

ACCUTE Newsletter

September 1992

Department of English ♦ University of Guelph ♦ Guelph, ON N1G 2W1 ♦ (519) 824-4120, x3268 ♦ Fax: (519) 837-1315
President: Michael Keefer ♦ Secretary/Treasurer: Ann Wilson ♦ Executive Assistant: Dorothy Hadfield

Published by the Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English
Publication of this Newsletter is supported by funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

ISSN 1187-8282

Calling All Members

It's the time of year again to be preparing papers and proposals for presentation at the next ACCUTE conference. Remember, the success of ACCUTE 1993 depends on the quality and originality of our members' presentations. See **page 9** for submission guidelines and descriptions of special interest sessions.

Inside this issue:

Thinking About the Profession:

More Thoughts on "Professional Skills" 2
by Sheila Delany, SFU

The 1992 CACE/ACCUTE Workload Survey:

A Preliminary Report 2
by Michael Keefer, Guelph

Conference 1993: May 30-June 2 9

Call for Papers
Suggestions for Special Sessions

Calls for Papers / Conferences 11

President's Column 13

News of Members 14

1993 Membership Form 15

ACCUTE Office Hours

You can reach the new ACCUTE office at
(519) 824-4120, ext. 3268.

The phone line will be staffed **Monday and Thursday, 1-3 p.m. (EST)**. If you call and no one is in the office, please leave a message on the machine. Or, send us a fax any time at (519) 837-1315.

Thinking About the Profession

More Thoughts on "Professional Skills"

Sheila Delany, SFU

In reply to Linda Hutcheon's letter in the last Bulletin: It was dismaying to see the myth of faculty self-governance resurrected, and then deployed in the service of advice that could be disastrous for young women scholars.

Ours must be one of few lines of work in which management has so successfully managed to make employees perform management tasks — and like it. In fact we do not make decisions: we make recommendations, any of which can be denied by our employers. Nor do we control (though to be sure, we can, by lobbying, sometimes affect) our conditions of work: these are ultimately controlled by our employer and by government.

For women, Hutcheon's "good citizenship" advice is more complicated than for men. While I agree completely with her stress on the need for mentoring and counselling, I want to distinguish these functions from administrative (i.e. managerial) work. The dilemma for young women academics is whether to bring a female viewpoint onto as many committees as possible (and risk one's work), or to be as productive as possible (and forego committees). But a few women academics simply cannot substitute for many: the solution lies in hiring, and meanwhile the tactic of increasing female administrative authority may well backfire, at least for younger women. Anyone who has served on an adjudication committee must be aware of the typical female profile: limited publications, overwhelming service. There are advantages to choosing writing over service in one's starting years. It is much harder to deny tenure to a well-published candidate than to one with a lot of service, and a book gives a better basis for an appeal. Equally important, one's personal integrity, fulfillment and self-respect, as well as

command of one's field, will benefit much more from writing than from committee work.

I would recommend the study, *Women in Academe* (1988) by Nadia Aisenberg, whose conclusions are drawn from in-depth interviews with many employed and unemployed women academics. I close with her advice:

Learn to say no. (59)

For academic women ... a highly specific word of crucial advice: Publish. ... Although [publishing] will not guarantee a successful march to tenure, lack of it will almost surely preclude its achievement. ... Do not allow your time to be consumed meaninglessly. (147-48)

The 1992 CACE/ACCUTE Workload Survey: A Preliminary Report

Michael Keefer, Guelph

1. Responding to hard times

University and college administrators seem no less fond of anecdotes and scandalous gossip than the rest of us are. Yet whenever a conversation in which they are involved shifts to fiscal matters, and the possibility of fresh expenditures appears on the horizon, they display an unhappy tendency to lapse into Gradgrindism. Any attempt to persuade them, on the basis of merely anecdotal evidence, that the graminivorous bipeds whom they have hired to drub into the minds of hapless students the principles of rhetoric, literary knowledge, and critical thinking are grievously overworked—and that the English Departments where these nags and pacers are stabled may be correspondingly underfunded—can be guaranteed to run aground on the flinty reef of a Demand for Hard Facts.

In 1991, accordingly, in response to a widespread perception among Canadian college and university teachers of English that those of us who are fortunate enough to have full-time employment (and those who are working in part-time or sessional positions as well) have been called upon in recent years to teach more students, to put in longer hours, and on balance to work harder than ever before, the ACCUTE Committee for Professional Concerns, seconded by the Executive of ACCUTE, decided that it would be worth the effort to assemble some data on the subject. With the active co-operation of the Canadian Association of Chairs of English (CACE), two parallel questionnaires were prepared. This work was carried out in close collaboration by Shirley Neuman and by Connie Rooke (who are now the past presidents, respectively, of ACCUTE and of CACE), and by Beth Popham of Trent University and the Committee for Professional Concerns which she chairs.

