

# 1 Introduction and Review of Research

*"This workshop was excellent."*

*"This has been the most energizing and inspiring two days I have spent. . . ."*

*"I was a little disappointed that nothing was said about 'criteria' or 'keeping up standards' or whatever informal writing, or in peer review, or in drafts."*

*"I came to this workshop with some reluctance.... However, I was happily surprised. "*

*"I learned; I enjoyed; I ate well. "*

*"I felt like [the workshop leader] didn't really understand the intensity of the problems some of us face in student journals."*

*"I am going to use informal writing in my classes."*

*"I'm all fired up about trying this, and I can see many applications for it." "The ideas are restricted by large class size."*

*"There was a lot of variation, which allows for a lot of flexibility in implementing this."*

*"I plan to start tomorrow."*

**P**erched on the edges of their chairs, faculty are writing these comments in the last few minutes of a two-day writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) workshop. Minds buzzing with stimulation, rear ends sore from sitting, belts bulging from donuts, spirits warmed by collegial communion, they write down their plans and their hopes—and sometimes their skepticism—about writing across the curriculum.

WAC began twenty-seven years ago, apparently at Central College in Pella, Iowa, where Walvoord gathered an interdisciplinary group of faculty to discuss student writing (Russell 1991; Steele 1985). Since then, thousands of faculty in institutions of higher education nationwide have similarly participated in WAC workshops, discussion groups, "fellows" programs, team-teaching programs, writing-intensive courses, linked courses, and other permutations, many of which are described in Fulwiler and Young's *Programs That Work* (1990) or McLeod and Soven's *Writing Across the Curriculum*

(1992). Perhaps a third or more of U.S. institutions of higher education have writing-across-the-curriculum programs (McLeod and Shirley 1988; Stout and Magnotto 1991). Among those institutions are the three very different ones profiled in this study—small, private Whitworth College in Spokane; comprehensive Towson State University in Maryland; and the University of Cincinnati, a large, public research institution that also includes several two-year and open-admissions colleges.

What has happened in the long run to WAC faculty within these programs? What did faculty expect from WAC when they entered into it? After two, five, or fifteen years, what have the workshops and other WAC activities meant to them? How has WAC affected their teaching philosophies, attitudes, and strategies? How has it affected their career patterns?

The authors of this book came together to try to address those questions. We are longtime directors of WAC programs or graduate assistants in those programs. Our associations go back a long way—back to 1981, when Walvoord moved to Baltimore and joined Dowling in the first five-week Summer Institute of the newly formed Maryland Writing Project; back to their shared leadership in the Baltimore Area Consortium for Writing Across the Curriculum (Walvoord and Dowling 1990); back to 1984, when McMahan joined Dowling in the Towson State University WAC program; back to 1989, when Hunt invited Walvoord to lead WAC workshops at Whitworth College in Spokane; and back to 1991, when Walvoord began directing the University of Cincinnati's WAC program, to be joined there in successive years by graduate assistants Slachman and Udel.

In 1993, Hunt proposed to Walvoord that they collaborate in collecting WAC faculty stories, building upon the collection that Hunt had already published at Whitworth. Walvoord brought in her research at the University of Cincinnati, where she and several graduate assistants had been using questionnaires, interviews, small-group discussions, syllabi, and other teaching documents to investigate WAC's impact on faculty. She also brought in research from Towson State, where Dowling had done classroom observations and written about the history of the WAC program and where McMahan had taken a sabbatical year to interview Towson WAC faculty and publish a book of their teaching strategies.

Thus, not only had we co-authors been longtime associates within the WAC community, but we each had been studying WAC outcomes and gathering WAC faculty accounts on our own campuses for a number of years. From 1993, when we decided to write this book, we gathered

further interviews and faculty-authored accounts from all three institutions.

### **Previous Studies of WAC's Impact on Faculty**

We were, of course, not the only ones who were asking, "What happens to WAC participants in the long run?"

#### **"Match-to-Sample" Studies**

One group of WAC outcome studies is what we call "match-to-sample." That is, researchers ask whether faculty, after WAC workshops, adhere to WAC beliefs or use WAC strategies, such as journals, that the *researchers* have defined as central to WAC. In other words, do faculty match the WAC-defined model or sample? The usual data are faculty questionnaires or interviews, sometimes augmented by syllabi and assignment sheets, classroom observations, or questionnaires to students about classroom practices.

