

2016

Degree of Change: The MA in English Studies

Margaret M. Strain

University of Dayton, mstrain1@udayton.edu

Rebecca C. Potter

University of Dayton, rpotter1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/eng_fac_pub



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Strain, Margaret M. and Potter, Rebecca C., "Degree of Change: The MA in English Studies" (2016). *English Faculty Publications*. 93.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/eng_fac_pub/93

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlange1@udayton.edu.



INTRODUCTION: DEGREE OF CHANGE

MARGARET M. STRAIN
University of Dayton

The history of higher education in the United States is one of admixture. The first American colleges initially followed a British educational model, with a prescribed classical curriculum characterized by lecture, recitation, and disputation. Undergraduate students finished their course of study by earning a baccalaureate degree. Those who completed advanced work (sometimes with a thesis) graduated with a master of arts, the highest postsecondary degree awarded. In the nineteenth century, the German university, with its expanded curricula, scientific approaches to research, and disciplinary organization, appealed to a new nation experiencing urbanization, industrial growth, and western expansion. American education reformers began calling for the creation of “universities” to remedy the limitations of liberal arts colleges. A vital part of this educational revision was the addition of the PhD as the culminating degree. In many cases, institutions imposed a graduate university structure onto existing undergraduate and masters-granting schools (e.g., Harvard and Yale). The opening of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 marked the first American institution conceived according to the German university model (Parker; Berlin). With this shift, the PhD supplanted the MA as the benchmark preferred terminal degree (Storr 47–56).

The rise of the new university in the United States had important consequences for higher education. It created a hierarchical relationship between the PhD and the MA. The tiered system also gave rise to a distinction in the purpose of graduate education—a

tension that troubles us still—and that is the difference between, as Bernard Berelson puts it, “graduate *education* and graduate *training*” (i.e., the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and preparation for a profession) (8). Masters programs provided graduates with coursework in areas such as education, engineering, commerce, technology, medicine, fine arts, and journalism and led to employment in various professional fields. In the field of English studies, the MA offered training for teachers and educational administrators. A PhD in English signaled more rigorous scholarship in the study of literature, with the end result of reproducing the next generation of academic scholar-leaders. The MA in English studies thus came to be seen in two ways: as either a stepping-stone to, or, failing that, a “consolation prize” (Bartlett 26; Dalbey 17) for those who did not qualify for, the proper end of graduate education: the doctorate.¹

In the twentieth century, the master’s degree, though diminished by its now medial position in higher education, never lost its value as a training ground for newly enfranchised learners (e.g., women, African Americans) and those seeking additional credentials (Stimpson 146; Steward). Indeed, especially after World War II, the number of master’s programs in the United States far outstripped doctoral ones. In fact, despite the growing preference for a PhD-wielding professoriate, the master’s remained the highest degree held by the majority of American college and university faculty members until the latter part of the twentieth century. Judith Glazer reports, for example, that in 1959–1960, “only 40 percent of faculty held PhDs” (10). Today, the number of faculty with PhDs has increased: 60 percent of full-time faculty and instructional staff and 18 percent of part-time faculty and staff hold the degree. Still, those with a master’s as their highest degree remain strong at 26 percent of full-time and 52 percent part-time faculty (“Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty”). Closer to home, the Modern Language Association’s (MLA) Ad Hoc Committee on the Master’s Degree reports that “close to half (49.1%) of all those teaching English in colleges and universities hold a master’s as their highest degree” (3). These statistics suggest that the MA continues to hold its stature as a professionalizing degree within the academy—and beyond it. Increasingly, the MA in English is a required or preferred degree for a number of “alt-ac” positions in

nonprofit and government organizations, publishing, education, and library sciences (*Chroniclevitae.com*).

