

Dara Regaignon
dara.regaignon@pomona.edu

Andrew Ragni
andrew.ragni@pomona.edu

Crookshank 203, x 72209
office hours: T & Th 3:45-4:45
& by appointment

ID1.19: Fairy Tales * Fall 2009 * TR 11-12:15 * CA 12

THE COURSE DESCRIPTION (FROM THE CATALOG) . . .

Say “fairy tales” and we think of princesses, castles, ogres, and dragons, of fantastic and frothy confections that begin “once upon a time” and end “happily ever after.” We might be surprised to learn that in some versions of “Little Red Riding Hood,” the heroine performs a strip-tease for the wolf, or that the Grimm brothers typically sanitized the folktales they collected. Fairy tale tropes help us imagine and therefore understand romantic love, childhood and growing up, gender, identity, difference, and danger. In this seminar, we will explore these tales as cultural narratives that simultaneously reveal and help to shape the ideals and nightmares of the societies that consume them by reading canonical western European fairy tales, versions from non-Western cultures, and contemporary adaptations. In addition, we’ll examine how the logic and tropes of fairy tales shape contemporary culture, and will write our own fairy tales.

THE BACK STORY . . .

This is a course with multiple goals. The goal of the ID1 Program, writ large, is to prepare you to participate fully in the intellectual community of the college. That makes it sound as though this is a warm-up course, but in fact the only way to *prepare* to participate in intellectual life and community is by, well, *doing* it. To that end, this course treats you as apprentice scholars. Over the course of the semester, you’ll engage and contend with published scholars about ideas and texts; you’ll do independent research; you’ll present your ideas in formal (and informal) discussion; and you’ll respond critically and substantively to the works-in-progress of your peers. You’ll be doing most of these things in your other three courses this fall, but in ID1 you’ll get more help (from me and from Andy) than you will in most of those. That’s where the “preparatory” component comes in: We have the same high expectations for you and your work as they do in those various other classes, but we’ll talk about the process of meeting and exceeding those expectations a bit more, and you will drown in feedback about how you’re doing.

Texts (available at Huntley; required)

Diana Hacker, *Rules for Writers*, 6th edition. Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2009.

Martin Hallett and Barbara Karasek, *Folk and Fairy Tales*, 4th edition. Broadview, 2009 (abbreviated below “FFT”).

If not in one of the above books, all readings are on Sakai (<https://sakai.claremont.edu>) → Resources (abbreviated below “S”).

Course Requirements & Expectations

Class Participation & Attendance (5% of the final grade)

You need to be in class, and you need to be an engaged, thoughtful, well-prepared member of class—otherwise, discussions will founder and you’ll spend the semester wondering why.

You may miss 3 classes without penalty over the course of the semester; after that, it will affect your grade: half a step for each additional absence. If, however, you routinely neglect to do the reading and/or phone in your class and written participation, it will also affect your grade—both directly (in that you will be penalized) and indirectly, in that everything we do in this course feeds everything else.

Written Participation (5% of the final grade)

There's ample evidence that writing about ideas—throwing words at problems, in essence—*develops* those ideas. There's also ample evidence that in order to move from writer-based prose (that only we can understand) to reader-based prose (which communicates ideas to an audience) writers need to pause over, analyze, reflect on, and revise their writing. To help you internalize that process, we require you to generate pre-drafts; to write cover letters to each full draft and revision; and to write responses to one another's drafts. I'll distribute more information about all of these as we get there.

THE WRITING CENTER (in Pearsons 010) offers students free, one-on-one consultations at any stage of the writing process—from generating a thesis and structuring an argument to fine-tuning a draft. The Writing Fellows—Pomona students majoring in subjects including Economics, Molecular Biology, English, Politics, and Religious Studies—will work with you on an assignment from any discipline. Consultations are available by appointment, which you can make online: <http://writing.pomona.edu/writingcenter>.

The Writing Center also offers drop-in hours on Sunday and Wednesday evenings in Mudd-Blaisdell.

