The Historical Context During the 1964-1984 Period of the National Writing Project: Its Importance to the Fields of Rhetoric, Composition, and Teacher Education

Kay Lester Mooy

University of Texas at El Paso, kmooy@utep.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, and the Rhetoric Commons

Recommended Citation

https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/2144

This is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

KAY LESTER MOOY

Department of English

APPROVED:

Evelyn Posey Ph.D., Chair

Katherine Mangelsdorf, Ph.D.

John Daresh, Ph.D.

Benjamin C. Flores, Ph.D.

Interim Dean of the Graduate School
Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family members who literally were the wind beneath my wings including my loving husband, Bruce Mooy; supportive son and daughter-in-law, Bruce and Diana Mooy; and my sisters, Margie Lester Crawford (deceased) and Mary Lester Malott. The inspiration for all I do has always been my mother, Alta McFall Lester (deceased). Shared love makes any work lighter.

Eleanor Roosevelt once said “The future belongs to those who believe in the beauty of their dreams.” I have faltered, but so very many times all of these wonderful people, legions of friends, and professionals have picked me up and put me back together again. Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez, Jeannie Johnston, and Scott White were part of the brigade who worked through problems with me in order to make me whole again as a teacher, friend, and knowledge seeker. It took a village to keep this dissertation process going, regroup occasionally to address life issues, and then to go forward once again. I will always be grateful to so many people for helping me believe in the beauty of my own dreams.

Lastly, this dissertation is dedicated to my students throughout the years. I always put the student first and my own work second. They deserve only the very best teacher they can have every day of their educational careers. Thank you for trusting me Marc, Valene, Jason, and so many more.
THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT DURING THE 1964-1984 PERIOD OF THE
NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT: ITS IMPORTANCE TO THE FIELDS OF
RHETORIC, COMPOSITION, AND ENGLISH EDUCATION

by

KAY LESTER MOOY, B.A., M.A.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at El Paso
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
May 2012
Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge all the educators who worked with me and taught me to believe in the beauty of my own dreams, who supported me in this long endeavor. These educators specifically include Dr. Evelyn Posey, Dr. Katherine Mangelsdorf, and Dr. John Daresh who served on my dissertation committee. Dr. Posey brought me to the edge of completion and still gave tirelessly to help me finish this work which is close to each of us personally. Dr. Mangelsdorf, taught me to persevere in whatever strife I encountered. Dr. Daresh gave me the gift of his knowledge as a sage educator who taught me to be more succinct and clear. Other University of Texas at El Paso administrators and teachers attended to my educational needs by teaching me that success is possible including College of Liberal Arts Dean Patricia Witherspoon, Dr. Lawrence Johnson, Dr. Carl Jackson, Dr. Helen Foster, Dr. Robert Wren, Dr. Bruce Lawson, and so many other wonderful professors whom I could not list entirely, but whose contributions are etched on my heart, mind, and soul. Each opened closed doors within my educational experiences and challenged me to read, think, and write about the wide world beyond those closed doors in my mind.

To Ruby Bernstein, Mary Kay Healy, Albert “Cap Lavin, Miles Myers, David Schwalm, and Mary Ann Smith; I owe gratitude for participating in this lengthy research Project with me. Without them, eyewitnesses to the founding of the Project, I would not have the core of information to make this Project not only a testimonial to their knowledge and teaching skill, but also unique as told from six different perspectives. I would be remiss if I did not recognize the generosity and support of the National Writing Project headquarters staff who allowed me access to James Gray’s archives. I never met James Gray, but without his vision and drive, this research would have never happened. I also want to acknowledge two special people who helped me with editing: Dr. Hector Carbajal and MA student Matthew Harding. Dr. Posey, thank you for accompanying me to the end; and Dr. Mangelsdorf, thank you for getting me through so many years. I wish to acknowledge the first teacher who recognized my thirst for
knowledge, Mr. Tilton, who taught me in the fourth grade. My gratitude will always be rooted in the fundamentals of my love of journalism planted by my high school journalism advisor, Mr. Cecil T. Tresslar, when I served on my high school newspaper as reporter, page editor, and editor-in-chief so many years ago.
Abstract

The Historical Context of the National Writing Project (NWP) is a broad inquiry into the core values and importance of theory-driven pedagogical “best practices.” This dissertation situates the teaching of writing within societal changes as well as changes in the disciplines. The researcher interviewed six primary sources (all participants in the first summer institute of the NWP) in a total of nine interviews. The research also reviews secondary sources and examines the personal documents of Gray twice, once before they were archived and once after archival procedures were begun. Results indicate that in the early days of the NWP theory was at the core of “best practice” demonstration lessons prepared by the master teachers involved in the first summer institute through eyewitness documentation by the early participants in the interview process or in later documents of James Gray, founder and first director of the NWP. Based on the results of this research, the NWP core values were discovered by investigating teachers’ knowledge base through primary, secondary, and archival sources which are rich in context and meaning.

This dissertation situates the teaching sources which are rich in context and meaning. The process of identifying the authority of teachers to base their classroom practices on experience leads this research through the history of writing processes. The research is grounded in the expressivist, the cognitivist, and process-over-product writing theoretical stances, traced through their development and interconnecting ideologies. The results provide proof that the long term product of teaching and writing movements was and continues to be fluctuating to meet societal changes that require adaptive postures by educators. Importantly, this research examines the underpinning of the theory which provides strength to the daily “best practices” teachers use in the teaching of writing, especially in the NWP by master experienced teachers sharing their practices with other master teachers. In the fields of rhetoric, composition, and teacher education, the phrase Gray used as his memoir title, Teachers at the Center is just as important now as it was for NWP founder James Gray.
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Chapter 1: The National Writing Project in Historical and Cultural Context

Introduction

The National Writing Project (NWP) history began in the Graduate School of Education at the University of California Berkeley, (UC Berkeley), where James Gray and his colleagues established a university-based program for K–16 teachers called the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP). At first, the Project was called neither the NWP nor the BAWP, but eventually these terms were adopted. Gray, a teacher educator in the teacher credentialing program at UC Berkeley and former high school English teacher, was motivated to create a different form of professional development for teachers, one that made central the knowledge, leadership, and “best practices” of effective teachers who were the experts in the field of teaching writing which promoted the sharing of that knowledge with other teachers. In partnership with school districts, BAWP created a range of professional development services for teachers and schools interested in improving the teaching of writing and the use of writing as a learning tool across the curriculum. The structure of the first writing Project site’s programs formed the basis of the NWP’s “teachers-teaching-teachers” model of professional development. Over two million teachers have participated in the summer institutes through the years.

The NWP’s basic belief is that it is crucial that practicing teachers teach other teachers because they are actively involved in the classroom on a daily basis and as such are the experts in the field of teaching writing. The model for the summer institute, a five week intensive program, and for in-service teaching programs combines principles of writing and theories of teaching through demonstrating successful “best practices” of experienced teachers.

Despite the wide implementation of the NWP, little research has been done on its core programs, motivations, and aims from outside the organization. This study examines the early
years to discover why it was created and the philosophy/theory that drove its creators to construct a new vehicle for improving a faulty system that blamed the students for low SAT scores rather than looking for a solution that involved supporting the teachers. The NWP’s basic tenet is that it is crucial that practicing teachers teach other teachers of writing at all grade levels, primary through university, and in all subjects. The mission of the NWP is to improve students’ classroom and overall writing achievement by improving the teaching of writing and improving learning in the nation’s schools.

The NWP remains a network of university based sites. There are nearly 200 local sites that make up the NWP network hosted by universities and colleges. The NWP is co-directed by faculty from local universities and from K–12 schools, with local sites in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The entities involved in these partnerships with area school districts aim to offer high-quality professional writing development programs for educators. The NWP was the only federally funded program that focused on the teaching of writing when it first received federal funds in 1991. Reading is Fundamental, Teach for America, and The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards programs received funding later. President Obama deleted most of this federal funding for all the writing programs in 2010 but partially restored funds to the NWP in 2012.

NWP sites share a model adhering to a set of shared principles and practices for teachers’ professional writing and teaching development. Each site has a leadership cadre of local teachers (teacher-consultants) trained at invitational summer institutes. NWP sites design, and deliver, customized in-service writing programs for local schools, districts, and higher education institutions. Support for the NWP is provided by the U.S. Department of Education,
foundations, corporations, universities, and K-12 schools. The core principles at the foundation of NWP’s national program model include:

- Teachers at every level—from kindergarten through college—are the agents of reform; universities and schools are ideal partners for investing in that reform through professional development. Writing can and should be taught, not just assigned, at every grade level.

- Professional development programs should provide opportunities for teachers to work together to understand the full spectrum of writing development across grades and across subject areas.

- Knowledge about the teaching of writing comes from many sources: theory and research, the analysis of practice, and the experience of writing. Effective professional development programs provide frequent and ongoing opportunities for teachers to write and to examine theory, research, and practice together systematically.

- There is no single right approach to teaching writing; however, some practices prove to be more effective than others. A reflective and informed community of practice is in the best position to design and develop comprehensive writing programs.

- Teachers who are well informed and effective in their practice can be successful teachers of other teachers as well as partners in educational research, development, and implementation. Collectively, teacher-leaders are the greatest resource for educational reform. (NWP 1)
It is notable that the first principle in this list includes the college level because the NWP, which is often referred to as for teachers of K-12, is truly for K-through university. The NWP extends through university writing experiences and does not stop at twelfth grade.

Research Questions

Targeted research questions help to identify the pertinent information I harvest from interviews, secondary sources, and archival materials that are important to the teaching of writing and the goals of the NWP. I do this by following the threads of the following research questions to map the terrain of the primary, secondary, and archival records. I touch base with these main research objectives throughout this dissertation which ground my research and guide my report on the Project’s history and importance.

- Why are the historical beginnings of the NWP important to acknowledge?
- Who were the main stakeholders in the NWP’s formative years and what were their roles in the NWP?
- What was the educational background and training of these stakeholders?
- What theory or theories of writing influenced these stakeholders?
- What were the cultural and societal aspects in the founding of the NWP?
- What were their aims, ambitions, and motivations in founding the Project?
- How was the NWP innovative at the time of its founding?

