

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

Order Number 9510986

**Being present in language: A comparison of therapy and journal
structures with implications for the teaching of writing**

Whitney, Anne Rothman, Ph.D.

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1994

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PREVIEW

BEING PRESENT IN LANGUAGE:
A COMPARISON OF THERAPY AND JOURNAL STRUCTURES
WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TEACHING OF WRITING

by

Anne R. Whitney

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: English

Under the Supervision of Professor Robert Brooke

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 1994

DISSERTATION TITLE

Being Present in Language: A Comparison of Therapy and Journal

Structures with Implications for the Teaching of Writing

BY

Anne R. Whitney

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

Robert E Brooke 21 Sept. 1994
Signature

Robert Brooke
Typed Name

Katherine J. Ronald 21 September 1994
Signature

Katherine J. Ronald
Typed Name

Barbara J. DiBernard September 21, 1994
Signature

Barbara J. DiBernard
Typed Name

Larry Andrews 21 Sept 94
Signature

Larry Andrews
Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name



GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

BEING PRESENT IN LANGUAGE:
A COMPARISON OF THERAPY AND JOURNAL STRUCTURES
WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TEACHING OF WRITING

Anne R. Whitney, PhD
University of Nebraska, 1994

Advisor: Robert Brooke

This theoretical study explores connections between therapy and personal journals--both structures that facilitate personal growth through the integration of thought and feeling. Through therapy theory and practice, as described by D.W. Winnicott, Carl Jung, Carl Rogers, Robert Kegan, Karen Horney, Mary Watkins, and others, and through reference to my own journals and journaling experience, it describes three characteristics of journals and therapy essential to such growth: holding, presentness, and reflective language. Further, it suggests how these three concepts pertain to the teaching of writing and interrogates the concept of integration in a consideration of classroom structure.

Holding, based on the originary relationship of mother and infant described by D.W. Winnicott, characterizes a nurturing context that supports the therapy client or journal writer in a consistent, responsive, and accepting way. In mirroring the individual, this context allows him or her to trust that their feeling self is accepted and that they can express that self in language. Holding is, thus, foundational to all later development. Presentness, or openness to feeling in the present moment, allows the therapy client or journal writer, who is already engaged in a writing process of story

telling, re-telling, revising, and naming, to further connect or engage with an "other," be it with other selves or parts of the self or with the world outside the self. Such feeling may occur in intense moments of felt connection or in a more ongoing way through the verbal expression of feeling statements. In either case, present feeling stimulates and energizes the drive for new meaning necessitated by changing contexts. Thus, feeling contributes to the creation of new form that renders meaning. Without language to access that feeling, however, experience remains unconscious. Reflective language, in one's "own words," that takes account of feeling and turns back upon the self engaged in a primary creative process like writing to reflect on that self and the engagement is inherently integrative and the means to deep learning and greater self knowledge.

PREVIEW

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Support for my thinking and writing has come from many places. I especially want to express my gratitude to Robert Brooke and Kate Ronald whose constancy and responsiveness throughout my doctoral program gave me the sense of security I needed to do this work. Robert's initial and continuing belief in me and my ability to teach and write and Kate's trust in my work in the writing center helped me to believe in myself and gave me the freedom to explore what that might mean in my work. Their faith and generosity will stay with me and challenge me to extend my faith to those I might teach in the future.

My friends have been a continuing source of engagement for me. Sim Chiang showed me it could be done by doing it first and sharing the struggle. Judy Levin continues to provide the blessed opportunities for reflection that are so important to my thinking and being. Rene Meaker teaches me even as she makes me laugh and listens to me cry. Year after year, Lynda Tredway follows both my work and family life in a knowing way that helps me hold the two together. Each of these women has shown me how friends, in Sim's words, "color our lives" in gorgeous shades.

My family, including my husband Scott, my daughter Sarah, and my son Lewis, have supported me with kind words when I needed them, silence when "I have to think," patience when I had little to give in return, and a sense of sturdy connection throughout. May the four of us continue to hold each other.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Writing as a Way of Knowing.	1
Chapter One: Holding: The Ecology of Human Systems	23
Chapter Two: "Live Where You Live": The Role of Presentness in Meaning Making	59
Chapter Three: Feeling into Words: The Language of Reflection	90
Chapter Four: The Dream of Integration and the Reality of Structure	118
Appendix	153
Works Cited	190

PREVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Writing as a Way of Knowing

This study began with an interest in my own journal writing--a practice I had begun and dropped shortly after college and returned to only during brief difficult periods thereafter. However, with my entry in 1988 into a doctoral program as a student and teacher, while at the same time continuing to carry out significant parenting and homemaking responsibilities, I took up journaling with renewed passion. Why, I wondered, did my journals help me so much to see and to give words and meaning to my experience? Furthermore, why was doing this so satisfying? For the first time in my life, I claimed problems and struggles I had resisted even noticing in the past. For the first time, I was able to realize I wanted things for myself that I never admitted wanting before. For the first time, I felt I was changing and understanding what I had only before observed from a distance. I came to see this as a process of personal growth, and it seemed to me that writing played a major role in that process.