Papers (including drafts) (90% of the final grade)

ID1 is only formally designated “writing-intensive” course at Pomona. That means that we focus more in this course on the *process* and *goals* of academic written inquiry—not that you won't be writing quite intensively in other classes. You will write four papers for this class. For each, you'll write a full draft and one or more pre-draft writing assignments (including outlines, annotated bibliographies, brainstorming and freewriting exercises, etc.). You'll get feedback on all those various pieces: from me, from Andy, from one another. I strongly encourage you to get additional feedback: from one another (again); from friends; from the Writing Fellows at the Writing Center.

See page 3 of this packet for descriptions of the essay assignments.

Grades

Essay #1 (3-4 pages)	10%
Essay #2 (5-7 pages)	25%
Essay #3 (8-10 pages)	35%
Essay #4 (5 pages)	20%
Written participation	5%
In-Person participation	5%

Below are the general standards to which I hold written work. I'll give you (and we'll discuss) a more detailed version of this early in the semester. Generally speaking, there is a line between work that achieves my minimum goals for papers in this class and work that does

not. This is the line between a B- and a C+. Essays that have an arguable thesis and a progressive, logical structure fall above that line (unless other problems are so egregious that they seriously damage the paper's quality), and typically receive grades in the B or A range. Essays that do *not* have both an arguable thesis and a logical, progressive structure fall below that line, and typically receive grades in the C range or below.

An **A-range** essay is both ambitious and successful. It presents a strong, interesting argument with grace and confidence.

A **B-range** essay is one that is ambitious but only partially successful, or one that achieves modest aims well.

A **C-range** essay has significant problems in articulating and presenting its argument, or seems to lack a central argument entirely.

A **D-range** essay fails to grapple seriously with either ideas or texts, or fails to address the expectations of the assignment.

To request academic accommodations due to a disability, please contact Dean Marcelle Holmes. She can be contacted via e-mail at mdc04747@pomona.edu or at 909 607-2147.

Assignment Overview

Essay #1: Close Reading (3-4 pages)

Offer an interpretation of "Little Red Riding Hood" that centers on the significance of a particular textual detail. You may use any of the variants of this tale in FFT.

Draft due: Sunday, 13 September; Revision due: Friday, 25 September

Essay #2: Close Reading in Conversation (5-7 pages)

Based on your close reading of one of the variants of "Cinderella" provided, engage with one (or two) of the critics we've read in class to develop an interpretation of the tale in conversation with scholarship on it.

Draft due: Friday, 9 October; Revision due: Friday, 23 October

Essay #3: Independent Research Essay (8-10 pages)

Design and execute a research paper that investigates the history of a particular fairy tale or fairy tale element and makes an argument about how this tale or element functions in contemporary culture.

Draft due: Sunday, 8 November; Revision due: Tuesday, 24 November

Essay #4: Creative or Non-Academic Genres (4-5 pages)

The goal of this assignment is for you to apply your knowledge of the fairy tale genre to writing aimed at a general audience. There are several ways to approach this task:

- You could write your own fairy tale (in a medium of your choosing);
- You could write a review of a contemporary fairy tale (as though for *The New Yorker*, *Harpers*, *slate.com*, or *salon.com*); or
- You could stage a performance of a fairy tale.