Additionally, the MA has taken on new purposes without ever abandoning its foundations. Associate and baccalaureate degrees provide students with a general education grounded in the humanities and social and natural sciences, but for those who require specialized preparation, the undergraduate degree is insufficient. Advanced study exposes teachers to curricular innovation and, just as important, intellectual engagement. And while many doctoral programs expect their candidates to have a master's prior to matriculation, the percentage of students who earn the MA with the PhD goal in mind is small. Indeed, the MA continues to outpace the PhD in appreciable numbers. The National Center for Education Statistics projected that by the 2020–21 academic year, the number of MA degrees to be awarded would reach 865,000 ("Actual . . . Master's Degrees") compared to 106,100 doctoral degrees ("Actual . . . Doctor's Degrees"). These figures reflect degrees awarded in multiple fields. Still, the sheer number of graduates across many disciplines invites greater attention to the value of the MA.²

The MA is, after all, the entry into graduate study. It is the place where students engage in the specialized work of their disciplines, hone critical thinking and writing skills, participate in the theoretical and philosophical conversations within their fields, produce original research, and enter a professional community. It is also the degree that motivates students to continue or discontinue further study. If we consider the degree as a site where career trajectories are shaped, if not defined, the binary between the MA as a "training ground" and the PhD as "serious academic study" breaks down. That is, if we see the MA only as preparation for other work, we overlook the importance of what happens in these programs and with this unique population of students. Clearly, there is a purpose to the MA—and all the more reason to examine the degree more closely.

In contrast, the mission and identity of the PhD in English studies remain relatively stable. Disciplinary exchanges about the doctorate regularly appear as discussion topics at annual MLA and Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) meetings and in other venues. From time to time,

scholars have turned their attention to the MA—as an offshoot of conversations about the doctorate (Gaylord; Giordano) or as a special topic for a journal (Bartlett; Wright).³ But these efforts do not capture the significant changes and expansion the MA in English has undergone in the last twenty years, not the least of which include the creation of track systems within existing programs, the development of online courses and programs, and an increase in international student enrollments.

Two studies have drawn attention to these changes. In 2011 the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master's Degree published the results of two questionnaires it circulated to PhD-granting and MA-granting institutions. The authors of "Rethinking the Master's Degree in English for a New Century" encourage departments to engage in programmatic and disciplinary conversations on topics such as content-based versus skills-based curricular models, the viability of certificates, and best practices for hiring MA graduates for non-tenure-track positions (2). According to their data, literature remains a specialization in nearly 95 percent of reporting institutions, while concentrations in composition, rhetoric, and writing (38 percent), creative writing (20 percent), and English as a Second Language (ESL) (16 percent) are growth areas (Table 3). The committee regards the diversification among MA programs as evidence of the field's "responsive[ness]" (8) to disciplinary and external factors. At the same time, the committee poses an understandable question: is the "diffusion" affecting the "identity of the MA in English" (8)? We would respond by noting that concerns about fragmentation and identity are less a cause for disciplinary concern and more an astute observation about the unique character of the MA. The MA, more than the PhD, is positioned in a dynamic contact zone—a place where disciplinary knowledge, student need, and local exigencies interact and where disciplinary identity is constantly negotiated.

John S. Dunn Jr. and Derek N. Mueller's 2013 "Report on the 2012 Survey of Programs" created for the Master's Degree Consortium of Writing Studies Specialists suggests contemporary trends and provides statistical snapshots of the present state of the degree. Targeting programs in writing studies and related fields, Dunn and Mueller raise questions about a range of issues: the age and size of programs, student recruitment and enrollment,