At the same time, I was aware that journaling was often compared to therapy, not only by teachers, but also by students. Based on my own experience of journaling and my interest in and exposure to therapy, I could see why. Both journaling and therapy, including art therapy which I turned to because of its obvious emphasis on the arts, were characterized by a sense of safety, acceptance, and response in the structure of each, by an engagement in the present in a primary process like art making or story telling, as well as by reflection on the present and past, and by what seemed like authentic or "real" talk, used in an attempt to make explicit what had previously not been named. I came to group these characteristics into three categories descriptive of ideal structures that enable

individuals to change and grow: holding, presentness, and reflective language.

Most notable to me in this growth process is the significant role of reflective or so-called "personal" language. The inclusion of feelings and sense of self, as expressed through use of the personal pronoun *I*, sets this language apart from other kinds of talk. In other words, its usefulness to learners and learning seems to be due, in large part, to its personal nature. But, equally important is the relation between the language and the context in which it is generated; that is, the talk cannot be separated from its secure environment with the freedom to engage the feeling and thinking self in the present. It is within this structure that the therapy client practices telling her stories to herself or others and also observes herself closely, reflecting on the experience and the stories, and gradually reframes her sense of the experience and of herself. Likewise, within the safe structure of the journal, recording what happened, what she did or said and thought and felt in response to life around her, the writer re-sees her experience and herself. The results of such practice within therapy and journal contexts clarifies for me not only what deep personal learning is, but also the significance of reflective language used within a particular context in order for that learning and, thus, development, to occur. For this reason, I have emphasized and attempted to elaborate these contextual features of holding and presentness in some detail.

Yet it is the language brought to bear on experience that makes such learning and growth possible. One reason this is so is because putting experience into words, the kind of personal narrative that reflection includes, requires the writer to differentiate from the self she was at the time of the experience and the self she is now, and, thus, reenforces a separation of selves. Once differentiated, that self is more likely to be modified.

Developmental theorist and therapist Mary Watkins, in Invisible Guests: The Development of Imaginal Dialogues, describes the "narrator" self that her clients develop as she encourages them to allow and release the many voices or selves within; a tolerant

and listening self thus emerges (125). Such a self or meta-self must hear, sort out, value, sanction, and permit the other voices and selves to exist and function, or not. Yet whether the concept of self is constructed as a metasef (Watkins), a narrative function (Watkins, Polonoff in Bruner), a self in relation, as some feminists have described (Jean Baker Miller 1986), an individuated self (Woodman, Rogers, Maslow), or as some combination (Kegan), is less critical to this study than is the way any construct addresses the question of human growth.

Though it alters the meaning somewhat to say, as many humanist therapists have, that development is through individuation--through becoming *more* one's self--rather than through establishing a balance or new relation among several diverse interior selves, the implication within any of these constructs is that a human being *can* significantly change and develop and that this change involves modifying and clarifying the sense of self that he or she has. In this text I refer to this process variously as individuation, self development, or personal growth, and consider it to come about through a complex integrative process. What I mean to describe is a development directed towards articulating a new or different self. In humanist terms, this self is one that has more fully integrated conflicting sides or voices of the self into a new relation and also has integrated past into present and feeling into thinking. Although the humanist construct of self is a unitary one while Watkins's construct is multiple, the two emerge as similar with Watkins's description of the new Self as more complex, visible, sensitive to subtlety, and tolerant. Moreover, with her depiction of the "narrator" role and its capacity to hear and balance the other inner characters or selves, this role takes on the stature of a meta-self that is very like the unitary humanist self. So, too, with Robert Kegan's "evolving" self, an ever changing construct that emerges from past selves; it is a self that "is not its duties, roles, or institutions, but the 'haver' of them, which having is regulated by the recognition of one's commonality or interdependence with others" (239). Like some

current feminist models, his model of development posits a self that is both integrated *and* differentiated, autonomous *and* interdependent (108-9) as a corrective to developmental frameworks that, he argues, define growth in terms of "differentiation, separation, increasing autonomy, and lose sight of the fact that adaptation is equally about integration, attachment, inclusion" (108). In this respect, his concept of the evolving self that at one time (or with regard to one issue) must differentiate and at another must integrate reflects an acknowledgment of both the complexity of individual identity and its interdependence with the surrounding culture and community. It also reflects the degree to which change and a human being's response to change are basic to most therapy.