Draft due: Friday, 4 December; Revision due: Friday, 11 December

Schedule¹

- T 9/1** **Introductions – Meet after Convocation in the outdoor classroom at the corner of 6th and College (between Crookshank and Pearsons)**
- Th 9/3** Reading due: syllabus; “On Close Reading”; Perrault’s “Little Red” (all TBD)
Writing due: none
- T 9/8** Reading due: Grimms’ “Little Red” (FFT); Delarue (FFT); Shavit (S)
Writing due: reading with & against the grain
- Th 9/10** Reading due: all other variants of “Little Red” in FFT
Writing due: Pre-Draft 1
- S 9/13 @ 5:00 pm: Draft of Paper 1 due via Sakai Drop Box**
- T 9/15** Reading due: 3 student essays (TBD); “Elements of the Academic Essay” (S)
Writing due: Draft Responses
- Th 9/17** Reading due: Bennett & Royle, “Readers and Reading” & “The Author” (S)
Writing due: none
- T 9/22** Reading due: Dundes (FFT); “Cinderella” variants by Perrault (FFT), Afanas’ev (FFT), Basile (S), and Grimms (S)
Writing due: structural analysis
- Th 9/24** Reading due: Bettelheim (FFT); “Cinderella” variants by Jacobs (FFT), Macmillan (FFT), and San Souci (FFT)
Writing due: 1-sentence summary of Bettelheim’s argument
- F 9/25 @ 5:00 pm: Revision of Paper 1 due via Sakai Drop Box**
- T 9/29** Reading due: von Franz (S); “Cinderella” variants by Lee, Maitland, Sexton (all FFT)
Writing due: 1-sentence summary of von Franz
- Th 10/1** Reading due: Ussher (S); Pace
Writing due: Pre-Draft 2
- T 10/6** Reading due: Howard (S); Bottigheimer, chapter 1 (S)
Writing due: none
- Th 10/8** Reading due: Bottigheimer, chapter 4 (S); Zipes (S)
Writing due: none
- F 10/9 @ 5:00 pm: Draft of Paper 2 due via Sakai Drop Box**
- T 10/13** Reading due: 3 drafts (TBD)
Writing due: Draft Responses
- F 10/23 @ 5:00 pm: Revision of Paper 2 due via Sakai Drop Box**

¹ FFT= *Folk and Fairy Tales*; S = Sakai; TBD = to be distributed

- T 11/10 Reading due: 3 drafts (TBD)
 Writing due: Draft Responses
- Th 11/12 Reading due: Rumpelstiltskin (FFT); additional reading TBD.
 Writing due: none
- T 11/17 Reading due: 3 (revised) drafts (TBD); "Stitching" (S)
 Writing due: Draft Responses
- Th 11/19 Reading due: Tosi, Hearne, Poniewozik (all in FFT)
 Writing due: none
- T 11/24 Reading due: "Goose Girl" and "Handkerchief" (FFT)
 Writing due: **Revision of Paper 3 due in class**
- Th 11/26: No Class – Thanksgiving Break**
- T 12/1 Reading due: Jacob, "Three Little Pigs" (FFT); Garner, "The Three Little
 Pigs" (FFT)
 Writing due: Pre-Draft 4
- Th 12/3 Reading due: Hoffmann, "The Nutcracker and the Mouse King" (S);
 Dumas père, "The Nutcracker"
 Viewing due: Baryshnikov's *The Nutcracker*
 Writing due: None
- F 12/4 @ 5:00 pm: Draft of Paper 4 due via Sakai Drop Box**
- T 12/8 **No class 11-12:15**
 End-of-term party/reading: Ena Thompson Room, 4-7 pm.

Revision of Paper 4, Portfolio, and End-of-Term Reflection due 12/11 @ noon in Dara's office.

Dara Regaignon
dara.regaignon@pomona.edu

Andrew Ragni
andrew.ragni@pomona.edu

Crookshank 203, x 72209
office hours: T & Th 3:45-4:45
& by appointment

ID1.19: Fairy Tales * Fall 2009 * TR 11-12:15 * CA 12

Schedule¹

T 11/17 Reading due: 3 (revised) drafts (TBD); "Stitching" (S)
Writing due: Draft Responses

Th 11/19 Reading due: Hoffman, "The Nutcracker and the Mouse King" (S)
Writing due: none

T 11/24 Reading due: Dumas, "The Tale of the Nutcracker" (S)
Viewing due: Baryshnikov's *The Nutcracker* (S)
Writing due: **Revision of Paper 3 due in class**

Th 11/26: No Class – Thanksgiving Break

T 12/1 Reading due: Collodi, *The Adventures of Pinocchio*
(<http://blais.claremont.edu/record=b3113927~S0>)
Writing due: Pre-Draft 4

W 12/2 @ 4:15 SCC 208 Marina Balina, "Pinocchio's Adventures in the Soviet Wonderland: Contexts and Challenges of Soviet Children's Literature" (see attached flyer)

Th 12/3 Reading due: None
Writing due: None

F 12/4 @ 5:00 pm: Draft of Paper 4 due via Sakai Drop Box

T 12/8 No class 11-12:15
End-of-term party/reading: Ena Thompson Room, 5-8 pm.