Historical Context and the Importance of Acknowledging It

It was a time of change from 1964-1984, a time of challenge, a time for action in this country across societal strata. The anti-war movements, dropouts from society and the school systems, and challenges to the educational norms were electric and sparked distrust of authority.
New methods for reaching the students had to come forward or SAT tests, college entrance exams, and the growing failure rates of students in university First Year Composition courses would increase even more than had already happened by 1974 (Gray *The Rise and Fall of National Test Scores* 1). There was once again a declared literacy crisis much like the one written about during the late nineteenth century, caused by the linguistic social anxieties in the United States of that time (Miller *Textual* 45). In the 1960s, the literacy crisis discussions were occurring at all educational levels but it was more prominently noticed when students passed to university from high school. One of the first problems that I examine in this study is the reality of the public and media claim of a literacy crisis. In light of the societal changes taking place, what change evolved because of this supposed crisis? In preliminary research, I found that some of the interviewees mention the NWP as a response to a literacy crisis and questioned if this type of crisis was not truly a cyclical myth of the educational community or as some of these authors believed was a manufactured crisis. If something happens concerning the youth in society as a whole, the general public seems to turn to the educational community to find reasons for the phenomena or place blame. Whether there was a true literacy crisis or only a perceived crisis, the teaching of writing was reformed and investigated because of the public attention to test scores falling and the need for perceived remediation at the university level. Tracing and acknowledging the historical context of the NWP becomes important to current scholars who also reside in a particular time and space and face issues that often reflect their own societal and cultural issues. In order to be responsive to needed changes in teaching and writing programs, one must be aware of the impact context has on teaching. Any leaders of programs or reform movements work from their own locations in time and space as the original founders of the NWP did. By reviewing the methods and climate that the NWP grew out of, current educators may
find a suggestion that would guide their own teaching pedagogy changes. Change is hard to implement no matter where or when it happens. The changes faced by the leaders of this Project can serve to highlight current issues associated with perceived literacy crises.

The Project first started in 1974 during the media outcry about problems in reading and writing; “Why Johnny Can't Write” stories began to appear in the nation's press. The writing deficit of Johnny was the cover story and featured article in *Newsweek* in 1975. The educational setting of this time registered both low and high points for writing education in this country. Test scores challenging writing proficiency brought forth pre-university writing instruction criticism, but that negativity in turn elicited some strong responses such as the NWP as positive responses. That summer, Gray gathered a group of educators from all levels and backgrounds and then put into action radically new ideas about teacher education—that included experienced, successful classroom teachers teaching other teachers their “best practices” in the classroom. Possibly, Gray’s plan for how to fix poor Johnny appeared as subversive to established practices and theory of the time, but the plan was actually in tune with the expressivists, cognitivists, and the process movement in writing theory which were operant at that time in writing classrooms. Research money was available in the field of reading but not in writing and no sections of the huge annual conference of the Modern Language Association targeted the teaching of writing (Gray and Sterling 1).

Gray and his colleagues felt a need for change in institutional approaches to teaching due to dismal testing scores for entering students at the college level (*The Rise and Fall of National Writing Test Scores* 1). Many students were not allowed to enter standard First Year Composition courses. Increasing numbers of entering students because of low scores on qualifying essays were placed in remedial courses. Instead of blaming students, this group of
educators looked inside the classroom processes and put forward the idea that problems could be solved by providing support directly to the teachers. The very first issue of *College Composition and Communication (CCC)* in 1950 had a section on the schism between high school and college-level writing and this was still the prevailing attitude in the sixties. David Schwalm, a lecturer at the first summer institute in rhetorical processes within the classroom and an early leader in the NWP, felt that in many ways, the teacher empowerment and dissemination features of the BAWP were more important than any particular theory of composition. According to Schwalm, BAWP was addressing the problem that most K-12 writing teachers received no training whatsoever in the teaching of writing. However, BAWP emerged at about the same time as “open admissions” was having a significant impact on the teaching of writing at public universities and at the community colleges then emerging as post secondary opportunities for many “new” students who had not been seen in college before. “By the early 70s, this was already starting the transformation of First Year Composition (FYC) from being a “barrier” course to being an “enabling” course—that is, from a course designed to see if students could write to a course dedicated to helping them learn to write” (Schwalm Interview 7). The key learning-centered insight into teaching writing at this time was the notion that writing was a reiterative process (Schwalm Interview 7). While this may seem a little simplistic and banal now, Schwalm is convincing when speaking about this major breakthrough mainly because it focused on the “student” (8). Furthermore, Schwalm says that even in that first summer institute, learner/learning centered approaches dominated the BAWP, which eventually become epitomized as “process” approaches. And in those early years, BAWP and NWP appeared to concentrate on disseminating learner/learning centered teaching of writing, especially what were called process approaches (Interview 2).
In *Fragments of Rationality*, Lester Faigley wrote of the myriad of ways that 1960s and 1970s cultural upheaval impacted English departments, in particular, the conferral of educational authority to students. According to Faigley, books like Vance Packard’s *The Naked Society* and Edward Friedenberg’s *Coming of Age in America* portrayed education as learning toward conformity and order even in the 1950s and 1960s, indicating that something was wrong in our country “in the midst of capitalistic prosperity of American confidence” (Faigley 56). Friedenberg’s publication highlights, according to Faigley that “the core assumptions of American education are based on conformity and order rather than individualism and creativity. His portrait of the American schools was that of a prison” (Faigley 56). Both authors paint a mental picture of a failing educational system, which envelops students in straight jackets made from restraint, conformity, and order of society’s making.

Furthermore, Faigley believes “The Port Huron Statement,” the first expression of student radicalism from the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was “as a breath of fresh air” (56). Within the ‘Port Huron Statement” is the following statement that “It is the potential that we regard as crucial [for freedom of expression] and to which we appeal—not to the human potentiality for violence, unreason, and submission to authority” (Students for a Democratic Society 236). The sometimes radical group in their belief system and its actions were negatively received but the line from the statement quoted above vow that the SDS was not organized or planned to neither become violent nor refuse to obey authority figures.

The founding members of the BAWP made a collaborative effort to offer “teachers a program unlike any other they had experienced. The BAWP vision moved to improve writing in the schools by creating a new model for continuing education, one that recognized the expertise, knowledge and leadership potential of classroom teachers” (Gray and Sterling 1). This new
Project intended to broaden and liberate the educational stance on writing and learning that organizations like the SDS were calling for in that cultural era. To this day, the NWP calls for innovation and redirecting education through reform.

In the period prior to Gray’s first group meeting for the writing Project platform, little writing was going on in the schools and little was written by students at home. James Britton also documented this same result in his research in England. “An academic whose field of interest was rhetoric was frequently regarded as a pariah by his colleagues” (Gray and Sterling 1). Janice Lauer also uses the term “pariah” to describe the attitude that existed about early Rhetoric and Writing Studies people in universities during the 1960s (253). There were not any accredited programs for writing teachers other than continuing education and summer school courses for practicing teachers. What did exist, for example the National Defense Education Act English Institutes of the late 60s, was all based on traditional “top-down” summer school models. However, those models did not focus on writing. Prior to the NWP, professors lectured the teachers who listened but did not actively participate in group work or teaching practices. These programs were offered mostly by schools of education not by rhetoric and composition people (Gray Teachers 35). Innovative and reformist ideas such as sharing classroom practices and demonstration lessons, at the center of the Project’s model, were not encouraged nor were any programs continued throughout the regular school year. Moreover, teachers were contextually at the bottom of the hierarchical totem pole of educational policy makers. Their voices were seldom asked for or heard. Those who were not teaching in the classrooms made decisions on curriculum, instruction, and staffing. Gray and his group of associates wanted to teach differently by making changes, and they did. That sometimes “meant turning past models and worn-out traditions upside down” (Gray and Sterling 1-2). This challenging attitude toward
standard models that Gray spoke about is still the same style used today in the NWP as the way to make school reform possible and effective.

Purpose of the Study

This research traces the early history of the NWP (1964-1984) within a framework of educational reform and theory articulated by participants in the NWP’s first years. It investigates how a small group of innovative educators spanning all levels of education came together across curriculum barriers, across theoretical stances, and across individual practices to focus on a new approach to classroom writing and teaching. In-service, teacher education, and research played primary roles in this group’s conception of how to approach writing. The content of student writing moved to the front of the classroom and basic skills took a backseat. This research explores the historical educational background that led to this innovation, and what eventually became the NWP, which started as a local group in the Bay Area of California and responded to real problems in our educational system. The research for this information is situated at the crossroads of theory and practice. To examine the historical background of the NWP, it is necessary not only to identify the writing theory and processes in place (at the beginning, in the progression of years, and currently) but also to contextualize those theories and processes. Theory standing alone often lacks practical applications and clear understandings for those who have to put it to use in the classroom. However, theory and practice are married with the NWP’s model teacher learning links to student learning. The Project combines networks, professional communities, and teacher learning in synergistic relationships. This model is the backbone around which the Project builds its ideas and brings change to teacher training to improve classroom performance by students. Local teachers provide in-service to other local teachers on an as needed basis and receive the funds generated by these programs to launch more in-service
and teaching programs. Rhetoricians including Britton, Moffett, and Christiansen were identified by Gray and by the interview subjects for this research; however, most of them seldom use the word theory. “best practices” are the words found in Gray’s memoir and in many of the individual interview transcripts. I assert that theory must underpin “best practices.”

My research uncovers and describes the theory that was operant in the sixties and early seventies. Moreover, this research covers the basics of theorists outside the writing field, but mostly draws on notes in Gray’s archives and the primary research data collected from the subjects I interviewed. The basic tenets of B.F. Skinner’s behaviorism and Piaget’s learning theory were the driving forces during the late 1960’s in the schools. I review these two influential researchers and research on writing theory prevalent at that time. Myers, the self-described business managing partner with Gray, said that those two, Piaget and Skinner, were not applicable to the English program that grew to be the NWP (Interview One 2). Myers discusses Skinner in the first chapter of a book edited by Myers and Gray as an example of the behaviorists answer to the question of what do students do when they write. Myers claims that behavioral theorists say “The student repeats reinforced behavior” (Myers and Gray Theory 5).