It is not surprising to find that language and, therefore, writing can influence such change by bringing a self to visibility and integrating conflicting voices into a new relation to one another. Freud's "talking cure" signals a link between language and change, Lacanian theory further emphasizes the extent to which language forms the individual, and Piaget and Vygotsky both consider language to be the measure of development. This study explores that link between language and development through a comparison of the structures of therapy and personal journaling, attempting to articulate the most fundamental parallels between these structures and thereby to suggest how other structures, like classrooms, might also facilitate deep learning. Such learning requires articulating the self through a dialogic process--one that elicits a particular self. Such individuation, rather than socialization, is reenforced by Vygotsky, who considers it to be the goal of development and makes explicit connections between it and language use in the maturing child. However, despite Vygotsky's observation of the role of idiosyncratic language in human development, his work does not explore the role of this private language in the ongoing adult development of the individual. In a sense this project asks, "So what if human beings possess a private language or shorthand?" In comparing the structures of therapy and personal journaling, it attempts to highlight and define those

features that contribute to what I consider to be deep learning, because it is both experiential or tacit and also conscious. It is a kind of learning that requires experiencing one's feelings and thoughts in the present in engagement or connection with self and/or other and also reflecting on that experiencing, in words. Through this process, only possible within an environment that is accepting and constant, one participates in what is essentially a dialogic relation of self and world that eventually leads to change in thoughts and even in one's self concept. It is a process that journaling and therapy facilitate because they are structures that allow and encourage the use of personal language or one's "own words."

The change or growth that therapists uniformly describe is facilitated through the telling, retelling, and revising of our life stories. Yet, if for whatever reasons we have not "written" these stories, we have missed opportunities to ascertain the meanings of those lived experiences. Such has been the case for women and other marginalized peoples especially, who until relatively recently have not been encouraged to tell their stories. Even now, many women keep the silences surrounding what Madeleine Grumet refers to as their "reproductive histories" (xvii), partly because these are filled with pain and, possibly, with difficult implications for the lives they currently lead. As therapy also makes clear, however, human beings both male and female possess the psychic means to maintain an emotional status quo; one of these is our fear of chaos. According to Jungian therapist Marion Woodman, in order to do the individuating necessary to recognize one's self, one must attend to the unconscious and open up to the chaos within: "All hell starts to break loose inside, and we wonder what's the point of dredging up all this stuff" (Virgin 22). In addition to this internal resistance to change and chaos, beginning as children and continuing into adulthood, human beings are discouraged from any overt sign of private language. As Mary Watkins explains, private speech not only represents a "breach of our agreement to pretend to be listening to actual others" as Erving Goffman

claims, but also represents a "breach with a unitary concept of the self that relies on a stable identity and does not look closely at shifts of mood, tone, or attitude that might, if examined, suggest a multiplicity of the self" (43). Likewise, private writing has not been highly valued by the academy, including the discipline of composition theory, except as a tool to generate ideas leading to a better and more public final product.¹

Historically, women's private diaries and journals and, more recently, therapy have provided men and women with opportunities for telling their stories--that is, for elaborating their more private language and entering a process of dialogue with themselves or others. As mentioned above, in prioritizing a reflective I-language that leads to individuation, these structures reenforce development. At the same time, because of the primacy of subjectivity in such contexts as private journals and therapy sessions, they argue for a retheorizing of the nature of thought. Though such work is not within the scope of this project, the centrality of a necessary balance of thought and feeling in any meaning making activity is one of its important themes: How am I to arrive at the meaning or significance of a life event if I do not both have the feelings associated with the experience and also *take account* of them? Conversely, how am I to arrive at a new emotional response to an event if I cannot reframe or reconceive it? Both activities--having and taking account--are central to personal growth and change because both are necessary to the integration that must occur. This study suggests how this process of integrating thought and feeling might occur and how that is necessarily part of generating new form and meaning. It emphasizes the nurturing environment that is necessary for a dialogic process to occur (Chapter One), the crucial role of feeling in meaning making (Chapter Two), and the power of reflective language in a holding context to reify what we know experientially (Chapter Three).