the specialization of faculty, and postgraduate career opportunities, to name a few. Their findings echo the trend found by the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master's Degree concerning the number of MA graduates who seek academic employment as community college instructors, followed closely by those who obtain writing-related careers in the public sector; those who pursue doctoral work in writing rank third (16). While it may serve those of us in the English professoriate to see the MA as a segue to doctoral work, the numbers tell us that many of those graduating with an MA in English do not see the PhD as their primary goal. This is not for lack of ability, as the "consolation prize" narrative might imply. Rather, graduates have come to see how the study of writing, literature, and language translates into meaningful everyday work within and beyond the academy. Dunn and Mueller's findings also concur with the MLA's ADE report concerning the expansion of existing programs and the inauguration of new ones. When asked to name the official start date of their program, 27 percent of those who responded to the question reported 1980–1989 (15). Clearly, diversification is not so new; it has been unfolding for nearly three decades. Rather, as a discipline, we have only begun to recognize and deal with the consequences of these changes, especially within the contact zone where disciplinary knowledge, student needs, and local exigencies converge.

Degree of Change: The MA in English Studies argues for a fuller consideration of the contemporary state of the MA in English and for new dialogue about its pivotal role in higher education. In doing so, the collection takes up some of the challenges programs face: creating curricula that reflect distinct institutional missions, rethinking how to compete in digital learning environments, and preparing graduates to thrive in global communities. The book also explores the inextricable link between local exigencies and broader, more complex concerns. In an effort to serve students and community needs (a long-standing hallmark of the degree), graduate educators must balance institutional identities alongside faculty resources and state accreditation boards. Many of the programs in existence today owe their strength to faculty commitment and creativity in the face of difficult material realities. The impetus to earn higher degrees and credentials shows

no signs of slowing down (Fairfield), yet this trend raises ethical concerns about labor. Are we overproducing MA grads? This question echoes one doctoral programs asked not so long ago about the number of students they admitted each year. Today, the potential for exploiting MA graduates remains a critical concern as more holders of MAs are hired for adjunct employment. In a glutted market, individuals with MAs face positions with low pay, no benefits, and no job security. Shouldn't conversations about such issues *begin* at the level of the MA, especially in departments where the MA in English serves as a stand-alone degree?⁴

Many of the authors represented in this collection—seasoned and newcomer—are those working on the front lines of curricular and institutional change, particularly in the secondary schools and community colleges. Thus, we see this collection of value to department chairs, graduate program administrators, faculty, and students interested in the conversations about and direction of the MA in US higher education. The cluster of chapters in each section features a prevailing theme. As the title of the first section suggests, “Disciplinary Shifts” examines MA programs as a generative force—at once administrative, interdisciplinary, and political—for change in English studies. The authors in the second section, “Programmatic Transformations,” examine the responsive, dynamic, and not unproblematic interactions between MA programs and the constituencies with whom they work within and beyond the university. The scholars ask us to consider the values and assumptions that underpin these connections. Finally, “Changing Student Populations” offers a glimpse into the lived experiences of graduate students themselves in the programs and in the field. The writers highlight some of the varied occupations the MA degree has opened for them and reveal the sometimes surprising ways these individuals draw on their MA experiences. In his afterword, Adam Komisaruk takes the chapters as a point of departure to suggest where the future of the degree might be headed. While the essays here do not reflect the entirety of the energy, labor, and diversity that MA programs in English possess, we are excited to explore some of the possibilities within these pages.

Part I: Disciplinary Shifts

MA programs by design and by circumstance are dynamic, ecological systems. They operate within complex academic networks even as they extend into public and civic spaces. The chapters in the section “Disciplinary Shifts” highlight the uniquely contextual and always rhetorical relationships that MA programs maintain with public, institutional, and programmatic constituencies. The authors of “The Locally Responsive, Socially Productive MA in Composition” take seriously the charge to serve both their graduate population and regional constituencies, which are often community colleges. They also complicate the proposition offered by Peter Vandenberg and Jennifer Clary-Lemon that “MAs can function on relatively autonomous ground, enabling community-based pedagogies that exploit intra- and interdisciplinary flexibility to link students to local exigencies and opportunities” (277–78). Kory Lawson Ching, Tara Lockhart, and Mark Roberge do so by identifying the “ethical and thorny dilemmas” that arise when newly hired MA instructors find that their graduate preparation is at odds with the skills they need as instructors in community colleges. Moreover, the curricular expectations of many community college English departments do not reflect contemporary perspectives on writing studies. How do faculty in MA programs grapple with these challenges? Ching, Lockhart, and Roberge account for the multilayered ways they attempt to negotiate the competing demands of each stakeholder while remaining socially productive.