An example of these match-to-sample studies is Smithson and Sorrentino's 1987 investigation of thirteen of the eighteen faculty who had attended a workshop at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. On a Likert scale, faculty indicated their agreement with WAC principles and classroom practices which the authors had formulated (e.g., "Writing cannot be used to teach concepts in the subject disciplines but only to test if concepts have been learned" [338]). This survey was administered before the workshop, immediately following the workshop, after ten weeks, and after five years. At the ten-week and five-year points, ten of the faculty also responded in writing to queries such as "Did you continue to use writing to teach your subject?" and "If you use fewer methods now than you did during your first quarter after the workshop, which ones have you dropped and how soon after the workshop did you stop using them?" These more open-ended questions still emphasize "using" or "dropping" the methods which the workshops or researchers had defined. Even five years after the workshop, the faculty reported using more of the writing strategies than they had before the workshop. Reports from 238 students in ten classes affirmed their teachers' use of methods which the researchers had defined. For example, 86 percent of the students stated that their teachers provided for peer evaluation of drafts. Students provide another source of data, but the emphasis is still on whether faculty are using researcher-defined WAC strategies.

Other studies which fall at least partially into the match-to-sample model are Goetz (1990), Kalmbach and Gorman (1986), and Hughes-Weiner and Jensen-Chekalla (1991). In this last study, holistic scoring of 1,200 student essays also revealed a small, but statistically significant, positive correlation between the number of WAC courses a student had taken and his or her essay score. Braine's 1990 study of faculty teaching writing-intensive (W-1) courses without having had WAC workshops showed that most were not using WAC strategies.

Taken as a group, these match-to-sample studies suggest that after workshops, many faculty use what WAC researchers define as WAC classroom strategies.

These findings are useful, but they exhibit several significant problems. The first is the role of the researcher. Some of the studies were conducted by the same people who directed the WAC program, yet the researchers are usually cast as neutral collectors of data. Often, they do not describe their own roles or political contexts for the study.

A second problem with the match-to-sample studies is that, within the foundationalist paradigm of this research, where researchers are supposedly finding out whether faculty *really* used the WAC strategies, faculty self-reports through surveys and even through interviews are considered weak. Eblen (1983) notes that "self-reports may blend respondents' beliefs and intentions with actual practice" (347). Actual practice is the assumed goal. However, it is possible that the beliefs and intentions are what we really need to know. For such questions, self-reports *would be* strong data.

Further, match-to-sample studies imply a perhaps overly simplistic "training" model: the workshop "trains" faculty to do something that the leaders and researchers know or assume to be good. To "prove" that WAC strategies enhance learning is problematic at best (Ackerman 1993), though a body of education research does firmly establish that interactive strategies such as having students write, responding frequently to student work, getting students involved in learning, and having students work collaboratively do enhance learning (Chickering and Gamson 1987).

A related concern is the assumption that even if WAC *is* good, the more of it faculty do and the longer they continue to do it after the workshop, the more successful the workshop is judged to have been—a rather primitive measure of effectiveness.

Match-to-sample research raises troubling issues of power. For example, who controls the creation of knowledge—the researcher or the teacher? Whose voice is privileged in the report? How are "data" produced

defined, and used? What political and social agendas, what cultural contexts, and what factors like class and gender are influencing the research? WAC workshops themselves often have striven for collegial relations in which power and "expert" roles are shared. The philosophy of the National (Bay Area) Writing Project (NWP), which has impacted many WAC programs, deliberately eschews leaders who dictate good practice and train teachers to do it. Instead, their philosophy holds that workshops tap teacher wisdom, everyone learns, and changes in practice emerge from reflection and dialogue.

The dissonance between such an egalitarian philosophy and match-to-sample research arises in an interesting way in Bratcher and Stroble's (1994) study of workshop impact on K-12 teachers. The *findings* of this study are minimally relevant to us because K-12 teachers operate within much different contexts than college faculty. But its *methodology* raises important questions. The researchers summarize the NWP's egalitarian philosophy. To them, it presents a research problem because the NWP offers no set definition of good practice. So the researchers construct one—a sophisticated version of match-to-sample, in which faculty are rated not just on whether they are *using* a particular researcher-defined strategy, but on the *degree* to which they are using it. The degrees are labeled "ideal," "acceptable," or "unacceptable" (74). The researchers have thus defined not only specific strategies but a level of use as their goal. Ironically, then, the research on NWP workshop outcomes has imposed a judgmental frame that the NWP workshop philosophy itself eschews.