Despite my emphasis throughout this text upon the individual and his or her development, everything that I have written here also depends on my knowing and

believing that human beings are social and similar--that my life experience as a white, middle-class woman, married with children, is similar to that of other women of my circumstance and location--and that these common real-life contexts have shaped me and others in similar ways. Adrienne Rich expresses her strong sense of commonality with other women in her book Of Woman Born. She writes, "Only in shedding the illusion of my uniqueness could I hope, as a woman, to have any authentic life at all" (40). Yet, somewhat paradoxically, she weaves her own story throughout that text. Her approach represents a consummately feminist one that acknowledges a woman's history and culture and the power of communal knowledge and support at the same time it disrupts established dichotomies, like personal and public, or thought and feeling, that have excluded women and women's experience. For myself, as for many other women, it is because I am so strongly and continuously influenced by the socio-cultural contexts of the "outside" patriarchal world that I must be conscious of and interrogate my "inner" world. In other words, it is because these worlds are inextricably connected that I must pay attention to and draw out the quieter one I call myself. As Linda Anderson explains, women's autobiographical writing is self creation: "In a sense women's autobiography is both a reaching towards the possibility of saying 'I' and towards a form in which to say it. Writing is a quest, a process" (65). So, too, have my journals and other life writing reached "towards the possibility of saying 'I.'"

The project of self creation, or of becoming more myself--a project I now consider among the most important tasks of adulthood--has been all the more difficult for being devalued and misunderstood by the society at large. At least this is so in the cultures I have inhabited, with the exception of the doctoral level of education. Indeed, much of the challenge of this educational level for me has been its emphasis on narrow or intense focus and unique voice--both characteristics my midwestern, middle-class, white culture has always discouraged, especially for women. So, doing what has been

necessary for success in graduate school has motivated me toward an individuation I might not have otherwise sought. It could be, too, that the position of college educator, which graduate education directs me toward, requires greater self confidence and self knowledge than many other walks of life. Nevertheless, I suspect my experience is not so unusual; as contemporary people face myriad life changes, they must frequently encounter feedback from other people, events, and institutions that forces them to change themselves. What they are called upon to do is to adapt to change through integrating past and present ways of being and thinking into new concepts and selves that are more meaningful and satisfying, or so therapy suggests.

In taking seriously the parallels between personal writing and therapy, this text also contributes to a dialogue about the role and place of feeling in classrooms. Although many writing teachers exclude personal or life writing from their classroom agendas, those of us who include it often struggle with questions about our roles as respondents to this writing. One of our roles, as Wendy Bishop points out, is that of writer who, like the student/writer, faces similar life challenges. Both teachers and students deserve attention as "people undergoing, and resisting. . . changes" (507), says Bishop. What she suggests is that teachers need to understand themselves better, so as to better understand their own responses to students and classrooms, and that if we do not, we participate unknowingly and perhaps destructively in recreating our students according to our own designs: "We need to examine teaching as a constitutive process, consider more deeply the idea of the teacher as the Subject Supposed to Know, and continue to explore the many complicated issues of gender, transference, and counter-transference in the writing classroom" (511). Just as my exploration of the parallels between therapy and personal writing gives me a clearer sense of the similarities between the two, it also clarifies the differences. Our roles as teachers, rather than therapists, direct us to provide an environment in which reflective talk and writing can occur, to encourage students to

engage with the writing and, thus, with their own lives, and to require reflective writing about that process and engagement. Although the more detailed elaboration of our roles as teachers grows out of our unique locations within institutions and peer communities and derives from our backgrounds, personalities, and motivations, this text suggests that teachers' reflective practices are an important part of that process of defining our roles and relations to students and learning.

The profession of therapy has historically been more inclined to use writing than has the profession of writing been inclined to use or even learn about therapy. According to compositionist Alice Brand, whose work has consistently focused on emotion, humanist therapy has, since Freud, expressed belief in the power of the arts to heal. Freud himself pointed to the "unexplored potential of writing for psychological wellness" insofar as he believed poetry and psychoanalysis "shared the unconscious and preconscious materials of dreams and fantasies," performed self-analysis through his own writing, and corresponded with patients (*Therapy* 8). A noteworthy study by D.J. Farber, mentioned in Brand's book, delineated the following advantages of writing: slowing down of the "process of evaluating details," enabling more review by therapist and client, "heightened sense of immediacy and intimacy between therapist and patient; by helping patients name their feelings, analysts helped patients transform them into thought" (14). Another relevant study by S. Nichols, summarized by Brand, traced a relationship between a personal journal and psychotherapy that included these benefits of journaling: "increased self-awareness and self-acceptance, a facilitation of affective expression, an opportunity for friendship with oneself, and an available creative outlet " (*Therapy* 22). As Brand points out, educators are not necessarily in agreement either with the view of writing as therapeutic or with the idea of their being responsible for such growth.