In “English Online/On-the-Line: The Challenges of Sustaining Disciplinary Relevance in the Twenty-First Century,” Kristine L. Blair confronts head-on several concerns facing English graduate education: declining tenure lines, faculty reticence in adapting to changing student needs, and institutional pushes to reach more diverse student populations. What impact do these disciplinary issues have on often-overlooked master’s programs? In answer, Blair recounts her department’s development of a fully online MA in English geared to public school teachers and writing professionals. While online courses are common forms of distance education, Blair explains how this initiative, because its success rested

on the investment of the entire English faculty (not merely those involved in writing and new media studies), engendered fruitful discussions about the future of the MA, the importance of digital pedagogies for English studies, and the tactical considerations of administering an online graduate program.

As some critics have lamented, the master's degree has been known for its credentialing function rather than its conferral of "mastery" in the field (Berelson 189). Mark Mossman sees untapped opportunity in this reality. In "Academic Capitalism, Student Needs, and the English MA," Mossman cites the number of fields that now require advanced degrees of new hires as they seek graduates with specialized skills and expertise. Shelia Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie and Slaughter and Gary Rhoades term the role of the university in this enterprise *academic capitalism*, and it is here that Mossman is most concerned with the entrepreneurial implications of this phenomenon for the MA in English. He proposes a new vision for the degree—one that embraces its role in the "New Economy"—a position he argues it has tacitly held for decades.

As I have noted, one of the major institutional developments within MA programs has been the emergence of curricular concentrations or the inauguration of programs devoted to writing studies. Students and prospective employers see a ready market for graduates prepared to move into writing-related and teaching careers. Coursework in writing studies, notwithstanding its other merits, is perceived as a pragmatic, even advantageous training for one's career. Can the same be said of generalist MA degrees or those programs with concentrations in literature? Has English studies failed to make a case for the relevance of literary studies for future teachers? Rebecca C. Potter takes up these questions in her essay, "But Can You Teach Composition? The Relevance of Literary Studies for the MA Degree." Using data from a survey of English department chairs from community colleges, Potter examines the assumptions these employers hold about the MA degree in literature, finding it lacking as a preparation for teaching in their departments. She also tackles a more troubling issue—the relative silence within the field of English studies generally to make an argument for its humanistic value to stakeholders outside

the academy. This conversation, she rightly claims, is one worth having.

Part II: Programmatic Transformations

The essays in “Programmatic Transformations” introduce us to the demographic and geographic diversity across individual programs. In each instance, the authors highlight the unique circumstances that motivate their programs, whether it is a response to a state mandate, the need for curricular and programmatic reform, or an alternative to traditional program delivery. In doing so, they remind us of the “silent success” the degree has achieved in its openness to new fields of study, alternative instructional technologies, interdisciplinarity, nontraditional students, and professionalization, to name a few (Conrad, Haworth, and Millar 314). Four years after its change in designation from Missouri Western State College to Missouri Western State University (MWSU), MWSU inaugurated its master of applied arts in written communication in 2009. Charting that journey in “From Political Constraints to Program Innovation: Professionalizing the Master’s Degrees in English,” Kaye Adkins employs the theory of ecocomposition to highlight how state, professional, institutional, and departmental discourses converged in the design and implementation of this new degree. Discursive ecology is an especially useful lens for understanding how the linguistic transactions were shaped by MWSU’s material environment. Adkins asks us to consider how some of the traditional strengths of MA programs such as teaching, literacy, and literature might be reimaged for alternative academic and nonacademic settings.