One questionnaire was sent to the chairs of 61 departments of English in universities and university colleges; of these 39 (or 64%) responded. The other was sent to all members of ACCUTE, of whom 271 (or 25.5%) responded. Although the latter response rate may seem disappointingly low, it should be remarked that 36% of those ACCUTE members who hold full-time academic positions returned their questionnaires. The much lower rate of response among the 35% of our members who are graduate students, underemployed, or retired can be ascribed to a perception on their part that many or most of the questions were not applicable to their situations. It is no doubt significant that 81% of our respondents from universities and 89% of our respondents from colleges hold tenured or tenure-track positions.

What follows is no more than a preliminary account of the results of the CACE/ACCUTE Workload Survey. For a more complete report, we will have to wait until the Committee for Professional Concerns has had time to analyze

the data (and, in certain places, to verify the data entry work, which was done at high speed in late April and early May in order to make the material available, at least in tabular form, for the Charlottetown meetings of the ACCUTE Executive and of the Committee for Professional Concerns).

Even from a preliminary analysis, however, several very definite patterns emerge. Although these patterns are not likely to strike any member of our profession with the force of novelty, this material will I am sure be of use to us in our attempts to explain to uncomprehending outsider—whether legislators, government bureaucrats, senior university administrators or members of the general public—what it is we do. But just how valid are the results of our surveys of the members of ACCUTE and CACE?

2. The question of validity

It would seem at first glance that the survey directed to chairs of English, which drew responses from all of the larger anglophone universities in Canada and had an overall response rate of 64%, ought to provide statistically valid conclusions—and that the survey of ACCUTE members, which had a much lower response rate, would be correspondingly less reliable.

However, the interpretation of the CACE survey's results turns out to be a very delicate matter. In both surveys a large part of the data is derived from estimates of the amount of time devoted by individuals or collectivities to different aspects of their duties, estimates which are of course subject to distortions of various kinds. Clearly, assessments by individuals of how they apportion their working time possess on the aggregate a higher degree of validity than do assessments by department administrators of the manner in which their colleagues divide up their time. In the words of one chair, "Some of this can't possibly be accurate, because I cannot

second-guess the work habits, marking times, etc. of 21 people." Other department chairs felt greater confidence in the estimates they provided—but only because they had access to individual responses of the kind evoked by the survey which we sent to all ACCUTE members. As one chair remarked, "The Department did a workload survey some years ago which has made it possible to answer some questions in this area more or less reasonably, but many others would require wild guesses on my part, or days of information gathering and analysis."

Another kind of problem is posed by the widely differing sizes of the departments whose chairs responded. It would seem that certain of the CACE and ACCUTE statistics cannot properly be compared unless the former are first weighted to take account of the fact that the chairs' estimates refer to groups of quite disparate sizes. (This weighting can of course be done, although it hasn't yet.) But as my further comments will go some way towards showing, there are many other ways (not all of them quantitative, by any means) in which the results of the two surveys can be usefully compared.

If the CACE results require careful interpretation, what validity can be attributed to our survey of ACCUTE members? As I have mentioned, we had an overall response rate of 25.5% (or 36%, if only those ACCUTE members who have full-time academic positions are counted). Of our 271 respondents, 252 were from 54 universities across Canada, and 19 were from 13 different colleges. Although the responses from our college members contain much valuable information (some of which will be drawn on below), it is evident that they cannot provide a basis for accurate generalizations about the working conditions among college teachers of English across the country. What, then, of the responses from university teachers? The university respondents break down as follows by rank:

Full Professor	74
Associate Professor	74
Assistant Professor	62
Lecturer	20
Teaching Assistant	8
Other	11

From a sample of this size one can, I believe, formulate valid generalizations, at the very least with respect to academics at the rank of Assistant Professor and above.

Yet how representative is this sample of Canadian college and university teachers of English as a whole? Several indications permit one to offer a tentative answer to this question.

(a) *Qualifications.* Of the university respondents, 86% hold the Ph.D.; the corresponding figure for the college respondents is 79%. Although statistics that would permit a precise comparison seem to be unavailable, I would guess that these figures are slightly above the nationwide average for university teachers of English, and more distinctly above the average for college teachers in our discipline.

(b) *Publications.* The university and the college respondents alike report average rates of publication that are almost midway between the average rates indicated by university department chairs as being typical for the profession and typical of the most active researchers in their departments. This is a subject on which one might expect the answers of individual academics to be coloured by wishful thinking; however, the fact that 11.6% of the university respondents report that they are receiving some degree of course relief on account of their research activities may indicate that in this regard the respondents are indeed somewhat above average. (The CACE survey indicates that course relief of this kind is unavailable in 45% of English departments; in the other 55%, an average of 12% of the faculty may have some course relief at a given time.)

(c) *Student numbers.* The university respondents report teaching an average of 86 students per semester (87, if one counts only the respondents at or above the rank of lecturer); in

contrast, the very approximate average figures supplied by department chairs suggest that university teachers of English on the whole are teaching slightly more than 100 students each per semester. (The average figure for the college respondents, by the way, is 100 students per semester.) If the CACE figures are reliable, the difference might be taken to reflect a higher than average rate of course relief among the university respondents, or to suggest that they teach, on average, fewer large lecture courses and more seminar-type or upper-level courses than is typical of university English teachers as a whole.

