individual stances towards classroom experience.

   I would like to discuss several examples of underlife in the writing classroom from this perspective. The examples all come from a semester-long participant-observation study of a freshmen writing class in spring 1986. As a participant-observer, I was able to hear and record many behaviors I am unable to attend to while teaching my own courses. These behaviors include the private conversations students have with one another, the notes they write to themselves and then scratch out, the things they're writing when the teacher thinks they're taking notes, and other such activities. What surprised me was the extent and content of these activities—even in the most docile class hour, such activities are constantly going on, and (significantly) they are usually connected to the class activities in some way. The students are developing their own stances towards class activity, not whispering about unrelated subjects like parties and dates as I had always assumed.

   In the classroom I observed, the students' underlife activities divided fairly cleanly into four major types, which I will discuss in order of frequency.

   First, students tend to find creative uses for classroom activities and materials which are purposefully different from those the teacher intended. Usually, these creative uses show that classroom ideas could be used outside of class in ways more interesting to the students. During a class period devoted to using Young, Becker, and Pike's tagmemic matrix in *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change,* for example, two male students found ways of thinking about the subject that asserted their own interests. The teacher had brought in a bag of po-

tatoes to serve as an example, and was having the class use the tagmemic matrix to explore "how many ways they could think about something as simple as a potato." While the class was discussing how a potato might change over time and in what contexts this change would be interesting, these students began a private discussion of how to ferment the potato to get vodka. When asked by the teacher what they were talking about, one of the two (looking nervous) explained that the process of fermentation was obviously a "change over time" and that this process was interesting "in the context of alcohol production." In this example, the students had openly ceased to participate in class, and seemed (from their giggles) to be "telling jokes" behind the teacher's back. But the content of their "jokes" was actually a way of applying the class concepts to their own late-adolescent interests in alcohol. Their retreat from class participation was a retreat which took a class concept with it, and which applied that concept in a highly creative and accurate way.

In the classroom I studied, this kind of creative use of classroom ideas was the most frequent form of underlife behavior. Most of the private conversations I heard applied a class concept to the students' world. In fact, particularly striking images or ideas frequently sparked several private conversations throughout the room. When the class discussed Annie Dillard's "Lenses," for example, a student pointed out Dillard's comparison of feeling disoriented to the shock of coming out of a really good movie and realizing you'd forgotten where you parked the car. Immediately, several private conversations started up throughout the room—the ones I could hear focused on how that feeling had happened to them too, in situations they could share with their peers.

To a teacher thinking only of how well her point is getting across, what seems to be going on in these cases is disruptive: students aren't paying attention, but are talking to one another about things that don't have to do with class. But to a teacher thinking about how students are using classroom information, these diversions should seem positive. In them, no matter how jokingly, students are actively connecting ideas in the classroom to their own lives outside the classroom, and are discovering ways in which classroom knowledge seems useful even when (or especially when) it isn't used for classroom purposes.

The second most frequent kind of underlife was student comments on the roles people were taking in the classroom, or the roles the classroom was asking them to take. Students, for example, frequently focused on the "gamesplaying" nature of student participation in college courses. Consider, for example, the following interaction which occurred during a small group discussion of a chapter from Margaret Laurence's *A Bird in the House:*

> Mick: "You know, everyone in the story tries to make themselves seem better than they are, you know, but Vanessa finds out every one of them is worse than they seem. It's like *all* of them are lying."
>
> Mel: "Good point. She[the teacher]'ll like that."

Chuck: "Yeah. Home run. Three strikes."
Mel: (laughing): "Big bucks."
Chuck: "Yeah, big bucks, no whammies."
    General laughter, and the conversation immediately turned to discus-
sion of a TV game show called "Press Your Luck!" On this show, contes-
tants played a form of roulette to get "big bucks," but lost everything if
they landed on a "whammie." The whammies, incidently, were animated
cartoon characters which would ramble across the screen and devour the
hapless contestant's earnings. The group's discussion (which went on for
several minutes, the assigned task having been forgotten) focused on how
"lucky" players had to be to win anything on "Press Your Luck!" and
how in general the game was a rip-off—as a contestant, nine times out of
ten you got to get humiliated for nothing.