A related problem with the match-to-sample model is the role of change. Match-to-sample research assumes that the workshop achieved the desired change and then the faculty member stopped changing. The more WAC strategies the faculty member is using and the longer he or she uses them, the better. There is no room in this paradigm for the faculty member to make new contributions by developing attitudes or practices not listed by the researchers' questionnaire. There is no room for the role of change suggested by the growing literature on "faculty vitality." Vitality is often defined and measured by faculty output of research, teaching, or service or by other evidence of faculty engagement, motivation, and involvement. Martin Finkelstein says, "Vital faculty are faculty who are not only motivated, but also are able to identify opportunities or potential opportunities and take advantage of them" (1993, 2). The literature on faculty vitality suggests that the most vital faculty are continually changing across their careers and that one of their

changes is to "experiment with alternative teaching strategies" (Baldwin 1993, 14). We need to ask: How might vital faculty use a WAC workshop? As a "training" experience? As a *developmental* experience? Would their subsequent changes continue to match a model that WAC researchers might construct?

Another body of research raises similar questions about the role of change for WAC faculty. Rogers (1983) and others have traced how "innovations" get "adopted." They characterize "early adopters" as people who are willing to take risks and try new things, and who are horizontally networked—that is, within the university setting, who are networked with colleagues inside and outside their disciplines. If faculty who attend WAC workshops can be classified as "early adopters," and if they come to WAC partly because they like new ideas and are not averse to taking risks, might we not assume that after WAC they might risk trying other good ideas that come to them through their broad networks? Or do we in WAC think that we have a corner on all the good ideas about teaching they would ever want to try? Do we think, as Bratcher and Stroble do, that we can identify four criteria which we consider "central" to good WAC pedagogy and then judge faculty compliance as "ideal" or "unacceptable"? Is it appropriate to have, as Bratcher and Stroble do, the stated goal of teachers' "full implementation" of *our* model (1994, 86)? If these faculty, years later, have continued to change so that they no longer conform to our model in the ways our match-to-sample tests are able to show, does this mean the workshops have failed?

These match-to-sample studies, then, raise several problems: the role of the researcher and the political uses of the research; the foundationalist assumptions that neutral researchers are finding the real truth; the role of self-reports; the training model; the assumption that researchers know what good teaching strategies are; the dynamics of power between researchers and teachers; and the issue of faculty change—its meaning, its value, and its role in WAC outcomes.

### **Open-Ended Questions about Change**

A few WAC studies have asked faculty open-ended questions about change and about WAC's role in spurring change. Such questions allow the researcher to move away from some limitations of the "match-to-sample" model. Open-ended questions also *leave to the faculty* the judgments about cause and effect that are so important to WAC leaders and so hard to establish empirically.

One study that asked faculty to identify change is that of Eble and McKeachie (1985). During the late 1970s and the 1980s, the Bush Foundation supported faculty development, including a number of WAC programs, at twenty-four institutions of higher education in Minnesota and the Dakotas. Through the use of questionnaires, Eble and McKeachie asked a random sample of faculty at these institutions the following question: "Did [the faculty development program] have an effect on teaching?" Of the 455 faculty solicited, 383 responded (an 84 percent return). Seventy-eight percent of the respondents replied, "Yes." Similar results emerged from Kalmbach and Gorman's (1986) study at Michigan Technological University and from Beaver and Deal's (1990) comparison between faculty at an institution that had an active WAC program and one that did not.

Together with the match-to-sample research, these broad questions about change suggest that faculty not only use WAC strategies, but believe that WAC has led to change and improvement in teaching and learning. However, a problem with such broad questions about change and improvement is that they lack informative detail about the complexity of classrooms and faculty lives.

### **Case Studies**

A body of case-study research offers such detail. Sipple's (1987) study, using think-aloud tapes, of how eleven workshopped and eight unworkshopped faculty planned an assignment suggested that planning by workshopped faculty included a larger, more clearly defined repertoire of strategies for planning writing assignments. Workshopped faculty used assignments to aid student learning, not just to test knowledge, and they integrated writing with learning.

A number of case studies focus on classrooms rather than on the course-planning process. They provide rich detail about the complexities teachers face when they try to use WAC strategies in the classroom. We will argue, though, that these studies often retain the problems of voice, power, and defining good, which were typical in match-to-sample studies. We will propose that a new sort of study is now needed.