Myers says “Skinner sees language as one of many pieces of human behavior, all capable of analysis as a sequence of stimulus-response-reinforcement, with consideration of intention and meaning” when one seeks causes of behavior (5). This appears to me to be a contradiction of Myer’s interview response assertion that Skinner and Piaget were not concerned with writing but were simply psychology theorists.

I know that I bring my own bias to this study since there is no completely “objective” history. One of my research resources says that good research “should maximize objectivity and minimize researcher subjectivity, values and emotions” (K. Smith 52) while Wolcott says every
researcher sometimes has subjectivity creep into his or her work (26). This historical research is an account of events that several participants experienced and remember differently or approached differently. With this research, I strive to challenge the givens or truths previously held about the historical path that developed the NWP as presented in literature by Gray and by later writers. The existing cultural context or sub-cultural influence was one idea that this research Project explores as one of the core values of the NWP founders.

Significance of the Research

This research will increase understanding of this major and influential program. My archival research and interviews with NWP founders provides information that will help other scholars build upon the findings concerning the ties between the theoretical underpinnings of the NWP and the practices that it led to. I will emphasize the phrase that Gray chose as the title of his own memoir, *Teachers at the Center*.

This research examines the motivations, aims, and backgrounds of participants in the founding of the Project in order to understand the program in its historical context. Despite the impact that the NWP has had on education, there’s little scholarship on its origins from an outside source. By offering a different terministic screen (a term that Burke used when talking about each audience member’s biases, beliefs, and opinions affecting their interpretation of a work), observations by someone outside the Project help to expand the research of those involved within the Project (Burke 44). Outside critique is important to public institutions. My own situation as a student at the University of Texas at El Paso allows me a measure of objectivity as a researcher. Although I worked as a staff member in the West Texas Writing Project, my position was limited so I was neither involved with core issues of the Project nor responsible for implementing the model’s theory and “‘best practices’.” When I attended the
summer institute, my position was that of an outsider studying the Project to fulfill an intern course requirement for my doctorate. I was there but somewhat distanced still.

This research focuses on the original group of NWP teacher consultants and administrators, as well as the important archival documents. It adds to our knowledge of the NWP by adding the voices of those who were instrumental in the founding or who were participants and eye-witnesses. These people include some of the first teachers who were invited to participate as scholars, as well as the subsequent leaders of the NWP the first institute and later leaders of the NWP. This research is the first archival and eye-witness gathering of information together in one document.

Rhetoric as a field of study maintains that everything is contextual. In that light, the educational context in those early years was important to understanding the NWP. So what was the cultural context of the NWP in its formative years? This research places the revolution and innovation in the particular time when the NWP was organized by examining the original documents in the NWP files of James Gray and by analyzing interviews with important early figures of the NWP. This research provides insights into the original Project leaders’ goals of writing education that were shaped by the social context in which they were educated and in which they taught others. Their implementation of those ideas grew into today’s organization and still influence programs sponsored by the NWP.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 1: The National Writing Project in Historical and Cultural Context

This chapter provides a general overview and background of the National Writing Project and its founders’ beliefs concerning the need for innovation in the teaching of writing. It also
provides some introductory biographical information on the Project’s founders and their collaborative efforts in developing the Project.

Chapter 2: Documents from NWP and Relevant Theoretical Stances

This chapter includes a comprehensive review of relevant literature which addresses the same reforms and ideas that the NWP valued.

Chapter 3: Examining the NWP through Proven Research Methods

This chapter describes more fully the methodology used in this study and cites the sources of the methodology.

Chapter 4: Winds of Change in Education Provided the Foundation of the NWP

This chapter provides the results and an interpretation of the data from the interviews completed by the participants and primary leaders during the early years of the NWP. It also includes a re-examination of James Gray’s role in the organization based on archival research of his personal files to provide some useful insights and empirical observations by the founder concerning the need for the NWP and its intended impact in the classroom. This chapter also traces the historical course of the early years of the NWP and the impact they have had on writing in general and on the NWP’s evolution and how it reached such prominence today. Chapter IV also contains information about the importance of the NWP’s participants’ pedagogy and NWP’s basic tent that teachers should teach other teachers.

Chapter 5: Implications and New Directions for the Future

This chapter provides a summary of the research, salient conclusions, and recommendations for teachers who have already participated in the NWP as well as for those
who are contemplating such participation. It also looks at the NWP’s recent loss and partial reinstatement of federal funding and what that may mean to the Project in the future.
Chapter 2: Documents from the NWP and Theoretical Stances

Review of the Relevant Literature

James Gray’s analysis of the National Writing Project (NWP) in *Teachers at the Center* is a very personal memoir of his growth as an educator as well as the Project’s inception and growth. The NWP does not have a true historical document representing its founding and early years of development other than Gray’s own work. Gray was very close to his topic of the NWP as he invested much of his life to that group’s conception, implementation, and growth, so objectivity may be a problematic issue in his book. His is a strong knowledgeable voice; however, this research Project adds the voices of others who were instrumental in the founding as participants and eyewitnesses.

Lieberman and Wood do some excellent reviews of the NWP also. However, much of their work is more modern with a focus on the current Project and does not provide the historical theoretical NWP foundations for the most part. They did at least one historical timeline which I use in this investigation to supplement the material I obtained personally from interviews and Gray’s archives. The research for this Project is confined to a short span of time (twenty years), starting in 1964, pertaining to the years just before the conception of the NWP and extends covers only to 1984, which makes it located within a framework of its historical contextual beginnings, including the influence of the expressivists, cognitivists, writing process movement, and cultural studies. I document how each of these movements built on one another as foundational platforms of the NWP.

What is each of these movements? Expressivism asks an author to find his own voice, to be authentic, and it emphasizes writing naturally. Cognitivism, as used by psychologists in the 1950s, is a response to the tenets of behaviorism that Piaget and Skinner used, as a theoretical
framework for understanding the mind. Behaviorists acknowledge the existence of thinking, but identify it as a behavior only in response to one or more stimuli similar to Pavlov’s dogs salivating at the mere ringing of a bell, anticipating the coming feeding (Pavlov). Cognition comes from the Latin word *cognoscere*, to know, which led to the word “cognition” to talk about thinking patterns that impact behavior and therefore cannot be a behavior. This is a minute point but it is pertinent when I look at the behaviorists as belonging to the theoretical stream of the NWP. Behaviorism involves more than just the reaction to stimuli but also leads to the thinking underlying the reaction. Cognitivism, as I use the term to apply to language and writing, examines the writing process and its recursively operating sub-processes. The process movement involved both expressivism, through theoreticians such as Moffett and Britton (both tied closely to the early years of the Project), and cognitivism, through Emig’s writings focusing on the writing process.

Jim Addison, director of graduate studies in English at Western Carolina University in North Carolina, who previously served as director of the Mountain Area Writing Project in North Carolina, wrote a review of David Russell’s second edition of his book, *Writing in the Academic Disciplines: A Curricular History* which highlights the 1970s to 1990s writing studies growth. This review gives the perspective of this one NWP person, who finds historical peaks in writing skills growth. According to Addison, Russell traced the development of programs in higher education and in secondary schools, pointing out innovative programs in “writing to learn” and “writing as a way of knowing” content in the various disciplines. Among the programs that he singles out for attention is the BAWP, which he cites as an example of reform in high school and college curriculums, not just in English classes. Russell says that teachers within the varied disciplines begin opening up academic discussions to scrutiny and demystify “disciplinary
secrets” in order to bridge the historical chasm that persisted between equity and excellence in American education. Again, this was a major concern of the founders of the NWP that I culled from their individual interviews about the sharing of knowledge beyond the writing classroom.

Russell writes, “To understand the ways students learn to write, we must go beyond the small and all too often marginalized component of the curriculum that treats writing explicitly and look at the broader, though largely tacit traditions students encounter…” (32). Russell’s book includes a history of writing instruction outside general composition courses in American secondary and higher education but does not go into depth about the NWP. He talks of questions he claims come to the surface in the cultural context of the late 1960s and 1970s concerning explicitly relaying the rhetoric of our disciplines to all students. He presents the image of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) as teaching writing in all disciplines rather than as a separate entity. He recreates passionate ideological debates, the academic "turf" wars, and the negotiated and imposed changes in curricula that underlie the evolution of what became the writing-across-the-curriculum movement and the beginning of the NWP (Russell 35). He tempts his readers with mentions of the BAWP but does not truly include an in depth look at the NWP. His information served as a reference point for the archival and contextual review that this dissertation examines. Here, I find a gap in the supporting material that my research Project bridges.

Emig’s Influence

Among the theoretical stances that the NWP built upon and most of their founding partners espoused were exxpressivism, cognitivism, and the process movement. These remain in the core values of the NWP model. Process-over-product preference began with the publication of Emig’s landmark work, *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Emig persuasively
presents writing as a complex, recursive process worthy of being studied and taught in its own right. Equally important to the writing to learn movement was Emig’s 1977 landmark article, “Writing as a Mode of Learning,” that stands as a charter document for that movement. Because writing is situated, active, and available for immediate visual review, Emig believes it represents a unique form of learning. In a study, eight twelfth graders compose aloud while writing three essays. Emig then wrote a case study based on interviews with one of the students who tried this process of writing, claiming that the student wrote in two modes, reflexive and extensive. The first style, reflexive writing works by using the writer’s feelings and personal experience and is informal. The more formal mode, extensive writing, transfers to the audience with less time employed in planning and drafting stages of the writing process. Emig’s study is extremely influential to the writing field in recognizing writing is a process, not just an end product to be graded.