If my interpretation of these indications is correct, the respondents to the ACCUTE survey tend to publish more research and to teach fewer students than does the average member of our profession. The first of these tendencies, at least, is not surprising: one would expect there to be a correlation between research activity and membership in scholarly associations. But we should be alert to the possibility that in this respect our respondents may represent a somewhat more than normally active cross-section of the profession of Canadian college and university teachers of English.

So much for throat-clearing. But as we move on to the Hard Facts, do I detect a faint glow of anticipation on the face of Dr. Stuart Smith? Has my last paragraph perhaps led him to expect that academics in the humanities, those eternally researching whiners with their endless wretched lamentations about teaching *loads*, are on the point of confessing—in full statistical regalia—to an unprincipled neglect of their primary responsibility to the public, as teachers? If so, Dr. Smith is in for a surprise.

3. The Facts

(a) *Teaching/Research/Service.*

According to the CACE questionnaire, one-third of Canadian university departments of

English have a scheme whereby teaching, research, and service are assigned relative weights reflecting the time that faculty are expected to spend on each activity. Of the institutions which have schemes of this kind, 77% said that the prescribed ratio was 40/40/20, and 23% said that it was 33/33/33. When the ACCUTE questionnaire asked individuals whether their departments recognized a prescribed ratio, the answers of university respondents were diverse, and often confused. Although the 40/40/20 ratio and (less frequently) the 33/33/33 ratio were both mentioned, many faculty members did not know whether their universities had prescribed expectations of this kind, or if so what they were. However, when in the preceding question they were asked what percentage of their working time they spent on teaching, research, and service, their answers averaged out to 55.4/26.8/17.3. (The corresponding figures for those who teach in colleges, where research is usually not emphasized, and service often goes unrecognized, are 68.1/12.9/17.2.)

The point bears repeating. We are dealing with a significant cross-section of university English teachers, who if they depart from the norm do so in being more than usually active in research and publication. But these people, on average, are spending over 15% more of their time on teaching than those universities which have established a norm of 40/40/20 think they should—or 22% more, in the case of universities which have a norm of 33/33/33. They are also spending significantly less of their time on research than is expected of them (13% less, or 6% less, if the norm is 33/33/33). These figures would not be alarming if they referred only to the period of the academic term: the summer months, when service work tends to be much reduced, teaching is reduced to course preparation (and, for some of us, graduate supervision), and research becomes our primary occupation, would easily balance the ratio. However, this question in the survey did not ask respondents to distinguish between term time and the summer months; their answers are an estimate of their

year-round activity. Fully 44% of university respondents, moreover, indicated that their distribution of working time deviated from departmental or university models, and 25% of that group felt that this deviation had negatively affected assessments of their work for purposes of tenure, merit or promotion.

But what do these figures mean? Are university English teachers cutting back on the amount of time they spend on research and service in order to make room for an increased amount of teaching duties, or are they accommodating an increased demand for teaching by increasing their overall working hours? The answers to other questions in our two surveys would suggest that the latter is the case.

(b) Total Workload.

The ACCUTE questionnaire asked respondents to estimate their average work-week during term (including weekends), and encompassing teaching, research, and service. University respondents estimated that they worked, on average, 55.3 hours per week—or, if one counts only those at the rank of assistant professor and above, 56.5 hours per week. (The estimates of our much smaller sample of college respondents averaged out to 53.5 hours per week.) Among the more senior members of our profession, work-weeks do not get shorter: full professors reported that they work, on average, 57.7 hours per week, while the department chairs who responded to the CACE survey reported an average work week of 59 hours.

Should we say then that an average assistant, associate, or full professor in a Canadian university English department might put in six eight-hour days in a week—and then proceed to celebrate the sabbath by working for an additional eight and one-half hours? (More probably, this average professor works five ten-hour days, takes most of Saturday off, and starts in again on Sunday afternoon.)

(c) Fun with figures.

But do these average figures seem improbably high? I think not. Other questions in the survey asked respondents to estimate how long they take, for example, to mark student assignments of different kinds—and subsequently to estimate how much time they devote to marking in a semester. Once one starts to add together the figures estimated for the various aspects of our work, the aggregate figure mounts up rapidly. Thus, for example, university respondents reported spending an average of 6.94 hours per week in service work within their universities, and an average of 3.52 hours in service to the profession. This adds up to 10.46 hours per week, or 18.9% of the average term-time workweek of 55.3 hours—a figure which is remarkably close to the 17.3% of their time separately estimated by the same respondents as spent on service work over the year. (The difference between these percentages may reflect the fact that most service work is done during the academic term.)

With respect to teaching, our information is regrettably less complete. The university respondents at or above the rank of assistant professor are teaching, on the average, 4.2 courses over the academic year, or 2.1 per semester. If we assume three classroom hours per week for each course, they are devoting 6.3 hours to classroom teaching. A further 18.1 hours per week are spent in marking. (To anyone outside our discipline, this figure may seem high; however, the estimate given by department chairs in the CACE survey is only slightly lower: 16.7 hours per week.) These respondents also report spending, on average, 3.4 hours per week supervising graduate students, directed reading courses and honours essays, and writing letters of reference. If we then allow two hours of preparation for each hour of classroom teaching, and an additional three hours per week for consultation with individual undergraduates, the average English professor is devoting 43.4 hours per week to teaching.