Not that our discipline has ignored feelings and their connection to writing, but we have had difficulty knowing *how* to account for them. Brand's own focus has more

often been on the writing process and how it is influenced by a writer's feelings than on writers and the effects of writing on them. Her 1980 book entitled Therapy in Writing is an exception, however. In this "observational" study of eight junior high students, Brand claims that for two of the young women, Ellen and Margaret, personal writing "fostered new confidences and new competencies" and that both girls "exercised greater self-determination" (157). Her study suggests that there were "times when the writing behaved therapeutically [and] times when it simply seemed to report other therapeutic activities" (195). In summary, Brand concedes that "we have no devices as yet by which we can measure even crudely the therapeutic play between person and process. Both cause and effect, the writing proceeded hand in hand with psychological growth, reflected and enhanced it, deepened and extended it, and often quickened the process" (196). Writing was apparently the means by which these two young women became more fluent, expressive, and confident in some respects; they opened up, took more risks, and allowed themselves more freedom.

Yet, writing didn't work this way for some students who refused to get involved. Brand's results point to what I call "readiness": Some students were ready and willing, while others were not. Even personal writing cannot be therapeutic where involvement is missing. Like therapy, it cannot bring about change or insight or growth if the writer doesn't participate and refuses responsibility or engagement. A student's refusal does not necessarily represent rebellion or ignorance, however; like all people, students are at varying places in terms of their readiness to change, and it is not up to teachers to decide for them or to know what is within their capability. Furthermore, just as writing cannot be useful where the learner chooses otherwise, its value and the changes cannot quite be captured by the writing itself or by someone outside of the process. The chapters that follow, in revealing how personal writing can work by showing how it worked for me, address this inability of others besides the writer to capture the subjective experience of

writing. In addition, describing my own experience through this text is consistent with my intent to express the subjective nature and individual path of learning--the kind of learning that entails consciousness of one's feeling self.

Besides Brand and Bishop, others in composition have traced connections between psychology and rhetoric. James S. and Tita French Baumlín in their exploration of the ancient perception of rhetoric as healing, point out that "Platonic dialogue is inherently therapeutic, and structured as a psychotherapy: a healing through language" (247). Further implicating psychology and healing with language, they write, "It is thus a simultaneously Freudian and Aristotelian insight that we can heal emotion by altering our perceptions and beliefs, that language does heal, and that the means of healing is a change of mind" (250). Outside of our own field, of course, many popular psychologists and writers have advocated writing for its personal growth potential. These include Ira Progoff and his "intensive journal," Christina Baldwin in One to One: Self Understanding through Journal Writing, Elaine Farris Hughes in Writing from the Inner Self, and Kathleen Adams in Journal to the Self, among many others. Christina Baldwin expresses the goals of journaling that are generally expressed in these texts: "As we become aware, we can decide whether or not we want a certain belief to continue driving us, and what new or modified beliefs will allow us to have the kind of life we desire. This examination is the essence of introspective writing" (14). Academic theorists and popular writers are thus consistent in their understanding that the healing power of language cannot be reduced to catharsis or a simple sensation of relief at having "gotten it out." We may indeed feel better after telling our troubles to a friend or writing out what's on our minds, but what happens when we do this writing or talking on even one occasion includes many more complex behaviors than a simple objective recounting. Even disregarding the responsiveness (or lack of it) in a listener, the way our own language participates in that healing is a matter of naming, categorizing, meaning making, and of reconceiving or

reframing experience and even identity in accordance with this ongoing process.