Britton and Emig were primarily responsible for turning the concept of process over product into an important pedagogical approach. In 1966, the Dartmouth Seminar brought together English language scholars from the United States and England, paving the way for a positive reception of the distinctly British model of language instruction by Britton. In contrast to the American emphasis on “disciplinary rigor, standard curricula, and standard ‘objective’ evaluation” (Russell 11), Britton identified three functional types of writing: “transactional, for communicating information; poetic, for creating beautiful objects; and expressive, for exploring and reflecting upon ideas” (Zinsser 57). This quotation from Britton is from his 1975 article that he published with several other educators in England. Britton and his colleagues drew their conclusions about writing from a study of about two thousand papers written by British schoolchildren between the ages of eleven. I support the findings of Britton and his co-authors
who concluded that school writing is mostly transactional for communication. However, I also believe as did Britton that children use expressive writing as a mode of learning (Britton, et al., 13). Transactional writing, the most common form of school writing, requires that the writer become a passive spectator, while expressive writing promotes a writer engaging actively becoming a participant in the process. Britton and his British educator colleagues prefer expressive writing because it plays a major role in learning at every developmental stage, in part because it resembles what Vygotsky had identified as “inner speech” (Zinsser 39). By foregrounding the personal and psychological utility of writing in learning settings and by emphasizing the powerful ways in which language organizes experience, Britton and his colleagues lent substantial credence to the idea of cross-curricular writing programs enhancing student learning.

Elbow: The Face of Expressivists

For Elbow, as for many people associated with expressivism, writing is a path to the discovery of a true, authentic self, usually uncovered through writing exercises such as free-writing, self-reflection, and exploratory writing. Only through self-discovery can students truly be liberated from constraining pedagogy, the force of cultural oppression, and their own insecurity (Elbow 173). Elbow argues that the writing that must take place is “private personal individual writing” (173). In fact, Elbow seems determined not to participate in disciplinary discourses. He says of his own thinking process that, “I ended up with a strong conviction that there was something better about interdisciplinary learning than disciplinary learning” (Elbow xxx). Elbow’s work is not disciplinary—it is personal and it is cultural.

Elbow became the theoretical voice of the expressivism during the 1970s. His own article “Reconsiderations: Voice in Writing Again: Embracing Contraries” caused him to be
labeled as an expressivist because of his belief system. He recognizes that he is “so often cited as representing a whole ‘school’ in composition studies” (“Reconsiderations” 173). There are some arguments over the tenets of expressivism even by people closely identified with that theoretical stance and, of course, by those who sought to critique it. Although there are significant disagreements within the works of the authors identified as “expressivists,” they are cast under the umbrella term. Expressivists bring a touchy-feely, student-centered quality to writing and the teaching of it. Elbow contends composition belongs to those who claim it, not those who have previously laid claim to it and not to experts, and his book feeds this aim. Elbow writes in the preface: “The authority I call upon in writing a book about writing is my own long-standing difficulty in writing” (vi). Elbow’s observation of his own long-standing difficulty reflects a precept of the NWP that the writing process is arduous, which is something that I also believe. Writing does not just arrive on a page after a quick gathering of facts. Writing is a multi-layered process.

At this time articles and books about teaching composition began to make heavy use of terms and concepts such as “voice,” “personal power,” “connectedness,” and “self.” They were spread throughout the rhetoric of counter cultures at the time, concepts which were roughly analogous in tone and sentiment to the rhetoric of consciousness-raising, community building, solidarity, and liberation that were in wide circulation as parts of the feminist, black power, anti-war, and other movements taking place in the late 60s and early 70s. The shift of rhetoric to current cultural concerns was the birthplace of the ideology of the NWP founders. Elbow addresses his users/students, not his academic readers, by using the language and constructs of popular culture. Diaries and journaling, personal writing, and writing processes including free-
writing and numerous revisions (that were not simply edits) of student writing were basic tenets of the NWP.

Cognitivists

One of the major precepts of the NWP is writing to learn, which I identify as a cognitivist notion based on the idea that a person’s thought and understanding can grow and clarify through the process of writing. A body of articles based on cognitivism (amassed in the 1970s and 1980s) spoke out about the writing theory of the past. Piaget’s theory and Skinner’s work, used as examples of the behaviorists, put forth that writing was truly a learning process. Applebee summarized the results of this research corpus as follows: “writing involves a variety of recursively operating subprocesses (e.g., planning, monitoring, drafting, revising, editing) rather than a linear sequence; writers differ in their uses of the processes; and the processes vary depending on the nature of the writing” (qtd. in Russell 582). This body of literature was compelling to the NWP founders. My interviews show how the founders grew to value the movements of cognitivism and expressivism.

A saying widely attributed to poet E.M. Forster “How can I know what I think until I see what I say?” captured the spirit of the cognitivist approach and has been widely cited by its adherents (qtd in Auden 162). This quotation is hard to pin down. I trace it through many claims on a discussion board on Forster that say that it was actually used one year earlier than his first publication of the fictional line in another poem by another writer (Wallas 106). Regardless of its original source in poetry and fiction, this observation grew to become the heart of writing pedagogy that focuses on personal, expressivist, journal, and other forms of exploratory writing. These are all central issues within the NWP, especially in its early years as I found in my interviews of some of the original stakeholders.
Chapter 3: Examining the NWP through Proven Research Methods

Sources of Data

Primary

Primary data for this Project comes from the transcripts of interviews with leaders in the early stages of the National Writing Project who were eyewitnesses and participants at the founding (or early years) of the National Writing Project. The list of interviews completed includes Ruby Bernstein, Mary Kay Healy, three interviews with Albert “Cap” Lavin (one of which in January 2010 included Myers and Smith), Miles Myers, David Schwalm, and Mary Ann Smith. Each individual had to go through a formal Institutional Review Board process by filling out and signing Informed Consent Forms which I have archived within this dissertation in Appendix A. The signed forms are kept by me as the principle investigator of this research Project and stored in another location.

When I started this research I listed possible questions, and then ordered the questions based on the categories of information sought. The protocol I’m using is an adaptation of both Werner and Schoepfle’s model (Oswald 210-211). They recommend that the serial order of the questions is not so very important in the interview if one simply kept track of what question elicited what responses. I determined that I needed the order to remain stable in order to keep track of cause and effect. I had two sets of interview questions that I used during my research. The first interviews received a set of questions that I have placed in Appendix B. The audience can appreciate the flow of the discussion without having lists throughout the more important elements of the research design and the appendix is a good place to keep track of the original and final questions. The final questions that I used in my second round of interviews conducted much later were informed by the quantity and quality of answers evoked in the first interviews. I include the final questions for easy access in Appendix C. I left both groups of interviews as
open as possible. I recognized that this approach to open ended questions followed the most common protocol interview model and adapted the protocol accordingly so that the questions do not presuppose dimensions of feeling, analysis, or thought that is salient for the interviewee. The interviewee was then free to select from among their full array of experiences not hemmed in by yes/no or pointed questions. Many times I would interrupt the speaker or say at the end of their response “Could you tell me more about that?”

The first interview was with Myers, who was one of the founders of the NWP and also the first NWP business manager. Myers worked side-by side with James Gray, the first NWP Director, who passed away in 2005. Both men were professors teaching at Berkeley in the program which helped teachers obtain credentials to continue to be eligible to teach in their schools. Every teacher in California had to take courses in order to retain credentials. Three of the first interviewees were teachers at that time: Smith taught fifth grade in her early career and went on to be on the staff of the NWP (up to the present time) in charge of governmental issues; Healy taught at the secondary level and then had a full career as a Berkeley professor; and Bernstein taught high school and then went on to travel to promote growth of the NWP. Schwalm, a NWP program director and an early lecturer at the first summer institute, was interviewed later electronically. He provided more depth of material on the actual practices that grew out of the NWP as it developed and changed while becoming more structured. I found it very helpful that some of my participants were readily available for follow up interviews and actually led me to other people and printed sources. However, some were a one-time constrained interview (in a business office on a busy day). My last interviews were with Lavin. We did two telephonically and then one at the NWP headquarters with Myers, and Smith present. He guided me through the shared intricacies of theory for the founding of the NWP as did Bernstein and
Myers. All were so very valuable in my quest to present an authentic ongoing story of the NWP. I include more biographical and education background materials on each of the original stakeholders in Appendix D.

Moreover, I found that most of them shared contact with some of the pivotal theorists of the time through their proximity. It was important that they not only had contact with those theorists but that they shared interpersonal relationships which contributed to the bonding of this group. Gray previously had been the graduate professor of two of these interviewees Healy and Smith. Myers and Gray had worked together in the credentialing program at UC Berkeley before the Project ever was conceived. Bernstein knew Gray before he invited her to the first summer institute. Schwalm met with Gray before the Project was launched and sat in many meetings with Gray and Brandt as they brainstormed the program they wanted to develop. Many people contributed to the foundation of BAWP: Gray, Lavin, Myers, and several UC Berkeley administrators, all of whom contributed to the foundational work to find a new way to approach the teaching of teachers.

Individual participants in the interview portion of the study are well-known national scholars specializing in areas such as teacher education, writing instruction, and the histories of those fields. Bernstein, Healy, Myers, and Smith were all interviewed in person in Berkeley. Bernstein and I met at the Hotel Durant Coffee Shop. Healy was interviewed at the Faculty Club on the campus of Berkeley. Neither setting was optimal for hearing the interviewee or recording the interview because there was so much interference of other diners and clatter of silverware and dishes that many points were missed on the transcribed tape. I augmented the tape transcription with my notes but those were not always recorded completely nor did they match everything that appeared inaudible on the tapes. I spoke with Myers and Smith at the NWP
offices. I interviewed Lavin twice on the telephone for one hour each time and in person in Berkeley along with Myers and Smith in January 2010. Lavin and I also exchanged multiple emails. Furthermore, he sent me early documents in hard copy that are mentioned in the research that I had already heard others talk about or read as part of my literature review or secondary sources for this work. The telephone interviews were taped and professionally transcribed. Bernstein, Myers, and Smith were also taped at the time I met with them and were also professionally transcribed. Healy was also taped but due to the background noise at the Faculty Club, the tape was severally damaged and very little was recoverable by transcription. I used somewhat detailed notes to produce a transcript but it is not truly complete at all. Schwalm did his entire interview by several emails seamed together that were then transformed into a transcribed document. The best interviews were one-on-one in person conversations in quiet spots and the email communications. The telephone transcripts were also flawed but were corrected and approved by Lavin personally. The final interview with Lavin, Myers, Smith, and I had many gaps due to cross talk and interruptions that took place so it is damaged but useable.