If we add to this figure the hours spent in service work, it would seem that our colleagues

at or above the rank of assistant professor have about two and one-half hours per week, out of the average total of 56.5 hours, available for research work. It becomes easy to see why many members of English departments complain that they are unable to sustain their research programs during the academic term—and why, even when they devote their summers to scholarly work, they estimate on average that scarcely more than one-quarter of their yearly working time goes into research.

4. And some opinions

I have presented here only a sampling from what struck me as the more salient results of the ACCUTE workload survey (with occasional corroborative details from the CACE survey). The ACCUTE survey also contains a large body of information on such subjects as the different kinds of course structures in place at the respondents' colleges and universities, the extent to which faculty are able to determine the nature and extent of their supervisory duties, the availability of research assistance and of marking assistance, the perceived interrelationships of our teaching, research and service work, and the pedagogical initiatives in which some of the respondents are engaged. (Some of this material will be the subject of a future article in the *Newsletter*.) Our data, moreover, can be separated so as to generate distinct results for university and college respondents, and distinct results by rank, by institution, or by province.

What value, then, will this exercise have had? The results of our survey show eloquently how serious the problem of overwork now is among English faculty in this country. (Think again about the average term-time workload: one of the things that figure means is that for every one of us who is putting in merely 40 hours per week—doing, that is, what most people in other walks of life would consider to be an honourable workweek—another one is working more than 70 hours per week.)

Yet if the numbers are eloquent, the written remarks which many respondents also provided us with are much more so. Some of these contain suggestions that will enable us to improve future questionnaires of this kind by incorporating issues related to gender, and by making them more sensitive to the specific concerns of college teachers and of those with sessional or part-time appointments. Others comment eloquently on the issues which have been discussed here. By way of conclusion, I offer a brief anthology of these remarks.

First, some comments by chairs of departments (for which I am indebted to the CACE questionnaire). One of these expresses something like despair: "The dictates of the Board of Governors automatically determine how each department reacts. Here, we are at a crisis, and not one of the questions asked above will assist me in circumventing the inevitable. OK?" Another chair, in sentences that resonate with weariness, questions the very idea of a survey:

We do not have a graduate studies program; we do have one of the worst student-teacher ratios in the country. We are very heavily overworked. Some of us still manage to write and be published. None of us is happy with what we are told the future portends. If this case has to be made to the powers, I wouldn't want to make it on the results of a poll. It would only result in their hiring a consultant. Both instruments suggest the death of mind.

Two more chairs: "Questionnaire was jointly done and involved a good deal of time from everyone." "No more please."

Some respondents to the ACCUTE survey reflected on the relations between a heavy workload and other aspects of one's life:

This is, I think, a job most naturally suited to the conditions of being a monk. I would be more surprised at hearing of hours that one does NOT devote to thinking about it. Any deviation into "normal" living patterns that make a distinction between working and non-working hours should be

considered the exception. Hence, it follows quite naturally that children force one to secede from the community. However, apart from the pressures to maintain a condition of "celibacy," it is an ideal life....

Or one's health:

The profession needs to do something. At 41, I'm beginning to experience health problems (viruses that recur, for example) that are clearly stress-related.

Another respondent reported taking decisive action:

I've resigned my position and opted out of tenure-track work precisely because of the work-load.... Next year I have a sabbatical-replacement position (teaching only) and I count the lower salary as money invested in sanity. I'm a teacher, not a scholar or an administrator. And I am an outstanding teacher of (to quote a referee) "large intro classes of non-majors." They take a lot of energy. In an ideal world, I would like to teach only such classes (despite the grind of marking) and write articles related to pedagogy or that emerge from specific literary works taught. I'm joining the part-timers and sessionals until (if ever) I can find a place that's willing to accommodate my skills and pay me enough to live on.

One respondent made a point of commenting on the manner in which our universities and colleges treat sessional and part-time teachers: "While I believe all of us are overloaded, we should bear in mind how (at this university at least) full-time academics are subsidized by their poorly-paid highly-qualified part-time 'colleagues,' without whom workloads would be even heavier." Or as another wrote, out of personal experience:

As a sessional worker at a university where sessional instructors are paid \$23,000 (ABD) or \$26,000 (with the degree), I bitterly resent the exploitation of young scholars (I earned more than my present wage in an unskilled

job at a library six years ago—AND I had benefits!). After years of graduate study I command a salary of \$23,000—less than half of what most of my colleagues earn—and I have a heavier teaching load. This seems to me unfair (to say the least). How can young scholars ever do the research needed to publish so they won't perish?

Our workload survey does not provide answers to this or to many other questions. It does, however, provide us with material that we will find useful in our attempts to make known to legislators and administrators the extent and the severity of the crisis which we face.