What struck me most about this interaction was not that students were
avoiding the official task, nor that they were avoiding my presence enough to
feel comfortable avoiding the task, but that the interaction highlighted (and
sprung from) a deep-rooted sense of their experience with classrooms. Their
comments, and the quick shift from doing a classroom exercise to discussing a
game show, pointed out that they thought of the classroom as a "games-
playing" environment, where "points" accumulated "big bucks," where one
might get "whammied," where you always had to "press your luck." They
thought of themselves as contestants in a game of luck, nerves, and skill, in
which those who scored the most points survived, and those who didn't went
home humiliated. They were aware, in short, that the classroom environment
demanded certain actions of them which were as formal and arbitrary as the
actions demanded in games-playing. The purpose of their interaction was to
show each other that they all recognized this, that they as individuals were
different from the roles they were being asked to play, and that they were all
aware of each other as fellow games-players.
    As a consequence of this mutual recognition of each other as games-players,
students frequently engaged in conversations about how to "get by" effectively
in the classroom. Especially in the few minutes before class when the teacher
was not yet in the room, students would openly discuss strategies they'd used
to succeed in the classroom. One woman told another, for example, that she'd
written in her journal (which the teacher would see) an entry describing how
hard the last paper was to write and how long it took her because that was the
sort of thing the teacher wanted—even though she'd actually written the
paper in an hour and a half after midnight the night before. Similarly, stu-
dents would often share the comments they received on papers, and discuss
what in the papers might have sparked the teacher to make these comments.
These conversations occurred especially when one student had done well on a
paper, and another hadn't, as if the students were together trying to pinpoint
what was expected of them for success in this classroom. In all these activities,
it was clear that students were not immediately evaluating each other on their
success and honesty in embracing the classroom roles, but were instead mutu-

ally helping each other to succeed in "getting by" in the classroom without losing themselves in its expectations.

Such "role-recognition" activities on the part of students seem very similar to the "identity jokes" Goffman found in the hospital he studied. The purpose for commenting on the roles that exist in the classroom is the same purpose for kidding a staff member for acting like an inmate—such comments show that the speaker is aware of and different from the roles assigned in the situation, that there is more to the speaker than that. The quantity of such comments in the classroom I studied suggests that students are highly aware of the roles the classroom asks them to play, and highly defensive of their differences from these roles.

A third major category of underlife activities involves evaluations of what is going on in the classroom. In these comments, students explicitly took a stance towards some aspect of the classroom, and evaluated it as good or bad. Often, these evaluations focused on their own performance:

> Chuck: Did you bring your paper?
> Ben: That damn thing—
> Chuck: Pretty "damn," huh?
> Ben: It's so "damn" I keep forgetting it.

or on the course materials:

> Jane: (holding up book): Did you think this was all right?
> Holly: Dumb.
> Jane: Dumb?
> Holly: I hated it. Let me read your journal.
> Jane: No, it's stupid.—No, don't take it.—Give it back. (whispers) Teacher! Teacher! (Teacher comes into the classroom, and both students straighten in their seats).

or on the day's activity:

> Nellie (to those around her during potato description day): I can't believe this! (She closes her book and starts writing a letter to a friend).

These activities, also relatively common, allow the individual students to claim explicitly whether or not they accept the activity going on around them. Interestingly, most of these in-class comments expressed negative evaluations, even though formal student evaluations of the course showed most students thought this was the best writing course they'd ever taken. The purpose of these evaluative comments, it seems, is the same purpose as the other underlife activities—to assert one's fundamental distance from the classroom roles. Negative evaluations show that one can think independently; positive evaluations would show compliance with the course expectations. The purpose of such an evaluative comment has nothing to do with what the student really

thinks of the class when comparing it to other classes. Instead, it has to do with asserting the student's ability to think in ways other than those expected in the classroom.