Secondary
Methods and Sources
The study includes comprehensive documentary research, another method of qualitative studies. According to Hillway, “This means the careful collection of available records relating to the subject under investigation and a thorough analysis of what these records disclose, together with a synthesis of the conclusions to be derived from them” (43). For this purpose, materials published by and on the NWP and Gray’s memoir were reviewed to determine the individual’s and the group’s own vision of their history. Background information for this research Project is also obtained by archival research into Gray’s personal files, and from my perspective as a
participant in the NWP’s summer institute model in 2005 at UTEP. Furthermore, I review the electronic archives of the newsletters published by the NWP and other documents published by the NWP. Besides that material, I conduct a review and analysis of what other educators and authors have written about the progress and processes of the NWP. This background material provides a good sounding board to work with when weighing the opinions that I encounter during the interview and research process. I also use Lieberman’s book (she is still a teacher consultant in the writing Project) entitled Inside the National Writing Project: Connecting Network Learning and Classroom Teaching to see the Project from an insider’s view.

Qualitative Raw Data Use, Grounded Theory, Ethnography, and Case Study

Almost all of the information for this research Project is organized on the basis of materials published by John Creswell, a renowned qualitative researcher and prolific writer of textbooks and articles on qualitative research methods. His textbooks are used in research courses in universities to include my own university, UTEP. Categories of the raw information from the interview, secondary source materials, as well as Gray’s archives and other writing theorists’ data come from Creswell. The information I mine from the interviews is categorized according to Creswell’s guidelines. I adapt my methodology research to meet the standards and forms set out from a Creswell chart, and I then determine my research material recording for examination. I chose the categories from Creswell’s five methods of qualitative research tables that best accomplished my goals to present the research data in a clear and structured format.

I follow hand coding systems Creswell outlines, paying special attention to four columns of Creswell’s Table 7.1 for Data Collection Activities and the Five Traditions on pages 112-113.
The first one is titled “Grounded Theory” which answers the question of what is traditionally studied and answered by an entry that states that typical research interviews are from “multiple individuals who have responded to action or participated in a process about a central phenomenon” (in this research, the beginning of the NWP), and the second column is titled “Ethnography” which says interviews should be with “members of a culture-sharing group or individuals representative of the group.” I also use Creswell’s book to set up my research methods and to design the interviews. Creswell says that qualitative researchers should use grounded theory in order to “set procedures for analysis” which would then lead to “open, axial,
and selective coding” (238). By open coding, Creswell says that one can develop categories of information and I did that while reviewing my literature sources and interviews.

### Table 3.2: Reporting Approaches for Each Tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Approaches</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Phenomenology</th>
<th>Grounded Theory</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General structure of study | - Introduction (problem, questions)  
- Research procedures (a biography, significance of individual, data collection, analysis outcomes)  
- Report of objective experiences  
- Individuals theorize about their lives  
- Narrative segments identified  
- Patterns of meaning identified (events, processes, epiphanies, themes)  
- Summary | - Introduction (problem, questions)  
- Research procedures (a phenomenology and philosophical assumptions, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
- Significant statements  
- Meanings of statements  
- Themes of meanings  
- Exhaustive description of phenomenon (Adapted from Moustakas, 1994) | - Introduction (problem, questions)  
- Research procedures (grounded theory, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
- Open coding  
- Axial coding  
- Selective coding and theoretical propositions and models  
- Discussion of theory and contrasts with extant literature (Adapted from Strauss & Corbin, 1990) | - Introduction (problem, questions)  
- Research procedures (ethnography, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
- Description of culture  
- Analysis of cultural themes  
- Interpretation, lessons learned, questions raised (Adapted from Wolcott, 1994b) | - Entry vignette  
- Introduction (problem, questions, case study, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
- Description of the case(s) and its (their) context  
- Development of issues  
- Detail about selected issues  
- Assertions  
- Closing vignette (Adapted from Stake, 1995) |

Note: Table shows general structure of study. Bulleted points might be a separate section in a journal article or book or a separate chapter in a dissertation.

The third column is “What are typical access and rapport issues?” Creswell answered those questions with the following “Locating a homogenous sample” and “Gaining access through gatekeeper [in this case, the NWP], gaining confidence of informants.” I also use a fourth category titled by Creswell as “Case Study,” which answers the question of “How does one select sites to study?” I selected the NWP founding as my research Project because that was an event that was part of a bounded system of teacher training and sharing. I had to obtain access to a gatekeeper of the NWP history so that I could find the other participants and establish through the gatekeeper the rapport and confidence based on the gatekeeper’s own knowledge and rapport with other leaders and participants. A cold telephone call to the Berkeley headquarters of the NWP led me to Smith. I identified Smith as the gatekeeper due to her own participation in
the first summer institute named BAWP, the forerunner of the NWP. Smith, then, with help of other staffers at the NWP, contacted Bernstein, Healy, and Myers on my behalf, and then Bernstein led me to Lavin. Dr. Evelyn Posey, then chair of the Department of English at UTEP, led me to Schwalm, who she knew when he started the West Texas Writing Project in 1984 at UTEP. Furthermore, I selected the national headquarters (located just off the UC Berkeley campus) as the bounded system for this research and focused on the foundation years to include ten years before the actual NWP came into being and the following ten years after the first summer institute was held. The NWP headquarters, (or its present administrators), contacted through my original gatekeeper Smith, also played the role of another gatekeeper by providing additional access to archival review of Gray’s papers taken from his office after his death. The archives that I had full access to for two days were not cataloged or preserved, but stored in cardboard boxes just as they had come from his office, as far as I could determine. At the present time, most of this material is archived properly at the headquarters of the NWP in Berkeley. I was allowed access again in 2010 but some of the documents I originally reviewed, but did not copy, were destroyed by an accidental water leak. One example of such a document I found only recently as a photocopy of several pages torn out of their original binding in a spiral notebook contains the budget figures for the first five years in Gray’s own handwriting in pencil. An email from the NWP staff inquired if I had made copies of some of the lost documents, so now I will be able to return these photocopies of the original notes and documents.

From the advice and chart included in Creswell’s qualitative research textbook, I developed “a data collection matrix as a visual means of locating and identifying information for the study” (Creswell 134) to take into consideration specific theory or theorists that the interviewees mentioned in what context in order to address my research question of what were
the founding NWP members’ own theoretical backgrounds that they brought together to start their work in this Project. Names included in this first research area grew substantially include Moffett, Christensen, Brandt, Britton, Myers, Caldwell, Blickhahn, and Corbett, which were some of the most frequently mentioned scholars by the six interview subjects. Some of these scholars are in the visual grid matrix listed under the category of theorists with a side column that addresses, in particular, what each added to this group's activities or individual mindset in forming the NWP. Moffett and Christensen were actually present in most of the groundwork foundational meetings. Britton was at the center of some of their theoretical backgrounds as was Corbett.

When these categories for heading titles in my dissertation were identified, I needed to investigate movements in writing theories to include the expressivists, cognitivists, writing to learn movements, in addition to cultural studies that situated the influences of the National Writing Project in the larger movement of rhetoric and writing studies. Those categories were first identified as specific educational theories, “best practices”, and school reform but expanded as more interviews were completed with key persons such as Myers and Lavin, who were Gray’s close teaching and director companions at the founding of the Project in the early years.

Secondary data was also collected through textual analysis of articles, NWP programs, and related publications from prominent leaders of the expressivist movement in composition from the 1960s to the early 1980s, the formative years of the NWP, and its founders’ theoretical framework. Printed original work from James Britton, Peter Elbow, Janet Emig, and James Moffett are some of the expressivists who are placed in a second visual color coded grid that I cover more extensively in the Data Analysis section of this chapter. I also examined material on cognitivism, including the work of Applebee, and Piaget/Skinner (two important behaviorists
I examined each of the names listed for the source of the information (mostly articles and books by the theorists themselves), practice and classroom changes, societal influences, rhetorical influences, and pedagogy.

While I use Creswell as my primary methodology guideline book, I also used several other authors: Hillway, Berg, Wolcott, Patton, and Werner; who author textbooks on research methods and finally adopt ethnography at some points to literally tell the story of the NWP. I employed “description, analysis, and interpretation of the culture-sharing group” of educators to place this research in time and culture (Creswell 152). Description is the starting point of any ethnography so that one may build a sound foundation for qualitative research. Each ethnographer becomes a “storyteller, inviting the reader to see through your eyes what you have seen….Start by presenting a straightforward description of the setting and events” (Wolcott 58). I do that by surveying the cultural developments of the era just before the Project began and following through for twenty years so that I could situate the rhetoric properly. I focus on a key event, the foundation of the NWP, the actors involved, the societal influences, showing different perspectives through the views of the interviewees. I move into an analytical framework of coding and visual charts to visually provide the information to be analyzed. Afterward, I move along to go beyond questions/answers and database to determine what is to be interpreted from all this information in the final chapter of conclusions drawn from this research. I draw inferences from the data and turn to well established theorist that existed prior to and during the time frame of 1960-1970 and beyond to provide structure for my interpretation of the materials as suggested by Wolcott (58).

The last methodology technique that I use is a case study. Following the model of a case study that Creswell lays out, I present a chronology of events that led up to the foundation of the
BAWP and to the transformation of the BAWP to the NWP so that I could present each step or phase in the evolution of this particular case study. Creswell remarks that knowing the setting or rhetorical situatedness of the case is extremely important. I read about Gray working in different situations to include teaching in a classroom himself, working as a school administrator, and further along as he developed a new way of teaching teachers that climaxed in his joint venture with the interviewees to plan and grow the first tentative steps of the Project and later BAWP which eventually led to the founding of the NWP.