Certainly *outside* of education, the personal journal, rather than more public writing such as autobiography or essay, has been most closely associated with personal growth. Within education, however, it has also come to be associated with learning, as a unique teaching/learning tool. Two texts are particularly noteworthy for making the concept of journals accessible to educators: Dialogue Journal Communication: Classroom, Linguistic, Social and Cognitive Views and The Journal Book. The former, a collaborative text, which includes teacher Leslee Reed's very individualized written responses to students, reflects a recognition of the idiosyncratic nature of learning as well as of the centrality of self knowledge and personal development to learning in general. Its contribution is to illustrate the dynamic between self knowledge and all learning and to articulate how dialogue within a relationship promotes such learning. Author Jana Staton writes, "Two major human needs are accomplished for both student and teacher by the ongoing dialogue: the need to construct an intersubjective understanding of the world and the need to acquire new knowledge about oneself. . . . Only within the context of this mutual understanding can new information be sought and incorporated" (312). Toby Fulwiler's Journal Book illustrates a range of classroom and across-the-curriculum uses of course journals and, in his introduction, points to a long list of positive functions of "good" journals. The book is intended to offer a sampling of uses of and ideas about course journals and it does that. Also included in the book are NCTE's "Guidelines for Using Journals in School Settings." Though these guidelines are generally useful, they express a wariness of the personal material journals might elicit (5).

Perhaps in an attempt to exclude the personal, course journals have come to be highly defined by some educators. Thus, journals may not necessarily represent the kind of personal reflective writing that allows students to explore or "process" in their own words their own experience and histories. Conversely, any other kind of so-called

personal or life writing, such as autobiography, personal essay, and freewriting, *can* be dialogic, on-going, reflective, and reflexive and, thus, a means to process one's experiences and stories. Despite the sometimes narrow defining of journals by teachers, however, journals are still generally understood to be what Natalie Goldberg calls "first thoughts" (Bones 8), and even if written within a classroom context, they are considered to be writing that reflects personal knowledge more than scholarly research. Because my own experience of personal writing has largely been through personal journaling, done for myself alone, I have had this kind of writing in mind when comparing journals to therapy, unless otherwise specifically noted in the text. This study adds my voice to the voices of compositionists Ken Autrey and Cinthia Gannet who have called for a retheorizing of the journal that would address its marginalized and gendered history and associations. My attempt to complicate such writing and revalue it according to its structure and, thus, its potential for individual learning is not intended as an argument for its instrumentality, as a means to other ends. When we trivialize journaling as merely a tool for invention and pre-writing, we ignore its value as a life practice, both for its own sake and as part of a lifelong process of learning directed towards self knowledge--a self knowledge that rests on connection between self and world.

Writing and learning have been closely linked by numerous composition theorists, including Donald Murray, Ann Berthoff, and Janet Emig. Murray has consistently described writing as a means to self discovery. In Write to Learn he writes, "Pay close attention to your own self, learn from your own learning" (ix), and his own drafts and pre-writing serve as models of a writer writing for an audience and also reflecting on his own history and on the writing. Janet Emig investigated the theoretical foundations of writing and thought in her 1983 collection entitled The Web of Meaning, which summarized ideas across disciplines from such thinkers as Thomas Kuhn, Howard Gruber, and Michael Polanyi. These theorists provide important grounding for my own

understanding of knowledge as both personal and social and of thought as potentially transformative of self. She quotes Howard Gruber on the latter: "'When we think new thoughts we really are changing our relations with the world around us, including our social moorings'" (Emig 148). However, Janet Emig's work on writing as learning emphasizes learning in general, rather than the kind of learning that is only possible with the inclusion and consciousness of feeling--what I have variously referred to throughout this text as consciousness or deep learning.

So, too, with Berthoff's seminal work on the writing process in Making of Meaning, in which she sees forming as the product of imagination (64-7) and defines composing as a "mode of learning" and "a matter of forming structures" (19). Berthoff's concepts are so foundational as to hold true for all thinking and forming; that is, because deep personal learning *is* learning, it partakes of the general principles Berthoff articulates. However, the fact that my understanding is derived from research into therapy theory and practice means that the learning process I have investigated is oriented towards this more particular kind of knowledge, self knowledge. Through reclaiming of the imagination and elaborating the relation between the concepts of forming and meaning making, Berthoff makes way for emotion and, thus, for the kind of learning I am describing; but her conception of the affective domain as necessarily one with the cognitive exempts her from articulating an explicit role for affect and from exploring how it might enter into and influence form and thought. In my understanding, to see composing as a creative act, as Berthoff does, means to see it as a uniquely individual combination of emotion as well as thought (word)--one that we attempt to articulate as we write from within a particular context. Though I share with Berthoff the desire to see thought and feeling conceptually reunited, I have accepted the separation of these domains and redefined their union as reflection. In other words, my definition of "reflection" explicitly includes emotion, while my definition of thought does not.