Revision of Paper 4, Portfolio, and End-of-Term Reflection due 12/11 @ noon in Dara's office.

¹ FFT= *Folk and Fairy Tales*; S = Sakai; TBD = to be distributed

ESSAY # 1: CLOSE READING (3-4 PAGES)

Offer an interpretation of “Little Red Riding Hood” that centers on the significance of a particular textual detail. You may use any of the variants of this tale in FFT.

Draft due: Sunday, 13 September; Revision due: Friday, 25 September

ADVICE:

This is a close reading assignment. You will therefore need to offer an interpretation of – that is, make an argument about – something relatively small: a recurring metaphor or trope, a single character, the scene of climax, or a particular striking addition or subtraction. Your argument and analysis should be primarily concerned with the version that is your focus; other versions of the tale should appear only to provide the necessary context.

The goal of this essay is for you to make an argument about the tale. That means that your interpretation needs to be controversial – it needs to be one of many possible interpretations, one that you need to spend 3-4 pages convincing your readers is the most interesting, compelling, suggestive.

GOALS OF THE ESSAY

Writing this essay will help you . . .

- **Provide a close reading with a thesis and a motive.** Close reading is a critical mode that pays attention to the details of a text, noticing how those details shape the text’s “message.” As Kerry Walk explains, “a close reading is *not* a line-by-line analysis of a passage but rather a coherent argument based upon such painstaking examination.”
- **Structure the essay according to your argument**, avoiding both plot summary and a descriptive five-paragraph essay. In arguing for your interpretation of a scene, you should structure your essay according to your *thesis* about that scene—not according to the progression of the scene itself. Your thesis should be both unified and worth arguing; it should *not* have three prongs (e.g. imagery, diction, and tone), each one of which is explored in a single paragraph.
- **Orient your reader.** You should imagine readers for your essay who have read the story you are analyzing, but not recently or in-depth. You will need to *orient* them with appropriate reminders (quick summaries of scenes, explanations of the context of quotations); always make sure that those reminders serve a purpose in your essay as a whole (not just summary for its own sake). Your readers should always know where you are in the text, through the material that you provide to jog their memories. Never assume 1) that readers know what to look for, 2) that they’ll read a passage in the same way you do, and 3) that they’ll draw the same conclusions. Your *analysis* of the *evidence* should persuade your readers of the validity of your claims. **Note:** Do not try to jog your readers’ memories with references to page numbers; use brief summary instead, and include the page number in a parenthetical reference.
- **Use active verbs** and limit your use of “to be” verbs. “To be” verbs include *is, are, was, were, be, to be, been, and being*. This simple style will invigorate your prose, and has its best effect if you remain aware of it as you draft and write, rather than translating sentences out of “to be” mode once the draft is done. You will also avoid empty phrases such as “there is” and “there are” to introduce your ideas. Work instead for stronger constructions and phrasing that actually tell your reader what’s important in that sentence. For example,

Avoid constructions like, “There are two important elements in this passage . . .”

And use constructions like, “The Grimms’ introduction of the wolf with “the” rather than ‘a’ reveals/demonstrates/announces . . .”

ESSAY #1 PRE-DRAFT: BRAINSTORMING AND CLOSE READING

There are many ways to move from observations about a text to an argument about it. This process is one way to begin generating ideas. Re-read “On Close Reading” while you work on this pre-draft, thinking about the ways your insights fall into the two major categories of “with the grain” and “against the grain” reading.