One case study of WAC impact on faculty is part of a study of WAC at Radford University. Kipling and Murphy (1992) usefully portray the institutional context and the career history of several Radford University faculty. The authors' accounts of several faculty members' development over time show their struggles, resistance, questioning, adaptation, and change.

The accounts, based on faculty logs, essays, interviews, and close working relationships with the authors, are replete with faculty voices. Within that context, the point of the chapter on faculty is to show how several initially reluctant faculty became converts (our term). All the faculty are described as finally "having come to see," as the chapter's last sentence puts it, what WAC was trying to demonstrate. The influence of the "conversion story" or "testimonial" genre is evident. It is worked out through the authors' selection of which faculty to portray, through the words of the faculty themselves, and through the way the authors arrange, select, and frame the faculty stories.

The testimonial genre is also strong in various collections of faculty stories and faculty accounts of successful classroom practices, which are not always couched as research but nevertheless add to our store of knowledge about outcomes (e.g., Fulwiler and Young 1990; Parker and Goodkin 1987; Griffin 1982; Thaiss 1983; and numerous articles that can be located in ERIC by using the descriptors "writing-instruction," the name of the discipline, and "higher-education"). Sometimes these accounts present actual classroom assignment sheets, syllabi, student work, or student evaluations. Sometimes they report struggle, disappointment, change, adaptation, or abandonment of WAC strategies. Sometimes they (perhaps unwittingly) reveal mixed theories and paradigms for teaching and learning or dissonance between belief and practice. Nonetheless, they often remain largely within the conversion or testimonial frame and paint a rosy picture of how faculty have adopted WAC strategies and how well these strategies work in the classroom. Their aim is persuasion or assistance to other faculty in adopting WAC. The ones published for a wider audience are the tip of the iceberg; its underwater base is the wealth of such stories published in campus newsletters and presented at local and regional conferences.

We are not saying that these accounts are false or that genre influence is wrong. The influence of one genre or another will always be present when people tell stories. But it is important to be aware of the impact of genre influence.

Challenging the rosy findings of the testimonials has been a spate of case studies that investigate how faculty "resist" WAC beliefs and practices and/or how faculty fail to implement them so as to result in student learning. These studies have been valuable in showing the realities of the classroom context and, in some cases, representing the teacher's own voice. However, despite their seeming candor about classroom realities, we will argue that many of these case studies still privilege the

voice of the outside researcher, silence the teacher, and reflect the "match-to-sample" paradigm in which the researcher knows best and in which change is desired only in the direction the researcher defines.

One such study is by Swilky (1992), who follows two teachers during the semester after a WAC workshop. She details the suggestions she gave them and notes the ways in which they "resisted" or "adopted" what she calls "my ideas." Her practice of referring to the teachers by their first names casts their quoted words into the frame of a research subject, not a professional whose words are being cited by a scholarly colleague. She points out the dissonance between what the teacher has stated as a goal and what she, the researcher, perceives as actually happening—for example, "By maintaining this approach to responding to student texts, Robert works against his goal of assisting students. . ." (58).

However, *Robert's* views on this perceived dissonance are absent. Did he *intend* to work against his own goal? What was his reasoning? The researcher uses quotations from Robert's letters to her to illustrate "both positive and negative resistance." But the judgments about positive and negative are the researcher's. Although Swilky concludes that "different determinants, including personality, assumptions, beliefs, and institutional conditions, affect teachers' decisions about pedagogical priorities," she does not explore these determinants from the teachers' points of view, but from her own. She does not question the value or rightness of the ideas she gives to the teachers. The article is strangely split in this way, with a nod to the teachers' concerns, but with a dominant paradigm of researcher-controlled WAC orthodoxy, against which teachers are counted as "resisters." "My ideas" still form the sample that faculty are expected to match. The researcher's emphasis is on teaching methods adopted or not, rather than on the teacher's own goals and theories, the teacher's ongoing growth and change, career patterns, or ways of interpreting the data.

Similar is Swanson-Owens's (1986) case study of two high school teachers with whom she worked for a semester on a project to use writing. She constructs a model to explain the teachers' "resistances" to her "suggestions." The model posits that teachers resist because their "locus of attention" and "conditions of instruction" may be quite different from that of the WAC leader. In such circumstances, their resistance is called "natural" but still regrettable. The teachers' adaptations to the conditions and contexts of their real situations are judged as resistance to an assumed

ideal, rather than as possibly the wisest or most creative course they could take under the circumstances. The researcher's frame of reference forms the sample which the faculty members resist matching. The model explains why teachers resist, rather than how they develop.