A more unexpected reward of reading through this material has been to discover the extent to which it bears witness to a fierce integrity among the members of our profession. This emerges in some cases as a refusal to indulge in self-pity (one colleague, welcoming "any attempt to obtain objective information on workloads," warns at the same time against "belly-aching and whining"), and elsewhere in the form of wry humour (under the rubric of "pedagogical experiments which you feel could result in more productive use of resources and time," a college professor lists experiments "with eight-hour blocks for sleep and stronger blends of coffee"). More often, this integrity takes the shape of a dogged refusal to compromise on such issues as the importance of individual contact with students and of individual attention to their written work, and an equally dogged insistence on sustaining the scholarly work that is the basis of our teaching as well as of our research.

This last paragraph may seem to have a suspiciously self-congratulatory tone. But this integrity was independently commented on, before I read any of the survey material, by all three of the graduate students who did the data entry work (and since all three are sociologists, they had nothing to gain by flattering English teachers.) If the results of this survey give us cause for concern—and for concerted action—they may also remind us that we have cause, as well, for pride.

Conference 1993: May 30-June 2

Call for Papers

The 1993 ACCUTE Conference will be held at Carleton University in Ottawa from May 30-June 2. As always, the nature and the quality of our conference depends on our members. ACCUTE 1993 will only be as good as the papers you submit.

Papers or proposals can be submitted to ACCUTE for consideration for next year's conference anytime prior to **November 15**. Please send **three copies** of all papers and proposals. Submissions must give evidence in their style and argument of being suitable for *oral* delivery. Speakers will have a maximum of 25 minutes to deliver their papers; if your paper is longer than this, please indicate clearly where it can be cut. *Papers longer than 20 double-spaced pages will not be considered for the programme*; multiple submissions are not accepted. Proposals should be at least 2 pages and should indicate clearly how the paper will be developed.

Each copy of your paper or proposal should be accompanied by a **cover page** with the following information: your name (in the form LAST, FIRST), address, phone and fax numbers, the title of your paper, and a brief biographical note. Your name should appear *only* on the cover page and not on subsequent pages of your paper. On a separate page, also include a **brief abstract** with each copy of your paper or proposal.

All papers and proposals submitted are sent, with authorial identification removed, to at least two readers who return their reports by late January. When making final decisions about the programme, the conference organizers consider the readers' reports, the necessity of including a range of period, national, theoretical and critical interests on the programme, and the ways in which the papers can be intelligently coupled in sessions. By late February, all those who submitted papers or proposals are informed of the conference programme and receive the reader's comments on their submissions.

Suggestions for Special Sessions

Members are also invited to submit proposals and papers for Special Sessions to ACCUTE. Anyone interested in any of these Special Sessions is encouraged to contact the organizer directly for more information. Submissions of proposals or completed papers should be received by the organizer by **November 15, 1992**; they must be forwarded by the organizer of the Special Session to ACCUTE by December 15.

The following Special Sessions have been proposed for the 1993 conference.

"Apocalypse: Issues and Methods"

This special session would explore three main interests that converge in this topic. One is the historic dimension of meaning in texts, a range of significance highlighted by the fact that we are now approaching the *fin de millennium*. This prospect has prompted a strong apocalyptic emphasis in postmodern writing while encouraging a highly productive comparison with the *fin de siècle* writing of the late 19th century. Secondly, it includes the topic of apocalypse in Derridean-based literary and cultural "nuclear criticism" and how it can be used in opening new cultural spaces for the analysis of gender and sexuality. This activity is an index of a third point of interest: the possibilities that apocalyptic thinking affords in articulating marginal subject positions in contemporary culture.

Contact: Richard Dellamora
Visiting Fellow
Department of English
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ USA 08544

"The Vampire as Metaphor in Contemporary Popular Culture"

Submissions are invited for a special session on the metaphorical function of the vampire in recent fiction and other media. Areas of interest include contemporary analyses of power

relations, sex/gender construction and politics, attitudes towards disease, the role of the artist, the nature of evil, the nature of difference, and the function of the fantastic. Submissions can take the form of one- to two-page abstracts or completed papers.

Contact: Veronica Hollinger
Cultural Studies Program
Trent University
Peterborough, ON K9J 7B8

"The Self-Representational Politics of Autobiography"

"Autobiographical writing," as Sidonie Smith notes in a recent essay, "has played and continues to play a role in emancipatory politics." This session seeks contributions that explore the self-representational politics of autobiography, particularly the emancipatory strategies that marginalized autobiographical subjects use to test the totalizing politics of traditional autobiographical practices and the representation such subjects offer of their relationship to their group or community. Submissions can take the form of detailed proposals or substantially completed papers.

Contact: Prof. Paul Hjartarson
Department of English
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5

"Romantic Criticism in the Nineteenth Century"

Submissions are invited for papers that examine the roles of ideology and/or theory in early Romantic criticism and in attempts to show the origins of contemporary debates in earlier criticism. Submissions may take the form of two-page proposals.