1. Xerox (or type out) and annotate the passage you have chosen to focus on: mark it up as much as you can, circling interesting words or strange images and identifying phrases that are in tension; track the focus of the passage—with what issues, ideas, and images does it begin and end? ask it (and yourself) questions in the margins. Think about reading the passage aloud—give a dramatic reading of it to a friend or to your computer screen, perhaps—this will help you notice elements of the text that you might otherwise overlook.
2. Next, freewrite about some aspect of that passage. Identify a puzzle in the passage you’ve chosen (a puzzle that seems to connect with the mandate of the assignment, or the ideas in the theory you’ve chosen). As in all freewriting, the trick is to silence your conscious, censoring mind slightly: as writing theorist Peter Elbow has written, you should “point your mind in the general direction of what you want to write” and then let go. Do not stop typing for the duration of your freewrite, even if it means writing the same phrase or sentence multiple times. (The freewrite, like the rest of this pre-draft except for the annotations, should be typed.) You might begin—should you be stuck staring at the blank page—by trying one of the following strategies: 1) write about why it’s difficult to begin this particular freewrite; 2) choose one of your questions or observations from the annotating step and try writing about (or around) it; 3) describe what a facile “with-the-grain” interpretation of the passage would look like, and then critique it, generating an “against-the-grain” interpretation. I cannot give you an estimated page length for the freewrite: it should be as long as it needs to be to help you come up with an idea that strikes you as exciting enough to serve as the seed of your question for this essay. Use the freewrite to push the idea as far as you can.
3. Write a slightly more formal paragraph that expands on the idea(s) you’ve generated in your freewrite. This is not your introduction to the essay, although it may well contain elements that you’ll use in your introduction. Re-read your freewrite, highlighting, circling, or otherwise identifying the various promising ideas that you generated in it beforehand.
4. Write a question that you want to figure out the answer to. Make sure that it’s a question that you *will* be able to figure out the answer to from the text of the tale itself, and also one that there are several plausible responses to.

Turn in the four pieces of this pre-draft in the following order:

1. **question and response (motive and thesis) (part 4),**
2. **formal paragraph (part 3),**
3. **annotated passage (part 1), and**
4. **freewrite (part 2).**

I will email you comments Thursday afternoon or evening, and will have originals to return in my office on Friday.

ESSAY # 2: CLOSE READING IN CONVERSATION (5-7 PAGES)

Based on your close reading of one of the variants of “Cinderella” provided, engage with one (or two) of the critics we’ve read in class to develop an interpretation of the tale in conversation with scholarship on it.

Draft due: Friday, 9 October; Revision due: Friday, 23 October

ADVICE:

In engaging with criticism, it’s important to read both critically and generously. If you only read generously, you’ll find it incredibly difficult to gain traction on the critic’s argument; in other words, you’ll find it hard to say anything original because you’ll be so blown away by the critic’s brilliance. If you only read critically, however, you can easily fall into the trap of arguing against a straw argument, a point that doesn’t get at the substance of the critic’s own argument, but takes issue with trifles, instead.

GOALS OF THE ESSAY

Writing this essay will help you continue to develop the close reading skills we worked on the in last essay, as well as the issues of structure and orienting. In addition, in this essay you will need to . . .

- **Motivate your argument by entering into an ongoing conversation about a tale or text.** This, in a sense, is the meat of written inquiry across the disciplines: building on the ideas or insights of other scholars, across space and time, to develop our understanding or and insight into a particular kind of problem.
- **Be precise in your key terms.** Almost every one of the critics we’re using has a set of terms that he or she uses. Both in adopting those terms and in developing your own, you need to define them carefully.
- **Cite correctly.** You should use MLA style and include a list of works cited, as is the convention in English Studies.

ESSAY # 2 PRE-DRAFT: ESSAY SKETCH

While you certainly can (and should!) do the kinds of annotating and freewriting you did for essay 1 in order to develop your ideas for the essay, the formal pre-draft I’d like you to turn in for this essay is what I’ll call an Essay Sketch. (See below.)

Basically, an Essay Sketch lies somewhere between an outline and a very, very baggy first draft. It gives you a chance to identify the contours of your argument, the key claims you plan to make, and the pieces of evidence you’ll need to develop those claims.