The raw data from the nine total interviews comes from answers to the interview questions based on the participants’ first-hand observations which made this primary research not hearsay or secondary recapitulating information. As I analyzed the data from the content of the interviews to determine topics that surfaced most frequently for most of the participants, topics that generated the most interest, and the importance of these topics for each participant. I grouped and catalogued quotations and key words according to the topics that emerged from interaction in the process of setting up the interviews and doing secondary source research. Each category is written as a partial picture of an event that addresses the intellectual and emotional connections between the participants’ small sampling. They provide very densely textured facts so that I could support broader assertions about the role of culture in the founding of the NWP as I engage the collective information to draw on key specific data from each interview that most of the primary interviews also identify.

Data Analysis

From the process I describe above about collecting the data and following key words or ideas in my research, I found interconnecting information within those categories (axial coding), which I did by color coding those documents according to similar topics or phrases. I then tell a
story which I build on the results obtained through open coding and axial coding which produce
categories (selective coding), which led me to a set of theoretical foundations from the
eyewitness reports. As Creswell says, “Grounded theory research is a process of developing a
theory, not testing a theory” (Creswell 241). I had a tentative theory but I soon realized that I
needed to ground my theory and research on the data, not my original hypothesis. An inductive
model of theory development gives me the process and generates the discovery of a theory which
is supported by the work of experts in the field.

After I interviewed the six subjects, I examined the raw data by close readings of the
transcripts of each interview. This process of examination of the transcripts revealed specific
data repeated in each interview that allowed the data to define itself and produce broad topics
listed under a single term or phrase. These topics enabled the first rough color coding of
categories that further defined specific bits of information. I next focused on the information that
resulted from most or, in many places, all of the interviews. From the reoccurring points of data,
I then built a visual color coded grid to compare various then those specific bits of information
across the interviews on the same category. I pulled these specific bits directly from quotations
that enabled me to accurately contrast and compare what each interview added to the specific
topics while using the same color coding that I used on the transcripts to compare the data side-
by-side with other interviews. The topics that I first coded in color on the transcripts were
determined by first, the data itself and then by me as I recognized repeating points. The original
coding system included “education,” “theoretical foundations,” “theorists,” “practice and
classroom changes,” “cultural and social influences,” “rhetorical influences,” and “audience.”
At first the discrete data placed into this grid was recorded in black and white ignoring the color
coding that I had used originally on the transcripts. The finalized grid from which I drew most
of the information in this dissertation is included as Appendix G containing the color coded information taken from the interviews.

**Table 3.3: Early Coding Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Gray's Archives Memoir Published Articles</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Other Theorists in Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Societal Influences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Influences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rough grid later became two separate grids as I learned to take only discrete bits of information. I also realized that primary and secondary sources should be treated differently. This decision was made as I realized a first rough draft ran to fifty-four pages even when done in landscape and I was only at the tip of the iceberg of information to be coded. I incorporated the color coding to quickly compare topics as apples to apples and not cross topics so that I was not comparing, continuing my metaphor, apples to oranges. That process of simplifying the grids produced the next figure. I soon realized that coding large amounts of information was a complicated process as evidenced in the next figure, when I found that I had switched the color code for the other theorists and sources that I needed to eventually stabilize all the grids by staying true to the color coding throughout both grids. The coding is on the transcripts by category or topics not by individual people. After simplifying the color coding then I truly could
compare the same type of data across all grids. The final matrix of coded information is in Appendix H.

**TABLE 3.4: OTHER THEORISTS AND SOURCES EXAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Classroom Changes</th>
<th>Cultural and Societal Influences</th>
<th>Rhetorical Influences</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applebee</td>
<td>Applebee summarized the results of a corpus of research documents (582).</td>
<td>This body of literature was compelling to the NWP founders who men-toned voices in the profession of writing teachers that was crying out for change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Writing involves a variety of recursively operating subprocesses planning, monitoring, drafting, revising, editing” rather than a linear sequence; (Applebee 582).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivism</td>
<td>Body of articles based on cognitivism (amassed in the 1970s and 1980s) spoke out about the writing theory of the past that came to the conclusion that writing is truly a learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow</td>
<td>An example of the theoretical voice of an expressivist coming forth in research during the 1960s is Peter Elbow, who published <em>Writing Without Teachers</em>, a book that labeled him as an expressivist, and, as he recognizes, “so often cited as representing a whole ‘school’ in composition studies” (“Reconsiderations” 173).</td>
<td>There are some arguments over tenets of expressivism by people closely identi- fied with that theoretical stance by those who critique it. There exist significant disagreement within works of the authors identified as Expressivists, cast under the umbrella term viewed as bringing touchy-feely, student-centered quality to writing and the teaching of it.</td>
<td>Teaching books began with heavy use of terms and concepts voice, person- al power connectedness and self were spread through-out the rhetoric of counter cultures, concepts which were roughly an alo-gous in tone and sentiment to rhetoric of consciousness raising, community building, solidarity, and liberation in wide circulation as parts of the feminist, black power, anti-war, other movements in the 60s &amp; 70s.</td>
<td>This shift of rhetoric to counter culture concerns is the birthplace of the ideology of the Bay Area Writing Project founders. Elbow addresses his users not his academic readers, by using the language and constructs of popular culture. Diaries and journaling, personal writing, and writing processes to include free writing and numerous revisions not simply edits of student writing—all basic tenets of the NWP.</td>
<td>Elbow also asserts that to make open space for the sort of writing pedagogy Expressivists wanted, they tapped into the cultural capital of the movements taking place in society and popular culture using the rhetoric of popular culture which was also saturated with rhetoric of self-realization and self-actualization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emig</td>
<td>The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders 1971, Emig’s 1977 article, “Writing as a Mode of Learning,” that stands as a charter for writing to learn.</td>
<td>Process-over- product presented writing as a complex, recursive Process worthy of being studied and taught in its own right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piaget/</td>
<td>Myers said that</td>
<td>The basic tenets of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Analysis Design

My process of coding the raw transcribed interviews is informed by experts in the field of qualitative research identifying one central phenomenon. Using the scholarship of Creswell, the main objective was to search for a central unifying phenomenon which ties into most of the information gathered, as well as provided insight into my initial question about the theoretical underpinning of the NWP’s founders. I began to look for a central unifying phenomenon, which tied into most of the information gathered and provided insight into my original major question of the theoretical underpinning of the National Writing Project’s founders. I then returned to the database of information to identify:

- what caused this phenomenon, to occur
- what strategies or actions actors employed in response to it
- what context (specific) and intervening conditions (broad context)
- influenced the strategies, and
- what consequences resulted from these strategies? (Creswell 239)

The central unifying phenomenon ties together most of the information gathered and provides insight into my original major question of the theoretical underpinning of the NWP’s founders. I take a large amount of information and distill it “to a small set of themes and categories characteristic of the process or action being explored in this grounded theory study” as Creswell advises (151). This type of study can take many forms to include supporting stories, visual
examples (such as my coding grids), or as a hypothesis. I use all three of these different methods to provide information to the audience on this data collection. I use axial coding to find causal relationships. I always remain aware of interviewing conditions and depth of interview material.

Other Considerations

The application by any researcher of small examples to draw larger conclusions is a dangerous assumption to follow. Qualitative researchers say it is problematic to use small samples to write large overarching conclusions. In qualitative research it is important to have a large base in order to draw further possible conclusions and assumptions. However, I find that this is possible to do with smaller implications and conclusions (not large overarching conclusions) by combining secondary sources with the primary sources and finding the essential elements that either deviated or maintained the pattern of the other works. I find that I could use a quantitative approach with only qualitative research data as long as I am careful to not presume that a small sampling could indeed indicate larger trends or anything more than the phenomenon that was actually observed in this research. I could, however, present specific material from descriptive interviews by displaying the information in grids and diagrams. I could draw comparisons through systematic procedures of categorizing the raw information and let that lead me to what takes on the look of quantitative research but does not meet the standard of randomness or quantity of interviews or questionnaires on the topic. I look for patterns of regularity in the data organized by the coded grids into a visual tool so that I could the report this information in a story form.

Moreover, I also compare this small cultural group of lifelong educators with other cultural groups and the larger community at the time the foundation of the NWP was laid. I look at the standards of this highly educated professional group and draw connections to larger
theoretical frameworks. The conclusions are not overarching assumptions drawn from the small database but are clues for further research into writing programs in other times and places. The early history of the NWP was situated in a distinctive time and cultural frame. With changes to reflect this time and cultural frame, this research presents the basic foundational theory of the NWP to depict a clear picture of one way to start a new initiative built on sound theory and practices.
Chapter 4: Winds of Change in Education Provided the Foundation for NWP

In this chapter, I have provided the results and interpretation of the data from the interviews completed with the participants and primary leaders during the early years of the NWP. This chapter gave me an opportunity to re-examine James Gray’s role in the organization based on archival research of his personal files to provide some useful insights and empirical observations by the founder concerning the need for the NWP and its intended impact in the classroom. Here I also traced the historical course of the early years of the NWP and the impact it had on writing in general, the NWP’s evolution, and how it reached such prominence today. Chapter IV also supplied information about the importance of the NWP’s participants’ pedagogy and NWP’s basic tenet that teachers should teach other teachers.

In this chapter, I examined the data from the primary, secondary, and archival documents to discover the crossroads of “best practices” and any underpinning of theory in order to find a deeper personal understanding of the National Writing Project (NWP). This chapter traced the historical course of the early years of the NWP and the impact it had on writing in general, as well as the NWP’s evolution process and how it reached such prominence today. I also added sections on the rhetorical influences, the first bumpy years of financial and growth figures disparity and finally on the impact all these issues had on the NWP.

Through serving as a consultant in schools, Gray became acutely aware that teachers, particularly secondary teachers, were:

…becoming increasingly cynical of most with the content of teaching, of the consultants themselves, the ‘take-the money and run’ consultants who, in many cases, had never taught in the schools, and, a particular sore point, of the mandated requirement to attend such programs. (‘Collaboration’ 36)
Gray and his small group of allies, not pleased with publishers’ efforts to design teacher-proof materials, believed that many earlier materials on writing published by Project English, a reform effort in the mid-60’s, had little impact nationally on improving student writing abilities or the teaching of writing. This new group of educators gathering to found Gray’s plans, in my opinion, made a wise choice to focus first on the nine counties surrounding the greater San Francisco Bay Area. That area contained 176 separate school districts which was a large enough population of students and teachers to make the sample adequate but not overwhelming the participants with the burden of long distance travel. This area contained diverse schools in a fairly small geographical region (Myers Interview 5). Travel does become a burden for educators who need to be where their students are. Communication was not expensive but could flow through the districts fairly easily. It was interesting to note the interviews revealed that this location was very important to give access to many teachers without huge travel expenses and time. I conclude that a dense population base is necessary to get a Project like this one off the ground so quickly. Work done in rural school districts is more difficult to obtain funding for and interest in people to implement such work.