Contact: Dr. Tracy Ware
Department of English
Bishop's University
Lennoxville, PQ J1M 1Z7

"Making Contemporary Critical Practices Accessible to the Taxpayer"

In light of the recurrent, often abusive newspaper attacks on the competence and integrity of academics, especially those in literary studies, should more energy be directed into explaining contemporary critical practices to a general readership? If so, what strategies of argumentation and publication would be most effective? To what extent do institutional reward systems militate against public relations activities?

Contact: Paul Stevens
Department of English
Queen's University
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6
Phone: (613) 545-2153
Fax: (613) 545-6872

"Lesbian and Gay Issues in Medieval and Renaissance Studies"

Submissions that examine lesbian- and gay-authored texts, undertake lesbian or gay readings of canonical texts, discuss questions of theory and methodology as they relate to the study of lesbian and gay issues in earlier periods, or reflect on the contribution of medieval and Renaissance studies to the development of modern lesbian and gay representations are invited. Submissions may be in the form of 250-500 word abstracts or completed 20-minute papers.

Contact: Glenn Burger
Department of English
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5

"Camp and the Canon"

Submissions are invited for a session dealing with the aesthetics of camp and its relation to the canon. Papers may treat specific texts, analysing the precarious boundary between camp and "serious" or "high" literature, or they may focus on more general theoretical questions such as: what is the difference between camp and parody?

What debt does the canon owe camp? What can the canon teach us about camp, or camp about the canon? Submissions can take the form of completed papers or proposals.

Contact: Steven Bruhm
Department of English
Bishop's University
Lennoxville, PQ J1M 1Z7

Reading *The Maltese Falcon*

Abstracts are invited for a special session on the application of differing reading strategies to Dashiell Hammett's *The Maltese Falcon*.

Contact: Priscilla Walton
Department of English
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6

Calls for Papers / Conferences

ACCUTE has received the following notifications of upcoming conferences and calls for papers.

The **Commonwealth-in-Canada IV** Conference, "Gender / Colonialism / Post-Colonialism," is taking place at the University of Guelph, November 5-8, 1992. Plenary sessions will feature an international array of writers and scholars, including Edward Baugh (Jamaica), Ama Ata Aidoo (Ghana), Abdul Majid bin Nabi Baksh (Malaysia), Beryl Fletcher (New Zealand), Albert Wendt (Samoa), Shirley Geok-lin Lim (USA), Meenakshi Mukherjee (India), Evelyn O'Callaghan (Barbados), W.D. Ashcroft (Australia), and Canadians Shirley Neuman, Janice Kulyk Keefer, George Elliott Clarke, Kristjana Gunnars, Smaro Kamboureli, Dionne Brand, and Stephen Slemon.

In addition to these sessions, the conference will sponsor a series of performances and

readings, including an afternoon of readings by some of the 1992 winners of the Commonwealth Writer's Prize, to be awarded in Toronto November 2-4: Ama Ata Aidoo, Robert Antoni (Bahamas), Louis de Bernières (UK), Amit Chaudhury (India), Lawrence Darmani (Ghana), Beryl Fletcher (New Zealand), and Rohinton Mistry (Canada). For more information contact Patrick Holland or Diana Brydon
Department of English
University of Guelph
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1
(519) 824-4120, ext. 3249 or 3252 or 6315

Perry Nodelman, guest editor, invites submissions for a special 1993 issue of *Canadian Children's Literature on Illustration in Canadian Books for Children*. Send brief abstracts, proposals, or enquiries by **October 1, 1992**, to

Perry Nodelman
Department of English
University of Winnipeg
Winnipeg, MB R3B 2E9
Phone: (204) 786-9261
Fax: (204) 786-1824

Engendering America, the 29th conference of the Canadian Association for American Studies, will be held in Halifax October 15-16, 1993. Addressing itself to the relationship between ideas of gender and ideas of America, this interdisciplinary conference will examine numerous aspects of the politics of gender, the gender of politics. Besides submitting individual papers, participants are encouraged to organize and submit sessions of two to three papers on a common topic. Innovative forms of presentation and collaboration are welcomed. For more information contact

Peter Schwenger
Department of English
Mount. St. Vincent University
Halifax, NS B3M 2J6
Phone: (902) 425-8891
email: schwengerp@ash.msvu.ca

The **Association for Bibliotherapy in Canada** will hold a one-day conference on Sunday, May 31, 1993, as part of the Learned Societies meetings in Ottawa. Papers are invited on any aspect of the usefulness of reading literary texts, either in mental health areas or in the areas of life-skills or identity formation. Case histories, teaching theory or practice, personal experience or the value of particular texts, fiction or poetry, journal making, or the value of fantasy, etc. are all applicable. Please share this notice with colleagues in Education, Psychology, Medicine, etc. Send submissions to

J. Gold
Department of English
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1

Call for Contributors: *Dictionary of Literary Biography* volume on *British Novelists 1890-1929*. If you are interested in contributing to this volume on lesser-known writers of the period, please contact the editor **immediately** for a list of novelists to be included. **Deadline for contributions is June 15, 1993.** Editor:

Dr. George M. Johnson
Department of English
University College of the Cariboo
900 College Drive
Box 3010
Kamloops, BC V2C 5N3

JASNA Conference 1993, the Annual Conference of the Jane Austen Society of North America will take place October 7-10, 1993 at Chateau Lake Louise, Alberta, and will focus on Austen's novel *Persuasion*. Plenary sessions will be led by Margaret Drabble, Isobel Grundy, and Elaine Showalter; other speakers include Julia Prewitt Brown, Ed Copeland, Jan Fergus, Gary Kelly, Gene Koppel, Ellen Martin, Jane Millgate, Elizabeth Newark, Richard Quaintance, Judith Terry, Inger Thomsen, Tara Goshel Wallace, and Joanne Wilkes. Entertainment will include the

world premiere production of *An Accident at Lyme*, a musical by Paula Schwartz and Neil Moyer based on *Persuasion*, and *The Dance at Uppercross*, with instruction in country dancing of Jane Austen's time (regency dress is optional, but encouraged). For information or registration forms, contact

Juliet McMaster or Bruce Stovel
Department of English
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5

Bibliographical Society of Canada: The Society is issuing a formal Call for Papers for their next conference, tentatively scheduled to be held in Hamilton, Ontario on June 16, 1993. The theme of the conference will be *The History of the Book in Canada*. Papers should be approximately 45 minutes in length; they may be considered for publication in the *Papers/Cahiers*, the Society's refereed journal. Please submit proposals by **January 15, 1993** to

Eric L. Swanick
Legislative Library
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, NB E3B 5H1

The **15th International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre** will be held at the University of Waterloo, July 26-30, 1993. The conference topic will be "Collective Invention/Collaboration and the Elizabethan Theatre." Short papers with a clearly articulated connection to the topic are solicited to supplement a programme of invited addressees. Please be aware that the spaces reserved for short papers are limited. Submissions, not exceeding 10 pages, should be sent by **January 15, 1993** to

Lynne Magnusson or Ted McGee
Department of English
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
Phone: (519) 885-1211 or 884-8110
Fax: (519) 884-8995
e-mail: ALMAGNUS@watdcs.UWaterloo.ca

President's Column

As the revised format of our Newsletter indicates, the headquarters of ACCUTE is now at the University of Guelph.

This seems a good time, then, to express our heartfelt thanks to those whose work has given added momentum to ACCUTE, both in intellectual and financial terms — to Jane Sellwood, who has completed her term as graduate student representative on the executive, to Beth Popham and her colleagues on the Committee for Professional Concerns, to Doug Wurtele and his team at Carleton, to whom we are indebted for their very efficient running of English Studies in Canada, to Gerry Hill, whose calm efficiency as executive assistant has been much appreciated, to Smaro Kamboureli, Martin Kreiswirth and Marjorie Stone, who I'm very glad to say will continue this year as members-at-large on the executive — and most of all to Paul Hjartarson, who as secretary-treasurer performed the minor miracle of getting ACCUTE into the black, and to Shirley Neuman, who with Paul's support has organized two splendidly successful annual conferences, and whose energetic and imaginative leadership will make her presidency a very hard act to follow.

Some advance news of our 1993 conference: two distinguished scholars, Isobel Grundy, who is Henry Marshall Tory Professor at the University of Alberta, and Jonathan Dollimore of the University of Sussex, have confirmed that they

Appeal from the Editor of ESC!

A recent stock-taking of back issues reveals that for some inexplicable reason we have run short of two old issues — Vol. X No. 1 (March 1984) and Vol. XI No. 3 (Sept. 1985). If there are members who are willing to part with their copies, the editor would be overjoyed to receive them. Donors will be rewarded with an extra copy of our recent special editions — or a cool \$5!

will join us as plenary speakers at Carleton University in Ottawa.

Jonathan Dollimore's publications include *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (1984), *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (ed. with Alan Sinfield, 1985), and *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (1991); those of Isobel Grundy include *Essays and Poems of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (ed. with Robert Halsband, 1977), *Virginia Woolf: New Critical Essays* (ed. with Patricia Clements, 1983), *Samuel Johnson and the Scale of Greatness* (1986), and *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English* (ed. with Virginia Blair and Patricia Clements, 1990).

Membership Renewals

It's that time again to think about renewing your membership to ACCUTE to ensure that you continue to enjoy the benefits of your professional organization — including the ACCUTE newsletter, which keeps you abreast of the professional issues facing faculty teaching English across Canada; *English Studies in Canada*, the journal forum for new research; and of course, the opportunity for stimulating professional, intellectual, and social exchange offered by the annual conference.

If the address label on this newsletter (or your last copy of ESC) indicates "(92)" after your name, your membership will expire at the end of this year. You will find a membership renewal form on the last two pages of this newsletter. Please take a few moments to fill it out and send it back. Should you or your colleagues require additional copies of the form, feel free to photocopy as many as you need. All membership fees will be acknowledged by a receipt.