In this group of "resistance" case studies, then, the teacher is still subtly viewed as what Norton calls the "mere implementer, deliverer" of researcher-determined, orthodox WAC teaching strategies (1994, 135). The studies focus more on why teachers resist than on why they do what they do.

Marshall (1984) investigates two high school classrooms—one in science, one in social studies—where the teachers deliberately tried to use writing for learning. The social studies teacher, Marshall concludes, largely accomplished his goals. In the science class, however, students' ways of handling the assignment subverted the teacher's goals, in Marshall's judgment. However, the *teachers'* voices, *their* judgments about their success—or about Marshall's judgment—do not enter in.

Johnstone (1994) details a college geology class where the teacher, though a strong advocate of WAC among his colleagues, does not achieve his learning goals because, the researcher judges, he does not integrate journals effectively into his class but keeps them peripheral, relying largely on lecture and multiple-choice testing. The responsibility for the classroom failure is placed squarely on the teacher. But his voice is oddly absent. We do not learn from his perspective his rationale for doing what he did, nor even whether he concurred with the researcher's judgment.

Several other case studies likewise make the point that teachers' intentions may be subverted in the classroom by students' ways of working, but they study multiple classrooms, and they draw conclusions not about what the individual teachers they studied might have done, but about what teachers in general might do to avoid the difficulties the researchers define—e.g., Marsella, Hilgers, and McLaren (1992); Nelson (1990); and Herrington (1981).

The body of case-study research, then, varies in the level of "resistance" it ascribes to the teachers and the severity of the judgments made by the researchers. What that body of research has not done, however, is to focus on why the teachers did what they did. It does not present the teachers richly to us as people who are struggling, in often complex and skillful ways, to realize their own goals and to juggle multiple constraints within the classroom.

### **A Model for Our Study**

One model for that kind of study is provided by Carneson (1994), who studies elementary and secondary school teachers in Britain. In his diagram of the model he proposes, teachers are shown working among many diverse and even conflicting forces. At the base of the diagram is the teacher's accountability to self, professional colleagues, school management, students, parents, friends, family, and community. The teacher then moves through a "framing matrix" composed of many different perspectives and theories of teaching, not just those of a particular project like WAC. Finally, in the classroom, with all its constraints and stimuli, teachers try to maximize control over elements that are in turn controlling them. In contrast to Swilky's and Swanson-Owens's focus on "resistance" to WAC, Carneson's model focuses on why the teacher does what she or he does. It recognizes that teachers often have very sensible reasons for decisions and are motivated by multiple, powerful loyalties. There's a recognition that teachers are deeply rooted in their own pasts, that they have philosophies, outlooks, investments that shape their use of new ideas. The researcher attempts to illuminate the reasons, goals, and principles that guide teachers' actions and development.

Hargreaves (1988), who also works in K-12 settings, notes the preponderance of "transmission" teaching that relies on lecture and keeps students passive. Most current theories about why transmission teaching is so widespread are "psychologistic," says Hargreaves—that is, they blame teachers' personal qualities or lack of competence; proposed remedies are better selection of teachers and better teacher training. But Hargreaves counters with what he calls a "sociological" explanation for the dominance of "transmission" teaching:

The framework I want to propose rests upon a regard for the importance of the active, interpreting self in social interaction; for the way it perceives, makes sense of and works upon the actions of others and the situation in which it finds itself; the way it pursues goals and tries to maximize its own (often competing) interests; the way it pursues these things by combining or competing with other selves; the way it adjusts to circumstances while still trying to fulfil or retrieve its own purposes—and so forth. In this view, teachers, like other people, are not just bundles of skill, competence and technique; they are creators of meaning, interpreters of the world and all it asks of them. They are people striving for purpose and meaning in circumstances that are usually much less than ideal and which call for constant adjustment, adaptation, and redefinition. Once we

adopt this view of teachers or of any other human being, our starting question is no longer why does he/she *fail* to do X, but why does he/she do Y. What purpose does doing Y fulfill for them? Our interest, then, is in how teachers manage to cope with, adapt to and reconstruct their circumstances; it is in what they achieve, not what they fail to achieve. (216)

Hargreaves's theory of teacher change is made more explicit later in his article:

All teaching takes place in a context of opportunity and constraint. Teaching strategies involve attempts at realizing educational goals by taking advantage of appropriate opportunities and coping with, adjusting to, or redefining the constraints. (219)

To Hargreaves's concept that teachers seek to realize educational goals, Raymond, Butt, and Townsend add the teacher's goal of creating a self:

The process of teacher development has to be understood in relation to personal sources, influences, issues and contexts. While changes in status and institutional mandates provide both possibilities for, and limitations to, . . . development, there is also a deeper, more personal struggle to carve a . . . *self*... Professional development is, in this sense, an enactment of a long process of creating *self*, of making and living out the consequences of a biography. (1992, 149)

The WAC studies we have reviewed work from a much more limited and researcher-defined notion of teacher change and development. They tend to assume that the only change teachers should make is steady change toward WAC-defined ideals. Such a theory is formally proposed in Bratcher and Stroble's (1994) study of sixty-nine elementary and high school teachers, mentioned earlier. Bratcher and Stroble explain their teachers' failure to fully adopt WAC strategies through a developmental model of teacher change. They claim that the teachers they studied through questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations showed "selective and gradual" implementation of WAC strategies. During the three years that followed their workshops, the teachers moved unevenly, but a general direction emerged. The teachers began with attention to prewriting, planning, and publication opportunities for their students. Then they moved to a fuller focus on rhetorical stance and on student choice and

input. Not until later (and at lower percentages) did the teachers attend to revision. The researchers link the teachers' uneven development to their "anxieties and uncertainties" which "blocked their complete implementation of the new paradigm" (83). The "full classroom implementation" of WAC strategies defined by the researchers remains the ideal (86). The researchers fear that teachers "will selectively adopt writing process instructional strategies in ways that fail to honor the paradigm on which these strategies are based" (73). They believe their study shows that full implementation may take longer than expected. We might term this the Pilgrim's Progress model of faculty change, where the researcher measures progress toward a researcher-defined good practice, and the theory of change tries to account for the lack of full implementation. What Swilky and Swanson-Owens called "resistance," Bratcher and Stroble recast as part of a slow and uneven progression toward the goal of "complete implementation."

To summarize so far, there have been three major bodies of WAC outcomes research. One involves match-to-sample surveys based largely on faculty self-reports, augmented at times by other data. That body of research suggests that at least some faculty use WAC strategies after workshops. But that research raises serious questions about the role of the researcher, the value of faculty self-report, the "training" model, who defines what is "good" practice, power in the teacher-researcher relationship, and the meaning and value of faculty change.

In a second type of study, the change issue is addressed by a few studies that query faculty directly through open-ended questions about change and improvement. Most studies suggest that faculty believe workshops have contributed to change and improvement in teaching and learning.

A third major body of research is case studies. They are valuable in showing the complexity of classroom situations. Some are cast in the "testimonial" frame, showing how faculty moved through resistance to adoption. Some show faculty resisting WAC strategies, a useful corrective to undue optimism. But though they provide valuable detail about the complexities of classrooms, these resistance studies, we argue, still assume the match-to-sample paradigm—the researcher defines what is good practice, and the focus of the study is to discover why that good practice was not implemented. Resistance is explained by situational factors that make resistance "natural" or even "positive" or by a regrettably slow and uneven pattern of development toward the ideal. But the ideal remains "complete implementation" of the WAC-defined agenda. Teachers' voices are silenced or contained within narrow, researcher-framed molds. The focus, in Hargreaves's words, is on why faculty do not do X, not on why they do Y.

All three groups of studies, we believe, ignore teachers' "wisdom of practice" (Hutchings 1993, 64); their "practitioner knowledge" (North 1987); the power of their personal vision for their students and themselves (Nyquist 1993); and their right to determine the path of their own career-long development. Further, as McCarthy and Fishman say, "We believe that educational research has too long focused on teachers' supposedly reproducible behaviors while excluding their voices" (1991, 422).

Current education research is moving strongly in this direction, with K-12 studies here and in Great Britain taking the lead (see, e.g., Constable et al. 1994; Hargreaves and Fullan 1992). We believe that WAC outcomes research needs to be informed by these forces.