The Process of Examination of the Research Findings

In this lengthy and arduous investigation into primary, secondary, and archival materials, I created new knowledge, not just for myself, but for others interested in the NWP programs by linking and cross referencing small pieces of data from several sources. As I examined this data, I moved to synthesize and produce new understanding on the teaching of writing. This research, which distinguished theory as an underlying foundation for Gray’s chosen words of “‘best practices’,” only strengthened my resolve to find evidence of the underpinning theoretical
foundation of the NWP. This research analysis could be a resource guide to others interested in
the teaching of writing and teacher education.

When I considered the evidence, I found of a true struggle to keep the NWP functioning
including a constant need for funds due to continued growth, an abruptly closed summer institute
due to the participants inability to work in harmony, and the major thought process change
required by teachers and university faculty about the teaching of writing; my conclusion was that
the following memo may have well been some bravado, hubris, or (based on my rhetorical
education) persuasion on Gray’s part to shore up the key players emotionally in order to keep the
NWP active. A copy of this memo was in Gray’s archives with a notation that he sent it on
August 23, 1976, just two years after the summer institute was launched to Lavin, Myers, and
Richard Sterling, (who worked with Gray at that point as a consultant):

The Project has got to succeed. It’s potential—which we’ve all glimpsed on
occasion—is so great that we simply cannot let it fall apart. The UC
Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project can touch the nation; it can affect major
educational reform. Through the Project we have that once-in-a-lifetime
opportunity of being at the right position at the right time. We can change things
in this country. And few people ever have that opportunity. (Undated Memo 1)

Learning from Primary Sources and the Archives

From my interviews with participants (Bernstein, Healy, Lavin, Myers, Schwalm, and
Smith) in the first summer institute, I found that none of them was sure where this Project would
lead except hopefully to better teaching. I found from Gray’s memoir and other early documents
he wrote that he had a plan which he had tried out at least twice before unsuccessfully.
Identifying the Stakeholders in NWP from Interviews and Gray’s Archives

Gray was the main stakeholder in the NWP’s foundation. He eventually was the first Director of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) and the driving force that established that group of talented educators who worked to improve writing skills for K-12 (and beyond) students. He was the chair of the credentialing department at UC Berkeley as well as a professor in that department. Teachers were required at that time to obtain licensing credits in a credentialing program at an institute of higher education after receiving a BA or MA as they started teaching careers. The credentialing department provided educational training to people who had not graduated from a college or university teaching program. His stake in founding the BAWP, according to Myers, was possibly to preserve positions at the university for himself, Myers, and others in the credentialing program. Myers was quite adamant about Gray needing to find another way to reach teachers with additional teaching practices and theory. Gray and Myers both thought the credentialing program was going to shut down due to educational policy changes that would no longer require teachers to take university credentialing courses (Interview One 2 and Interview Two 3). What was “important to Jim and to all of us to some degree (apparent to Jim) that the credential program was dying. They were laying teachers off. No one was getting jobs. Matlin (who worked with the California Commission for Teacher Preparation, Credentialing, and Licensing in 1974) put up some money and one of the people that got money was Jim” (Myers Interview 3). According to Myers, Gray tried to figure out a way to do another program in place of credentialing that hopefully would engage people who were already experienced teachers to come back to school for more training (Interview One 3). Gray had prior experiences that were tremendously important to his developing a program, “one was called the English Teacher Special Program which was run by George Maslach, who was in the department of education” (Myers Interview 3). Myers talked of the two of them (Gray and Myers) working
in a program that brought teachers together to develop specialty interests. Myers said they obtained money to bring in support people such as Moffett and Christiansen even in the earliest stages of planning (Myers Interview 3). Christiansen and Moffett were mentioned in the interviews of all or almost all of the primary subjects’ stories. The primary subjects talked of many people who joined at the first of the Project in the planning, or some other role, broadening the professional base of experience and knowledge surrounding the Project.

Other stakeholders included the teachers who willingly attended BAWP’s first summer institute, including Bernstein, Healy, and Smith. Each of them stayed with Project, and Smith is still there in charge of governmental issues. Bernstein traveled the world, at Gray’s request, after completing the first summer institute, in order to carry the story of the BAWP to far corners of the nation and abroad (Bernstein Interview 3). Healy became an early coordinator of the NWP working along side Gray to spread the Project’s main mission. Both Healy and Gray were charismatic, strong leaders, with impressive credentials to do this job. Smith spent her first year of the Project working along side Moffett implementing many of his ideas in her own team teaching environment with Jo Fyfe also a first summer institute participant (Smith Interview 5).

The credentials of all the founding members of the Project were impeccable (as evidenced by their biographical sketches in Appendix D); a factor which still contributes to the longevity and endurance of the NWP. The Project remains so strong because it renews itself continually introducing innovative teaching methods, trained key participants, and up to date technology uses, so that it does not stagnate but evolves to fit the ever-changing needs of teachers, students, and society.
Interviews Tie Past, Present, and Future of the NWP Together

The interview transcripts provided many remarks from the primary resources that tie this research, the NWP, and educational trends together in a web of past, present, and future trends in writing pedagogy, combining with several workable strategies in teacher education. Bernstein, Healy, and Myers all talk about Moffett, Macrorie, and Britton as theoreticians that they worked with personally during the Project or in their earlier training. Healy studied and worked under Britton, so that in her interview she knew him well enough to speak of him personally as “Jimmy.” Schwalm, the West Texas Writing Project’s (WTWP’s) founding director worked in that capacity for three years. Schwalm says now, “I saw my role primarily as organizer and catalyst” (Schwalm Interview 5) while giving credit to others such as Gray and the community of El Paso educators for making the WTWP possible. Gray supported Schwalm in the founding and funding pathways source search. In his interview, Schwalm talked of making an effort to show how current research and theory in teaching writing supports the strategies which teachers found successful and help them to develop additional strategies for teaching writing (Schwalm Interview 2).

Interestingly, both Myers and Schwalm were both part of the summer institute in 1974 yet unnamed: Myers, as one of the founding fathers of the Project and Schwalm, as a paid part time lecturer. Myers remembered things differently from Schwalm when he asserted that “There was no education in composition and rhetoric and that kind of theory” (Myers Interview One 2). He contended that most composition, rhetoric, and accompanying theories resided at that time in the Department of Rhetoric but most of the teachers who taught at UC Berkeley who were involved in the first summer institute came out of the Department of English, not the Department of Rhetoric. He emphasized that “Rhet[oric] was a new invention; actually we didn’t have a rhtet[oric] department here at Berkeley until very late. I am not sure of the date” (Myers
Interview One 2). Myers talked about the Department of Rhetoric as being “…interesting in its history…was primarily a department [that] ordinarily studied disabilities – you know people who could not talk fluently, and I don’t know the year on this, but at some point, they started reorganizing that department…(Myers Interview One 2). Myers noted that professors came from English and other various places to make up the new Department of Rhetoric even though it still retained the feeling of the older speech department saying that “all their graduates from speech come to the rhetoric and it was on rhetoric of print, film, media, all things having to do with the rhetorical” (Myers Interview 2). Thus, a Department of Rhetoric existed but Myers seemed to feel it had nothing to do with the Project’s foundation. It is interesting that he was apparently unaware of Schwalm’s involvement as a lecturer from the Department of Rhetoric and as a planner for the first summer institute. Schwalm said he worked in the Department of Rhetoric from 1970-1976 and must have at least met Myers in the time in which he met with Gray planning his part in the summer institute. Through Bill Brandt, who Schwalm identified as the intellectual leader of the rhetoric group at UC Berkeley; Schwalm met Gray in 1974. At that first meeting with Gray, Brandt asked Schwalm if he was interested in doing three or four sessions on rhetorical approaches to teaching writing at the first summer institute. After this first meeting with Brandt, Gray, and Schwalm, numerous planning meetings took place in which Schwalm reports Gray “explained the basic principles” of the program he was planning. Schwalm spoke of being impressed with the offer, the plan, and the scope of the undertaking saying in his interview what a remarkable thing it was to see such a collaborative effort between a major research university with K-12 which was extremely rare then. “But beyond that, the first key concept was the recognition of the expertise of master teachers as a source of knowledge and “best practices” in the teaching of writing” (Schwalm Interview 1). Brandt (a rhetorician), Gray,
other professors from the Department of English including Josephine Miles put together the summer institute program for first master teacher participants who would attend (Schwalm Interview 1).

I found Myers’ and Schwalm’s reports about the Department of Rhetoric at UC Berkeley’s existence and the content material of its coursework a little unsettling. I questioned if this could be a semantically incorrect identity problem of not only the word “rhetoric” but the curriculum in the Department of Rhetoric. When I studied the evidence, I found the differences were attributable to each man’s vantage point. I also sensed a clue to some of the rhetorical theory underpinning which Gray and Myers only address much later. Most of the primary subjects mentioned Brandt as a person who played an integral part at that first summer institute. Only Lavin identified Schwalm in his interviews within a list of people who later founded or directed sites but not as a lecturer at the first summer institute. The discovery of Schwalm’s role as a lecturer then came only through his own interview. Again, I believe this is not a deliberate example of deceit or forgetfulness, but is a small detail as viewed by some of the subjects. I realized that Schwalm and Myers may have worked side by side with Gray, Brandt, and Lavin without ever realizing each other’s particular backgrounds and without discussing the Department of Rhetoric. The plans to launch this program involved many people working and sharing very cooperatively but who were also honeycombed together to accomplish different parts of the multilayered Project which grew then and continues to be complex. Rhetoric was not a major word used in Myers daily teaching experiences in the credentialing program, but it was the name and subject matter of all his courses for Schwalm.