The complete Essay Sketch is due on Sunday by 8:00 pm. I’ll email you all comments that evening/Monday morning.

ESSAY SKETCH

DUE SUNDAY, 10/4 BY 8:00 PM

Introductory Material (motive, thesis, orienting, keyterms, sources)

Describe the central issue at stake in your response to the critic or critical debate. If you're entering a debate, you should summarize both sides. If you're engaging with a single critic, you should describe that argument.

Then, sketch out your response. Some considerations include: Why the debate as it's been played out between the two critics misses the fundamental point. (Or why two critics who seem to disagree at a fundamental level are actually in agreement without realizing it.) Why critic Q has misinterpreted "Cinderella." How critic Q's ideas about tale Y can change our reading of a tale Z, which s/he never seems to have considered. And so on.

Evidentiary Map (evidence, analysis, structure, sources)

Rather than being organized by key point or claim (like an outline), an evidentiary map is organized by, well, evidence. While the essay will ultimately be driven by your argument, it's often important (and frankly easier) to map out the key points you'll make by identifying the crucial passages you'll analyze in order to make them.

It's my hope that making this map will help you to do a couple of things:

First, that it will let you continue the great close attention to the language of the text(s) that you all started in your work for essay 1;

Second, that it will let you develop a structure for your argument that is independent of the structure of the tale itself and of the argument of the critic you're engaging.

ESSAY #3: INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ESSAY (8-10 PAGES)

Design and execute a research paper that investigates the history of a particular fairy tale or fairy tale element and makes an argument about how this tale or element functions in contemporary culture.

Draft due: Sunday, 8 November; Revision due: Tuesday, 24 November

PRE-DRAFT 3.1 – FORMAL PROPOSAL

The proposal, of roughly 500 words (1-2 pages), is your chance to make your case for the importance and urgency of your proposed essay. The job of a proposal is to convince your reader (a funding agency, an editor) to give you permission to do the project you describe; it's therefore your job to make the project seem as urgent and interesting as possible. All writers – whether they are scientists, historians, literary critics, engineers, advertising executives, or journalists – write proposals to “pitch” their ideas to the authorities of their respective fields.

The proposal should therefore include the background information your reader will need to evaluate the viability of the project, as well as information about the argument you believe you will make. (This, of course, is likely to change.) You could say that the most important “element” of a proposal is *motive* – because the intellectual context that makes this project compelling is at the heart of the case you'll build to get permission to pursue it. In addition, in *any* good research project the actual argument will change. Your proposal should therefore include a possible thesis, but you should expect it to develop and transform in light of your reading and research.

I've attached a couple of sample proposals, which I've drawn from my own work. (The first is more like this assignment than the second, which specified no more than 300 words.)

PRE-DRAFT 3.2 – DISCURSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY & ANTHOLOGY OF QUOTATIONS

The discursive bibliography is like an annotated bibliography – that is, a bibliography for which you have annotated the entries with notes summarizing the sources and indicating their usefulness – but it gives you more organizational freedom. Like an annotated bibliography, it should include all the information listed below; instead of organizing the texts alphabetically by the authors' last names, however, it should organize the texts thematically or conceptually. In other words, you can cluster texts that speak to one another, and write an annotative paragraph summarizing and evaluating each cluster, their relations to one another, and their relationship to your project and the development of your argument as a whole.

For each text, include:

1. A complete MLA-style citation.
2. A brief description of the kind of source it is (scholarly article written for a highly specialized audience? general overview from a magazine? private or highly personalized narrative? tale, film, or image?). This kind of evaluation is particularly important for the primary sources on which you will be relying heavily; it may take some additional research to answer this question.

3. For primary sources, a brief description. For secondary sources, a brief summary of the argument and the types of sources it uses.
4. The relationship of this source to the others you are using (similar perspective? radically different approach? Personal essay as opposed to tale as opposed to psychological study as opposed to literary criticism?).
5. The role this source will play in your intellectual preparation for and writing of this essay (for example, key evidence to support your central claim about *Cinderella*? counter-evidence that will form the basis of a counter-argument that you plan to refute? general background? supporting evidence but not absolutely central?).