Steven Fox and Kim Brian Lovejoy present another look at programmatic diversity in their essay, “Boundary Crossings and Collaboration in a Graduate Certificate in Teaching Writing.” In the state of Indiana, educational reformers are calling for changes to state laws that undermine or eliminate the requirement for a master’s degree for middle and secondary teachers. In its place, they favor district or school initiatives that shift the purpose of teachers’ continuing education from the teachers’ own enrichment

to ways instructors can foster *student* achievement. The difference between the two is substantial. In a move that unites the partnerships they have forged with the Hoosier Writing Project, the Indiana Teachers of Writers, and their university resources, Fox and Lovejoy detail the development of a Certificate in Teaching Writing in their department. While not replacing their MA, the growing twenty-hour program brings together middle, high school, and college teachers to create opportunities for collaboration, critical dialogue, and action research.

Like many MA graduates, Abigail G. Scheg completed courses in traditional literary studies, writing pedagogy, and a bit of creative nonfiction. She also came to her first job with teaching experience. What she found missing from her graduate education was attention to teaching in online environments, an ability many academic employers presume new hires possess. In "TextSupport: Incorporating Online Pedagogy into MA English Programs," Scheg argues for "the necessity of theoretical and practical preparation for using technology" (122) at the MA level.⁵ In the early days of computer-assisted instruction, many of us learned on the job how to teach writing in classrooms ill-fitted for the task. Face-to-face (F2F) teaching was changing even then. Today, technologies are ubiquitous educational tools, but F2F pedagogies are not sufficient preparation. Facing pressures from "above," programs frequently adapt to offer training in the areas in demand, such as ESL, writing instruction, and online education, but without adequate faculty expertise in these areas. Programs across the country are facing these pressures, made real and explicit in this collection.

Most people find change discomfiting. It destabilizes us, and therefore we resist it even in the face of the opportunity for something better. William T. FitzGerald and Carol J. Singley locate their MA in English program in exactly this position. The MA in the English department at Rutgers University–Camden maintains a confident identity as a stand-alone program serving the south Jersey area. It is also a regional campus, part of the State University of New Jersey, with New Brunswick as the flagship institution. Recent events have converged that propel the faculty to undertake curricular and institutional revision, and for a traditional program based on literary studies, this presents a sea

change. The situation the authors describe echoes the challenges of many stand-alone MA programs. FitzGerald and Singley provide readers with a candid look at some of the avenues before them and invite us to ponder what such change means for the mission of Rutgers–Camden.

Hildy Miller and Duncan Carter, in “‘There and Back Again’: Programmatic Deliberations and the Creation of an MA Track in Rhetoric and Composition,” chronicle a journey of sorts. Having completed an undergraduate curriculum revision with an enhanced focus on rhetoric, Miller and Carter began to consider the interrelationship between their undergraduate major and a new MA program in rhetoric and composition. Should the program be a stand-alone MA or a track within the existing MA in English? The authors’ institutional quandary is one shared by departments across the country as evidenced by the proliferation of MA majors and stand-alone programs in recent years. Miller and Carter chart five critical questions and responses that led them to see the efficacy of creating a track. Ultimately, the decision the faculty made had less to do with matters of form. Rather, they began to see “this choice as a rhetorical problem, as a process in which we must reflect deeply on the many layers of faculty’s disciplinary identities” (172). Their critical questions are a useful heuristic for others contemplating changes to their MA program.