The last major category of underlife activity involved those private activities whereby an individual divides her attention between the class activity and something else. The most common example of divided attention was reading the student newspaper while the teacher was beginning class, but more interesting examples occurred. In this class, students were required to turn in a one-page journal entry every day—in a typical class period, four or five students could be observed writing their journals. Sometimes they would write these in such a way that the teacher would think they were taking notes. Sometimes they would write them as they were participating in small group discussions. In each case, however, they would be dividing their attention between the journal page and the activity that the teacher had set up. Both activities, of course, were connected to class demands; what was rebellious about writing the journal in class was that it took full and undivided attention away from the prescribed activity in the classroom.

The point of all these underlife activities is clearly to distance oneself from the demands of the classroom while hopefully remaining successful within it. All would be considered examples of "contained" underlife by Erving Goffman. The point is not to disrupt the functioning of the classroom, but to provide the other participants in the classroom with a sense that one has other things to do, other interests, that one is a much richer personality than can be shown in this context. All these activities, in short, allow the student to take a stance towards her participation in the classroom, and show that, while she can succeed in this situation, her self is not swallowed up by it. The interesting parts of herself, she seems to say, are being held in reserve.

Underlife and the Writing Teacher

If student underlife within the writing classroom is "contained" underlife, then the writing teacher's position can only be considered "disruptive." Students merely try to gain a little psychic distance from the roles they must inhabit in the classroom, but writing teachers clearly see themselves as engaged in the process of changing classroom roles. In fact, many writing teachers explain their position as one of "struggle" against the prevailing educational institution because the goals of writing are finally different from the goals of traditional education. Adrienne Rich, for example, claims in "Teaching Language in Open Admissions" that her goal of helping underprivileged writers find ways of writing powerfully in their own contexts comes into conflict with large social institutions which would prefer these individuals remained inarticulate. Mike Rose's article, "The Language of Exclusion," describes the

writing teacher's plight, aware of the importance of writing for learning and thinking on the one hand, but forced by institutional administrators to test, remediate, and exclude students because of their poor writing "skills" on the other, and claims teachers must strive for the first while combating the second. In "Reality, Consensus, and Reform," Greg Myers shows how wanting to teach writing as a freeing process has historically been in conflict with (and undercut by) the ideological purposes of the educational institution, and argues that writing teachers need to recognize that "our interests are not the same as those of the institutions that employ us, and that the improvement of our work will involve social changes" (170). Similarly, Pamela Annas' "Style as Politics" shows how, for writers who are disadvantaged within the current social structure, writing is always a complex political act of finding language to express other possibilities than those offered by the current sociopolitical climate, and that this finding of language is in conflict with the standards of accepted writing. In each case, these writing teachers feel themselves to be after something different from what the traditional education system produces—instead of traditional "good students," they want students who will come to see themselves as unique, productive writers with influence on their environment.

They would like their students to see themselves as writers rather than as students, and their pedagogical changes are attempts to facilitate this shift in roles. Writing teachers change the classroom to help students extend their identities.

Writing teachers, however, are more likely to speak of "voice" than of "identity," for the first is a rhetorical concept and the second a sociological concept. But the two are very closely related, since both have to do with the stance an individual takes towards experience. In writing theory, a writer's "voice" is most often described as the unique stance she takes towards experience, and the unique way she relates herself to her context. In sociological theory, as we have seen, "identity" develops out of the individual's stance towards experience and out of the way she relates herself to the roles assigned her in the context. The ideas are closely connected: when a writing teacher worries about her student's "voice," she is also worrying about her student's "identity."