ESSAY #3 COVER LETTERS

At this point in the semester, you all know the function of a cover letter: to reflect on your writing process and to articulate your thesis; to evaluate your written product and to ask for the specific types of feedback that you think will be most useful.

Be sure to include cover letters for both the draft and revision of Essay #3. In addition to reflecting your writing process, please do tell me about your research process as well. How did writing and research interact as you developed and revised your argument?

Conflicting Advice: Infant Death and Maternal Prescriptions

Abstract

Dara Rossman Regaignon
Pomona College

“[W]hen children are cross and fretful and will not sleep, Ayahs are in the habit of secretly giving them opium to make them repose; this is done very frequently, and is productive of very bad consequences; as long as they are undiscovered they continue the practice, till at last the child’s constitution is undermined. I believe many children die from this cause, while the parent and doctor are alike incapable of assigning any satisfactory reason upon the subject, being ignorant of this fact.”

Domestic Guide to Mothers in India (1848)

“A wet nurse must never be allowed to dose her little charge with Godfrey’s Cordial, with Dalby’s Carminative, with Syrup of Poppies, or with medicine of any kind whatever. Let her thoroughly understand this; and let there be no mistake in the matter. Do not, for one moment, allow your baby’s health to be tampered and trifled with. A baby’s health is too precious to be doctored by an ignorant person.”

Pye Henry Chavasse, *Advice to Mothers* (1866)

Warnings such as these abound—one might even say structure—Victorian domestic advice literature. Aimed primarily at middle-class mothers, and often authored by physicians, this literature repetitively invokes the spectre of infant-death: In the midst of a chapter on teething, as an addendum to a discussion of mid-wives, or as part of a section on medicines, warnings that hired servants dope babies erupt out of the text. The mothers reading these books are, apparently, powerless to stop them; while they are warned of the dangers and told to be vigilant (as above), it seems that their protection is only ever anxious and partial. If infant-death was one of the basic facts of Victorian parenthood (see Anthony S. Wohl, *Endangered Lives: Public Health in Victorian Britain*), warnings of infant-doping turn a statistical probability into an individualized tragedy that could have been prevented.

In *Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud*, Carolyn Dever has argued persuasively that the Victorian ideal of the selfless, nurturing, angelic mother could only be imagined in the absence of physical (or at least narrative) mothers. The maternal return, she contends, functions in novelistic and psychoanalytic narrative as a moment when authors can subvert or trouble that ideal (31-34). But by assuming a readership of mothers who supervise their children’s care but don’t tend them directly, domestic advice literature collapses the poles between maternal absence and presence; in doing so, it imagines mothers who are always a bit lost, confused, and perplexed—the very mothers, in fact, that it claims to make obsolete with its expert advice.

In studies of nineteenth-century literature, advice books typically appear as a kind of abject other to novels: they provide the ideological background against which we read the putatively more complex interventions of fictional narratives. It is my contention in this essay that the familial and particularly maternal subjects who emerge out of Victorian advice literature are as unstable and ideologically fraught as the representations in the period’s novels. To this end, I situate mid-century British and colonial advice texts in the context of the period’s domestic fiction, examining in particular how the spectre of infant death invokes a mother who at once saves and kills.

But What Difference Can It Make? A Small-Scale Study of Course-Based Peer Tutoring

Dara Rossman Regaignon

Pomona College

dara.regaignon@pomona.edu

Candace Spigelman and Laurie Grobman have recently pointed out that “WAC tutors . . . play an increasingly important role in WAC pedagogy” (5). Similarly, Margot Soven argues that “peer tutoring” has become “the new mainstay of many WAC programs” (200) in the twenty-first century. If this is the case, then it is an important moment to assess the effectiveness of such programs. If WAC is likely to rely increasingly on course-based peer tutoring in the near future, then the time is ripe to study how and why it works. Why should faculty like the possibility? Why should higher administrations fund it?