Part III: Changing Student Populations

Most, if not all, of the evaluations and recommendations we read in our professional publications about the master’s degree reflect the perspectives of deans, chairs, faculty members of national organizations, and other institutional administrators. These voices are shaped and motivated by the continued viability of graduate education. They share a united concern, of course, for the pathways their students take after graduation and caution us to mind the gap “between students’ aspirations and employment outcomes on the one hand and MA programs’ stated goals and curricular requirements on the other” (ADE Ad Hoc Committee 1). They are mindful too that while many students complete an MA in English and later pursue a career in teaching, that is not to say the program

itself has equipped them to do so. The authors in Part III answer the proverbial question about post-MA careers and offer critical responses to disciplinary and institutional stakeholders. These are the voices of recent MA graduates and the faculty who mentor them. In an ideal world, these individuals would sit down at a large round table to share their viewpoints. But failing that, we have much to gain by regarding how the degree has informed their life decisions and professional relationships. At the same time, the studies presented in this section offer insight into the ways MA graduates have navigated the disjunction between “employment outcomes” and their programs’ “curricular requirements.”

Ann M. Penrose takes the helm as director of graduate studies at her institution and begins asking critical questions: What is our admissions philosophy? Does it align with our program goals? What are these goals? Her chapter, “Student Ambitions and Alumni Career Paths: Expectations of the MA English Degree,” presents the preliminary findings of two surveys she circulated to current students and graduates of their MA in English—a program that offers specializations in five areas and shares a disciplinary home with an MS in technical communication and an MFA in creative writing. This firsthand feedback, Penrose notes, “enable[s] us to go beyond our personal impressions and anecdotal reports . . . [and] represent students’ goals and expectations” (181) in forging a program that produces not only “good writers but also critical thinkers and thoughtful humanists” (194). Graduate faculty mentoring by individuals who are informed about workforce options is essential to guiding prospective graduates toward a variety of career paths (see Moore and Miller).

The master’s degree has also demonstrated its capacity for community outreach and engagement. Vandenberg and Clary-Lemon, seeking to underscore the importance of the MA in writing, have noted the degree’s “responsiveness to local conditions” (268) and “distinctive flexibility” (275). In their view, the MA in writing is equally poised to build intra- and interdisciplinary relationships, thereby strengthening its disciplinary and institutional position. James P. Beasley explores how the qualities that Vandenberg and Clary-Lemon identify as integral to a new understanding of the MA in writing apply to the MA in English. Not only that, but Beasley shows how the dynamic interplay between

the degree and its constituencies (e.g., other disciplines, community partners, university administrators) is multidimensional. In sum, he underscores the dialogic, contextual fluidity of the MA in English and the impact it has on graduate students.

One of the most pressing literacy issues in a time of global communications is meeting the needs of second language learners. We hear this message at all educational levels. A few MA programs do offer ESL as a specialization (ADE Ad Hoc Committee 33). Still, only 39 (20 percent) of the 200 MA-level Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs in the United States reside in Departments of English, as noted by Gloria Park and Jocelyn R. Amevuvor in "An MA TESOL Program Housed in the English Department: Preparing Teacher Scholars to Meet the Demands of a Globalizing World."⁶ The others are found in Departments of Linguistics, Foreign Languages, Education, Curriculum and Instruction, even International Studies. In what ways does an MA TESOL program based in an English department distinctly shape the preparation of its graduates? How does the program support those who are not native English speakers learning how to work with diverse domestic populations but instead international, multilingual graduate students hoping to teach English and present their thesis research in their home countries? Park and Amevuvor offer insights into these questions in an analysis of their program.

As we know, there are many ways to evaluate the worth of an MA program. It can be assessed quantifiably through financial support for teaching assistantships and tuition reimbursement, graduate student job placement, even Carnegie Foundation rankings. In "When the MA Is Enough: Considering the Value of Graduate Education," Sharon James McGee, Rebecca Burns, Kisha Wells, Nancy Thurman Clemens, and Jeff Hudson explore the intrinsic benefits of a teaching of writing specialization that is part of a stand-alone program. McGee admits that when she initially imagined this chapter, she had intended to interview graduates for their input. As co-writers with McGee, these authors take on an agency and self-reflexivity missing in the reports of academics long removed from their own graduate student days. Each speaker—from a soldier teaching Afghan girls in Kabul, to a National Writing Project instructor, to an assistant professor

at a community college, to a preschool teacher now working with developmental writers—reminds us of the values an MA in English confers that we cannot quantify, such as the beauty of language in all its forms, respect for difference, the importance of literacy, and the uniqueness of human expression. While surveys and statistical data tell us that the largest number of MA graduates go into teaching, these authors demonstrate just how often graduates enter teaching environments nothing like the settings in which they were trained as teaching assistants at elite colleges or universities.