In writing classrooms, "voice" is often felt to be the paradox that prompts pedagogical change—as teachers, we want students to write in their own voices, but how can they when we *assign* them to? And how can their voices really be their own when they are evaluated by us? Knoblauch and Brannon explain in their *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing:*

> How can teachers hope to encourage engaged writing, particularly given the fact that classroom composing is, to a degree, inevitably artificial since the impulse to write comes from outside the writers? . . . Any school writing alters the normal circumstances in which a writer takes initiative to communicate to some reader, and in which the reader is inter-

> ested in the substance of that particular text but not especially interested
> in the writer's overall ability or continuing maturation. (108)

If our goal as writing teachers is to enable students to see themselves as and to
act as writers, then our role as teachers making assignments and evaluating
their performance can only get in the way. In the classroom, students write to
comply with our demands—they don't write because they see themselves as
writers. The need for writers to develop their own voices is the central place
where writing pedagogy comes into conflict with itself. If students really are
to develop their own voices, they will need to ignore the requirements set for
them by outsiders and write instead as they want—they would need, in short,
to engage in a kind of underlife in relation to the classroom.

What's at stake, it seems, is a part of their "identity"—we would like
them to think of themselves as *writers* rather than as *students*. We would hope
they see purposes for writing beyond the single purpose of getting us to give
them good grades. We would like them to take initiative to communicate
with readers, to use writing to help better their world, to use writing to help
them understand their world. Instead, we worry that they may see themselves
only as gamesplayers, as individuals forced to play the student role and who
consequently distance themselves from that role as anyone working in an or-
ganization does. As writing teachers, we want them to *own* their writing,
rather than attributing it only to the classroom—rather than claiming it's only
a game we play in class.

If we wish them to see themselves as writers, we must help both them and
ourselves to see our interaction in writing classrooms as cut from a different
mold than "regular" classrooms. The roles must be different.

In fact, it is exactly such problems with classroom roles that lurk behind
current calls to change writing pedagogy. The range of such suggested
changes is staggering. Janet Emig's "Non-Magical Thinking" and Peter
Elbow's *Writing Without Teachers* both argue that the teacher should become "a
writer among writers," and that the first requirement of the writing teacher is
that she must write herself, often and in many modes. Knoblauch and Bran-
non's *Rhetorical Traditions* suggests changing the structure of the classroom to
a "writing workshop" where students and teacher can really talk to one an-
other "as members of the same community of learners" (111). Donald Mur-
ray's *A Writer Teaches Writing* argues for one-on-one conferences between writ-
er and teacher, in which the teacher takes a secondary place to the writer's
own talk about her work and acts mainly as a fellow writer-editor and not as a
teacher. Alongside these suggestions for classroom reform are powerful indict-
ments of the traditional writing classroom for being teacher-centered rather
than student-centered, focused on the product rather than process, being op-
pressive rather than liberating.

The whole call for pedagogical shift is most powerfully a call for a shift in
the identity roles offered in the classroom. In other words, although we
haven't clearly articulated it, the organizing assumption of composition in-

struction, in theory and practice, is that the primary function of the composition classroom is to foster a particular identity or stance towards the world. Writing teachers want to produce writers, not students, and consequently we seek to change our pedagogy to allow the possibility of the writer's identity.

Conclusion: Writing, Autonomy, and Action

The reasons writing teachers seek to alter normal classroom practice and the reasons students express their distance as individuals from classroom roles thus seem intimately connected: both have to do with a concern for the student's identity. Neither writing teacher nor student is content to rely on the expected roles of teacher and student. Both want there to be more to the self, and both show this desire—the student by distancing herself from classroom expectations, the teacher by structuring the course so that normal classroom expectations are only partly in effect.

What is at stake, in other words, is who the individuals in the classroom will be. Student underlife primarily attempts to assert that the individuals who play the role of students are not only students, that there is more to them than that. It is thus a *contained* form of underlife, a form which (as Goffman would say) attempts to exist within the existing structure without introducing too much friction. But writing teachers would have students go further—they would have students see themselves as writers, as people who use the processes writing offers to explore, question, and change elements of their social lives. Writing instruction is thus a *disruptive* form of underlife, a form which tries to undermine the nature of the institution and posit a different one in its place.