Pomona College provides an ideal site for such research. For the first time in its history, Pomona will run three “Writing Fellows Courses” this spring. While these courses follow a common format (students submit drafts of their papers to dedicated Writing Fellows for feedback before turning revised versions in to the professors to be graded), because this is the beginning of the program, this spring we’re offering two additional courses with the same sequence of assignments *but without dedicated Writing Fellows*. As a result, we can examine time-sequenced portfolios of student writing in order to understand what kind of difference the integration of peer tutors into the courses has made.

Our findings will help us to make a case for the expansion of the program; we hope that they will enable WPAs at other institutions to make similar arguments. In addition, the Pomona study of course-based peer tutoring provides an opportunity for a critical re-examination of how and why – and *whether* – this approach to WAC works.

Works Cited

Soven, Margot. “Curriculum-Based Peer Tutoring and WAC.” *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs*. Ed. Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, and Christopher Thaiss. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2001. 200-232.

Spigelman, Candace and Laurie Grobman. *On Location: Theory and Practice in Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2005.

Writing and ID1: The Pomona College First-Year Seminar in Critical Inquiry

The goal of ID1 is to prepare first-year students to participate fully and successfully in the intellectual community that is Pomona College, becoming more active participants in their own learning by becoming more critical thinkers, readers, and writers. By the end of ID1, students should regard writing as a central component of and vehicle for this intellectual community and should have learned strategies for generating, supporting, and sharing their ideas within a community of scholars.*

Writing as Critical Inquiry

Students should understand writing as a form of critical thinking rather than merely the achievement of sentence-level correctness, and should regard learning to write well as a life-long process, not the accomplishment of a single semester or even an entire undergraduate career.

ID1 therefore seeks to teach student writers to:

- **Engage with the work of others.** Academic inquiry not only interprets (in the broadest sense of the term) texts, images, and data but also identifies and engages with what others have written about that subject.
- **Articulate arguments of their own.** Through such engagement, writers develop and articulate original positions that emerge from their engagement with the primary sources or data (of whatever form) *and* the scholarly literature on the subject.
- **Present that argument in a sustained and persuasive manner to a specific imagined audience.** Academic writers develop an awareness of the intellectual concerns and conventions of their fields. These include assumptions about what make interesting intellectual questions and what counts as effective support for an argument, as well as conventions of acknowledgement, citation, document design, and so forth.

Writing as Process

The process of developing and presenting an insightful argument in dialogue with sources, while attending to disciplinary (or inter-disciplinary) expectations, usually involves a recursive process of drafting, revising, and getting feedback from a variety of readers.

ID1 gives student writers practice in this process by building the following activities into all sections:

- **Researching.** Students read the course texts critically, and are expected to select and develop questions and arguments in dialogue with those texts. In addition, all sections of ID1 include some instruction in library research, including the evaluation of sources.
- **Giving and Receiving Feedback.** Academic writers habitually share works-in-progress with colleagues in order to reconsider and develop their arguments. Students learn how to become better critical readers of their own prose by responding to one another in seminar discussions, classroom workshops, and draft exchanges.
- **Revising.** Students are asked to re-think their works-in-progress in ways that go beyond simply editing individual sentences to extend, develop, and modify their arguments and how they present, support, and develop them.
- **Editing.** Students are expected to turn in work that has been polished for clarity and proofread for correctness; that documents sources appropriately and correctly for the discipline in question and that makes effective use of visual design.

* Dara Rossman Regaignon, Director of College Writing, drafted these guidelines in 2006. This document is informed by the following sources: "Writing and 'Critical Inquiry,'" a document that grew out of the Pomona College faculty's conversations about the place of writing in the liberal arts curriculum between the mid-1980s and 2006; the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition"; and the Outcomes Statements (or comparable statements of "goals" for first-year writing seminars) from the John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines at Cornell University; the University Writing Program at Duke University; and the Princeton Writing Program. A draft was then circulated to the groups of faculty teaching ID1 in 2005 and 2006 for feedback and revision.