Together, the contributors to *Degree of Change* demonstrate the vibrancy and diversity of the faculty, administrators, and graduates who make the master of arts in English a degree that is at once a significant part of our educational heritage and an exciting part of our educational future. Now, as in the past, MA programs enculturate new student populations, train teachers, and provide vocational training for administrators and professionals. The essays reveal that the number of graduates entering professions other than teaching remain small. Increasing numbers are finding positions in community colleges and the field of English education; there is also a growing international demographic of graduate students who will return to teach English in their home countries. These chapters provide a vivid portrait of the diverse labor MA graduates undertake that previous reports on the status of the degree do not. At the very least, they call us to reconsider the old narrative of the MA as simply a stepping-stone to a PhD.

At the same time, challenges that the MA has traditionally met are reframed in new iterations. The creation of MA programs in writing studies and TESOL is not the only way the MA has diversified. It is not uncommon to see degree programs that offer endorsements or certificates in specialty areas to better equip graduates for marketplace demands. Yet our contributors reveal the many challenges that the shifting marketplace has created for MA programs in English. Are faculties keeping up? Are they preparing their master's students to teach in the online classroom, the diverse classroom with a majority of nonnative speakers, the economically stratified classroom? The answer is probably not.

Finally, the authors show us the ways in which the MA degree has embraced a kind of hybridity. While stand-alone programs in

literature exist, the mission and curricula of many others reflect global literacies, cross-disciplinary connections, and pedagogies sensitive to digital course delivery. These issues pose more urgency given the economic climate, the rise of international US universities, and increased demand for online education. Clearly, there is much work to do. The essays in this collection provide a road map for that future.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Patrick Thomas for his thoughtful comments, useful recommendations, and abundant goodwill in reading several iterations of this introduction.

Notes

1. On the second-place status of the MA in English, see also Allen and Duyfhuizen.

2. In 2007 the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing reported that “close to half (49.1%) of all those teaching English in colleges and universities hold a master’s as their highest degree” (qtd. in ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master’s Degree 3). This percentage (which was taken from a 2004 national study of postsecondary faculty [2004 National Study]) prompted the ADE Executive Committee to take a “hard look” at the MA (3). Ten years after these data were first released, we can presume that MA graduates represent an even greater percentage of postsecondary teachers.

3. See the 2005 special issue of *Rhetoric Review* edited by Stuart C. Brown, Monica F. Torres, Theresa Enos, and Erik Juergensmeyer devoted to MA programs in rhetoric and composition studies.

4. MA programs not attached to PhD programs are often referred to as “terminal” or, alternatively, “stand-alone.” Throughout this collection, authors use both.

5. According to the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master’s Degree, coursework in technology or digital humanities is not a requirement in more than 75 percent of the reporting MA programs (see their Table 5).

6. For a breakdown of the concentrations *within* MA-granting programs, see the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master's Degree report (33). The responses in Table 3 may reflect MAs attached to doctoral programs.

Works Cited

"Actual and Projected Numbers for Doctor's Degrees Conferred by Postsecondary Degree-Granting Institutions, by Sex of Recipient: 1995–96 through 2020–21." Table 35. *Projections of Education Statistics to 2020*. (NCES 2011-026). By William J. Hussar and Tabitha M. Bailey. Washington, DC: NCES, 2011. 75. Web. 14 Aug. 2013.