When we look at writing instruction from the perspective of underlife, it appears that the purpose of our courses is to allow students to substitute one kind of underlife for another. Instead of the naive, contained form they normally employ, we're asking them to take on a disruptive form—a whole stance towards their social world that questions it, explores it, writes about it. We ask them to stand apart from the roles they normally play, and instead to try exploring what they normally think and what they'd normally do through writing. We would like them to become distanced from their experience, and consider it. As their underlife behavior shows, they are of course already distanced, already posing as "different from" the roles they play every day. They *are* different from these roles. But they aren't conscious of how they are different, and how they work to maintain their difference. And that, it seems, is what writing instruction tries to do—get them to become conscious of their differences from their normal roles, get them to accept that they are different, get them to explore and write out of these differences. Writing, finally, asks individuals to accept their own underlife, to accept the fact that they are never completely subsumed by their roles, and instead can stand apart from them and contemplate. Writing instruction seeks to help the learner see herself as

an original thinker, instead of as a "student" whose purpose is to please teachers by absorbing and repeating information.

It is in this desire to shift roles, from student to writer, from teacher-pleaser to original thinker, that writing instruction comes into greatest conflict with the existing educational system, and also has the most to offer to it. For the shift begun in writing classrooms is a shift that would improve education in other classrooms as well. If the student in a chemistry class grew to think of herself as someone who thinks in certain ways to solve certain problems rather than as someone who must "learn" equations to pass tests, then the student would begin to see herself as a chemist, and to act accordingly. In other words, if all our classrooms were to focus on fostering the identities of students as thinkers in our disciplines rather than merely on transmitting the knowledge of our fields, then students might easily see the purpose for these particular "information games." But for students to see themselves as chemists, or social scientists, or writers, they must first see themselves as more than just students in our classrooms, as real thinkers with power and ability in this area. To help students make this change, of course, would require just as far-reaching pedagogical changes in other areas as writing teachers have begun to make in theirs. It would need much that is now only offered in writing classes—small class size, student-directed projects, peer interaction, chances for revising work and ideas as the course progresses. In all these changes, writing teachers could lead the way. For the student's identity of writer as original thinker, as able to step outside expectations and think creatively on one's own, may be the identity that would make the other identities possible, in the same way that the identity of "good student" (complete with study skills and time management behaviors) is now what makes traditional academic learning possible. Such a shift in education would be a far-reaching and beneficial shift, focusing on the identity and abilities of the student as an original thinker, rather than on the student's ability to comply with classroom authority.

Writing, in short, is "about" autonomy and action—to really learn to write means becoming a certain kind of person, a person who accepts, explores, and uses her differences from assigned roles to produce new knowledge, new action, and new roles. The concept of underlife shows us this process, a process at work in every classroom and at the core of our discipline. It suggests we think carefully about the identities we have, the identities we model, and the identities we ask students to take on, for the process of building identity is the business we are in.

Works Cited

Annas, Pamela. "Style as Politics." *College English* 47 (1985): 360-71.

Berthoff, Ann. *The Making of Meaning.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

Dillard, Annie. "Lenses." *The Bedford Reader.* Ed. X. J. Kennedy and Dorothy Kennedy. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985. 101-05.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing Without Teachers.* New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

Emig, Janet. "Non-Magical Thinking: Presenting Writing Developmentally in Schools." *Writing: The Nature, Development, and Teaching of Written Communication, Vol. 2: Writing: Process, Development and Communication.* Ed. Carl Frederiksen and Joseph Dominic. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981. 21-30.

———. *The Web of Meaning.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

Goffman, Erving. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates.* New York: Anchor, 1961.

———. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Knoblauch, C. H., and Lil Brannon. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1984.

Laurence, Margaret. *A Bird in the House.* Toronto: Seal, 1978.

Murray, Donald. *A Writer Teaches Writing.* 2nd Ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Myers, Greg. "Reality, Consensus, and Reform in the Rhetoric of Composition Teaching." *College English* 48 (1986): 154-74.

Rich, Adrienne. "Teaching Language in Open Admissions." *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978.* New York: Norton, 1979. 51-68.

Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion." *College English* 47 (1985): 341-59.

Young, Richard, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike. *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970.