McCarthy and Fishman's collaborative work, published during a span of several years, provides an example, we believe, of the kind of case study the field needs. In several articles, McCarthy, a writing specialist, and Fishman, a philosopher significantly influenced by WAC, examine Fishman's teaching as it grows and changes over several years (Abbott et al. 1992; Fishman 1985, 1989, 1993; Fishman and McCarthy 1992, 1995; McCarthy 1991; McCarthy and Fishman 1991; 1996). What emerges is the story of a teacher's journey whose outcome the writing specialist does not pretend to know or control, but for which she, and their interaction, provide a rich resource. (Models for such collaboration are described by McCarthy and Walvoord [1988] and by Cole and Knowles [1993].) McCarthy, the researcher, watches keenly and collects data as this fascinating development unfolds. Each collaborator learns from the other. Readers of their accounts learn the complexity of the human journey and share Fishman's reasoning about his classes. Readers also come to understand how Fishman balances conflicting needs, adapts ideas he reads or hears, seizes opportunities, juggles constraints, shapes goals and changes them, combines paradigms and philosophies, but always insists upon his own right to determine what is "good" for him and his classroom.

In one of their articles, Fishman and McCarthy (1992) challenge the fear, expressed by Bratcher and Stroble, that partial implementation of WAC strategies will break the strategies loose from the paradigms that underlie them. Bratcher and Stroble seem to want the classroom to operate unpolluted, within only one paradigm. McCarthy and Fishman argue that Fishman's classroom is a place where different paradigms powerfully interact, shift, change, and develop. Throughout this body of work, Fishman's story leaps from the page in his own powerful words and in McCarthy's observations. His story defies the boundaries of easy generalization; it does not match a sample.

Another case study where teachers' voices enter as co-authors, and their *growth* rather than their resistance or conversion becomes the focus, is a study of four college classrooms by Walvoord and McCarthy (1991) and their college-level teacher collaborators from four disciplines. The teachers, all former WAC workshop participants, collaborated with the outside researchers to study the "difficulties" that arose in classrooms where WAC workshop ideas were being implemented in various ways. The point of the study is not "resistance" in the teachers, but the mutual efforts of teacher and outside researcher to learn what is happening in the classroom and to make pedagogical changes of the teacher's own choosing. The writers suggest that WAC methods discussed in a workshop may work more or less effectively in actual classrooms and that classroom research is one way for the teacher to gain fuller insight upon which to base further pedagogical changes. In the biology classroom, Anderson, the teacher, and Walvoord, the researcher, trace over four years Anderson's pedagogical changes and the subsequent rise in the quality of students' scientific experiments and reports. (Another, differently authored study of Anderson's classroom, focusing on how she manages issues of gender, presents another "take," reminding us of the many viewpoints from which the same classroom may be viewed [see Maher and Tetreault 1994].)

The work of Walvoord, McCarthy, Fishman, Anderson, and their colleagues moves along a spectrum toward investigation not of the "success" of particular WAC-defined agendas, but generally of how teachers change over time, of what factors influence those changes, and of how particular events such as a WAC workshop fit into personal journeys, into broader institutional contexts, and into career-long growth patterns—of why teachers do Y, not why they fail to do X.

### **Our Approach**

We wanted our study to continue this progression. We wanted to get back to some of the large populations of the earlier match-to-sample studies so that we could move beyond individual case studies to see general trends in WAC workshop participants over time. But we wanted to transcend the imposition of a WAC orthodoxy presumed to be good and the adoption of researcher-defined teaching strategies or

beliefs as the measure of success. We did not want to interpret teacher change as "resistance" or as regrettably slow and incomplete progress toward "complete implementation" of our agenda. Rather, we wanted to understand WAC's role in teacher-directed, multifaceted, career-long development, driven by the teacher's struggle to define a self, to balance constraints, to maintain control, and to realize educational objectives in ways consonant with that teacher's own personal vision and wisdom of practice.

We did not begin with this desire fully articulated. But, through years of various investigations of WAC outcomes on our campuses, we have moved more and more deliberately toward this vision. We have attempted to listen to faculty in new ways. We invite our readers to listen with us. For that reason, we have tried to pack the present volume with teachers' voices, teachers' stories. We think the present volume will help answer our research questions—what did faculty expect from WAC, what did WAC experiences mean to faculty, and how has WAC affected their teaching and their careers? We think this book will give teacher readers useful classroom ideas, as our faculty tell specifically what has worked for them. The stories tell in teachers' own words the patterns of their lives and thoughts as they struggle to grow across the span of their careers, to realize their own potential and that of their students, and to reflect on what WAC has meant to them in the long run.