"Actual and Projected Numbers for Master's Degrees Conferred by Postsecondary Degree-Granting Institutions, by Sex of Recipient: 1995–96 through 2020–21." Table 34. *Projections of Education Statistics to 2020*. (NCES 2011-026). By William J. Hussar and Tabitha M. Bailey. Washington, DC: NCES, 2011. 74. Web. 14 Aug. 2013.

ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Master's Degree. "Rethinking the Master's Degree in English for a New Century." *Modern Language Association*. MLA, June 2011. Web. 14 Aug. 2013.

Allen, Don Cameron. "The Intermediate Degree in English." *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 1.1 (1968): 1–2. Print.

Bartlett, Anne Clark. "Is It Terminal? Re-Evaluating the Master's Degree." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 37.2 (2004): 26–29. Print.

Berelson, Bernard. *Graduate Education in the United States*. New York: McGraw, 1960. Print.

Berlin, James A. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. Print.

Brown, Stuart C., Monica F. Torres, Theresa Enos, and Erik Juergensmeyer, eds. Spec. issue of *Rhetoric Review* 24.1 (2005): 5–127. Print.

Chroniclevitalae.com. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Web. 24 Apr. 2016.

Conrad, Clifton F., Jennifer Grant Haworth, and Susan Bolyard Millar. *A Silent Success: Master's Education in the United States*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. Print.

- Dalbey, Marcia A. "What Good Is the MA Degree?" *ADE Bulletin* 112 (1995): 17–20. Print.
- Dunn, John S., Jr., and Derek N. Mueller. "Report on the 2012 Survey of Programs." *Master's Degree Consortium of Writing Studies Specialists*. Master's Degree Consortium of Writing Studies Specialists, 19 Feb. 2013. Web. 14 Feb. 2014.
- Duyfhuizen, Bernard. "Betwixt and Between: The Master's Program and a Field of Dreams." *ADE Bulletin* 112 (1995): 21–24. Print.
- Fairfield, Hannah. "Master's Degrees Abound as Universities and Students See a Windfall." *New York Times*. New York Times, 12 Sept. 2007. Web. 23 Sept. 2014.
- "Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff in Degree-Granting Institutions, by Field and Faculty Characteristics: Fall 1992, Fall 1998, and Fall 2003." Table 269. *Digest of Education Statistics 2011*. (NCES 2012-001). By Thomas D. Snyder and Sally A. Dillow. Washington: NCES, 2012. 393-94. Web. 14 Aug. 2013.
- Gaylord, Mary M. "On the Outside Looking In: Some Thoughts about the MA Degree." *PMLA* 115.5 (2000): 1267–69. Print.
- Giordano, Michael J. "Revaluing the Master's Degree." *PMLA* 115.5 (2000): 1271–73. Print.
- Glazer, Judith S. *The Master's Degree: Tradition, Diversity, Innovation*. Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1986. Print.
- Moore, Cindy, and Hildy Miller. *A Guide to Professional Development for Graduate Students in English*. Urbana: NCTE, 2006. Print.
- Parker, William Riley. "Where Do English Departments Come From?" *College English* 28.5 (1967): 339–51. Print.
- Slaughter, Shelia, and Larry L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999. Print.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004. Print.
- Steward, Doug. "The Master's Degree in the Modern Languages since 1966." *Profession* (2004): 154–77. Print.

Stimpson, Catharine R. "Graduate Education: The Nerve Center of Higher Education." *What Is College For? The Purpose of Higher Education*. Ed. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann and Harry Lewis. New York: Teachers College, 2012. 132–55. Print.

Storr, Richard J. *The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America*. New York: Arno, 1969. Print.

2004 *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003*. National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 2005-172). Washington, DC: May 2005. Web. 23 Feb. 2011.

Vandenberg, Peter, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. "Advancing by Degree: Placing the MA in Writing Studies." *College Composition and Communication* 62.2 (2010): 257–82. Print.

Wright, Erika. "Graduate Degree on the Margins: Educational and Professional Concerns of the MA Student." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 37.2 (2004): 30–36. Print.