News of Members

Stephen BONNYCASTLE (RMC) has published *In Search of Authority: An Introductory Guide to Literary Theory* (Broadview Press, 1991). His essay "Robertson Davies and the Ethics of Monologue" has been republished in *Robertson Davies: An Appreciation*, ed. Elspeth Cameron (Broadview Press, 1991).

Steven BRUHM (McGill) has recently published "Blackmailed by Sex: Tennessee Williams and the Economics of Desire" in *Modern Drama* 34 (1991): 528-37; "William Godwin's *Fleetwood*: The Epistemology of the Tortured Body" in *Eighteenth-Century Life* 16 (1992): 21-33; and has forthcoming "Aesthetics and Anesthetics at the Revolution" in *Studies in Romanticism*.

Jared CURTIS (Simon Fraser) has published "'Poem Hid in a Tin Box': Dorothy Wordsworth and the *Inscription for a seat by the pathway side ascending to A Windy Brow*" in *Wordsworth in Context*, Pauline Fletcher and John Murphy, eds., *Bucknell Review* 35 (1992); and "Matthew Arnold's Wordsworth: The Tinker Tinkered" in *The Mind in Creation, Essays on English Romantic Literature in Honour of Ross G. Woodman*, J. Douglas Kneale, ed. (McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992).

Ajay HEBLE (Guelph) has published "'This Little Outpost of Empire': Sara Jeannette Duncan and the Decolonization of Canada" in *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 26.1 (1991): 215-28, and "'The Widening Rise of Surprise': Containment and Transgression in the Poetry of Michael Ondaatje" in *Wascan Review* 26.1&2 (Spring/Fall 1991): 117-27.

Irene MAKARYK (Ottawa) has edited and contributed to *"Living Record": Essays in Memory of Constantine Bida* (University of Ottawa Press, 1992). Her article "Antony and Cleopatra at Moscow's Vakhtangov Theatre" is forthcoming in *Foreign Shakespeare*, ed. Dennis Kennedy

(Cambridge UP, 1992). Her mega-project, of which she is the general editor, the *Encyclopaedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, is now completed and is scheduled to appear in March 1993 from U of Toronto Press.

Elliott MALAMET (Toronto) has published two articles on Graham Greene, one in *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 34.1 (Spring 1992): 106-28, and the other in *Modern Fiction Studies* 37.4 (Winter 1992): 689-703. Also, "Raymond Carver and the Fear of Narration" appeared in the *Journal of the Short Story in English* 17 (Autumn 1991): 56-67.

Tom ORMAN (Toronto) has published "'Everything Means Something, Cynthia': Alan Rudolph's *Mortal Thoughts*" in *Cineaction* 29 (1992): 22-25.

Ruth PANOFSKY (Toronto) has published *Adele Wiseman: An Annotated Bibliography* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1992).

J. Russell PERKIN (Saint Mary's) has published "Narrative Voice and the 'Feminine' Novelist:: Dinah Mulock and George Eliot," *Victorian Review* 18.1 (1992): 24-42, and "Literary Studies and Society: Some Reflections on the Political Correctness Debate," *Queen's Quarterly* 99 (1992): 314-27.

Jane SELLWOOD (Victoria) has published "'Certain vague hopes of disaster': a psychosemiotic reading of Alice Munro's 'The Found Boat' as the Flooding text" in *Studies in Canadian Literature/Études en littérature canadienne* 17 (August 1992).

1993 Membership Form

- New Member
 Renewal

Member's Name: _____

Academic Affiliation Information

Professional Designation:

- Professor
 Assoc. Professor
 Asst. Professor
 Sessional Lecturer
 Retired Faculty
 Grad. Student / TA

Address (use home address *only* if you are without academic affiliation):

 _____ Postal Code _____

Phone (wk): _____

Fax: _____ (hm): _____

E-Mail: _____

I enclose (Please make cheque payable to ACCUTE - University of Guelph):

- The regular membership fee of \$65 The reduced fee of \$30
 The household membership fee of \$115 (2 memberships, one subscription to *ESC*)

Second householder's name: _____

Second householder's professional designation: _____

ACCUTE Membership Directory Information

Please complete the information on research interests found overleaf, for use in the 1993 ACCUTE *Directory*. The *Directory* is used mainly by colleagues seeking scholars to review books, prepare scholarly papers on special topics, and to evaluate manuscripts, grant applications, conference papers, and graduate student theses. In order to help colleagues locate specialists more easily, the 1993 *Directory* will list scholars categorically by *primary area of research interest* first. In addition, members may specify other categories in which they would feel comfortable performing professional tasks; these will be included in a secondary listing format.

Primary Listing (*List only 1 area of specialization*)

List specialization by Period / Nationality / Genre; Other (Theoretical Methodology, Culture / Gender Studies; Authors / Works, etc.)

Example: Modern British Drama; Feminist Theory, G.B. Shaw

Additional areas

Periods / Nationalities / Genres _____

Culture / Gender Studies _____

Criticism / Theory / Methodology _____

Language / Linguistics _____

Pedagogy _____

Authors / Works _____

Other _____