Lavin said even at “our beginnings to be lucky enough to be a community of discourse waiting for destiny” (Lavin Interview Two 6). Gray and Lavin began to meet in 1971 discussing
the design of the Project proposal. Lavin remembered that “Even during this embryonic period
the presence and the multiple talents of Myers were definitely in the picture” (Interview One 3).
Lavin listed a long group people who were there locally at the beginning with Gray. These
nearby colleagues were kindred spirits who contributed to the work of many originals minds of
other gifted teachers who would arrive for the first BAWP summer institute. Lavin’s interviews
provided so much information about specific people involved in the early years such as Professor
Jo Miles who was close to the program, and, of course, a part of it always.

Moffett and Christiansen Pivotal Theorists

“Moffett and Christensen, both powerful thinkers, had done impressive breakthrough
work throughout the 1960's, work that was in our minds and in our classroom strategies before
and during the time BAWP was taking shape,” according to Lavin in his second telephone
interview (Lavin Interview Two 10). He and Moffett became friends in the mid-1960; they had
similar views about teaching writing and were corresponding before the 1966 month long Anglo-
American Seminar at Dartmouth, New Hampshire, on the Teaching of English. Lavin was
Supervisor of English in the Tamalpais Union High School District and had tried out Moffett's A
Student-Centered Language Arts Curricula, Grades K-8 before it was published. That same
work contains the theories Moffett was sharing with Fyfe and Smith mentioned previously
(Lavin Interview Two 4).

Christensen and Lavin were also friends and colleagues. The chapter called "Build
Sentences Rich in Meaning" in Lavin’s Writing, Book 3, is based on Christensen's "Generative
Rhetoric of the Sentence", one of the six essays on teaching in his Notes Toward a New Rhetoric,
Harper & Row, 1967 (Lavin Interview One 6). Gray, like Christensen, was an excellent close-
reader. He had a keen appreciation of what Christensen had accomplished in long and extensive
studies of the structure and style of sentences and paragraphs. Lavin states Gray was right about the importance of Christensen's work for the teaching of writing. In the early 1960's, he had been publishing some of Christensen's ideas and approaches in his *Writing* Series books. “I admired Jim's ability and his passion in teaching Christensen's leads to students” (Lavin Interview One 7). Lavin reminds me that the heart of the matter was always (1) teachers teaching teachers by describing their "best shot" and (2) an intense and authentic writer's workshop going on at the summer program and beyond (Lavin Interview One 10).

The closeness of “Project people” was a connection I found again and again from the founding group and currently in the NWP. Schwalm, a professor working in the Department of English of UTEP, met Evelyn Posey, who was a participant in the first summer institute in 1984 at UTEP; later Posey also directed the WTWP, and she is my connection to finding this group while serving now as my committee chair. “Project people” was a term I heard many times when working with the WTWP and in my research. It implied a special grouping of people with shared interests, goals, and methods for accomplishing those goals that while probably not recognized by the NWP organization is a common insiders words used by directors, co-directors, and teacher-consultants warming the atmosphere for more sharing and openness to critique and praise.

Schwalm’s Contribution as a WTWP Director

Schwalm talked in his interview of his own experience in 1981 of writing a grant proposal to The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) requesting a $500,000 grant to establish a novel NWP site that included parallel tracks for composition and English as a Second Language (ESL). This was, however, about the time that Arturo Madrid was replaced by Sven Grunig as FIPSE director, and southwestern ESL proposals were no longer
popular. So, Schwalm renewed contact with Gray (he came to visit the UTEP campus), and, in 1982-83, wrote a proposal to NWP for $25,000 in startup funds to set up a traditional NWP site the WTWP in El Paso. At this time, other NWP sites in Texas—Fort Worth, Trinity (San Antonio), East Texas State, and UT Austin existed (but at least one was not strong (Schwalm Interview 2). Schwalm and Gray collaborated to design the WTWP to fit comfortably into the local economy so that it would not be dependent on the grant monies as many of the first Projects were. Schwalm and Gray wanted the emphasis to be on the shared experiences of master teachers, not on searching for money and grants to fund the program. From the beginning, the WTWP had buy-in from the school districts (with money—they agreed to provide the stipends for the fellows and to pay them to do workshops subsequently) and from the university (running the institute as a 6 hour summer graduate course—which paid the costs, and also got some clerical help and a summer salary supplement) so that the program could function as long as people felt that it was worth it. The districts—initially Ysleta and El Paso, but soon expanding to more area districts to identify outstanding teachers, and it expanded to all of K-12 rather than confining eligibility to high school teachers (Schwalm Interview 5). This appeared to me to be a logical choice that truly enriched the experience for all involved; there was theoretical unity between kindergarten writing readiness activities and the “best practices” in high school. Now, the NWP also includes K-university which seems appropriate since this was the one of the original plans for the Project (Schwalm Interview 12).

Through the voices of the primary sources, I learned a humbling respect for experienced teachers who use their experience to support and learn from other experienced teachers within a program. I came to appreciate the group or team approach through hearing the primary subjects speak of the values and economy of sharing rather than forging ahead alone. The primary
subjects’ adopted Gray’s vision of turning a large body of knowledge and expertise that existed in classrooms everywhere into a professional development Project to benefit students, teachers, and society. The base of master teachers’ experiences would inform other master teachers who in turn share their own base of knowledge that they enhanced with the support of other teachers in the NWP. My small circle of primary sources became the center of rapidly spreading concentric pools of knowledge available out from “behind closed doors.”

Secondary Sources and Underlying Theory

Finding: No Right Way to Teach

Gray, when working with teachers, “instilled in them new confidence in their special knowledge” so that they believed “that they can make a difference in their classrooms and beyond” (Gray Teachers xiii) according to past Executive Director of the NWP, Richard Sterling. Sterling says the underlying principle of Gray’s memoir was an attitude on Gray’s part which is that Gray is at the center of his historical memoir of the Project which reaches back to him as a young school boy and stretching over fifty years of work as an academician. Sterling credits Gray with making the writing Project possible because he had a true belief in teachers.

This respect, according to Sterling, came from Gray working throughout his career with multitudes of teachers, never asking that they follow his or anyone else’s mandates for teaching style or foundational theory; nor did he espouse a “right” way to teach. Respect for other teachers is a thread that travels through my research documents chapter by chapter. Gray simply wanted teachers in the front line of engagement with students to share the teachers’ growing knowledge base in the daily classroom trenches. This sharing of experiences in teaching and learning help growing the collective and individual knowledge bases while finding unique workable classroom pedagogical strategies and pedagogical stances.
The BAWP vision, conceived by a small group of classroom teachers, faculty and administrators at UC Berkeley, was to improve writing in the schools by creating a new model for continuing education, one that recognized the expertise, knowledge, and leadership potential of classroom teachers. “Prodded to action by what we saw as the failure of the profession to understand that writing is fundamental to learning. We found this lack of interest; this almost total neglect, inexplicable” (Gray and Sterling, “The National Writing Project” 1). As the first summer institute began, Gray commented on the teachers’ tensions “These were leading teachers, and they were strung tight. [They were] quick to react to any hint of criticism, any hint of condescension, or any attempt from anyone outside the classroom” (Gray “Collaboration” 6). Many of the teachers may have appeared wary even though they accepted an invitation to attend the first summer institute of this new university program, according to my research, because it was another new program being offered when some of these teachers had tried so many other such well intentioned meetings. Thus, Gray felt they had a hair trigger that could snap easily at any criticism or perceived pressure and describing that tension as “tight.” Gray, I believe, portrayed the teachers as being first reactive rather than proactive, but then he seemed to also note most of the participants changed to a more relaxed position when they perceive the quality of instruction available and experienced their opportunities to present demonstration lessons. The summer institute members began to relax and realize that this was a safe arena to discuss their own worries and frustrations from their classrooms and to shine as experts through their own experience. They worked with engaging inquiry in and out of the classroom in order to discover new teaching practices.

Moving forward to the current times, the various sites of the NWP provide professional development as long term investments rather than one time services. New types of professional
learning communities, can nurture teachers to become better teachers (Smith “After 22 Years” 693). The foundation of the NWP builds from 1974 to present (as cited by a task force researching the history of the NWP recently as 2008):

…when empirical research in writing literacy was nascent and professional development for teachers was uneven at best. Yet NWP found ways to harness the power of writing for instruction and in support of the development of teachers. It did so in ways that would anticipate later scholarship on the potentials of writing to foster learning and institutional transformation; the centrality of professional collaboration in the growth of both literacy and professional competence; the value of university-school partnerships; the necessity of professional communities in support of teachers’ professional growth and development, and the efficacy of peer leadership in instructional improvement.

(NWP “Overview” 1)

Current scholars, as in the above article, are realizing the importance of the building blocks used to found the NWP that can still be applied to teaching writing today with students from a different time and different circumstances as well as teachers with different pedagogies and different theoretical foundations.

Other Reforms: Proof NWP’s Reform Format was Important

Smith and Fyfe Team Teaching Provided Theory Test Grounds

Smith’s numerous comments in her interview of changes in classroom practices were similar to several other educators who spoke of the winds of change in education. To fully understand the founding of the NWP, a person needs to be familiar with and understand programs such as Smith’s own experience with team teaching which she first spoke about in an
interview on her the first years of the Project. Smith taught and shared open classroom spaces in that team teaching process with another participant in the first summer institute, Jo Fyfe (Smith Interview 6). Fyfe and Smith used a large area that held two full classrooms of students and they arranged the area as open spaces with centers for students to explore Projects without supervision. The two teachers also taught each other’s students for various subject matters or for special topics. Their classes shared Moffett’s teaching theory programs to test his ideas.

Goodlad’s and Anderson’s Nongraded Schools Freeing Curriculum Structure

Another such important change in education was Goodlad’s notion of "nongraded" schools which were introduced in the late 1950s (Goodlad and Anderson 32). Goodlad and Anderson wrote about the public outcry for higher standards of performance for students, suggesting an organization of nongraded curriculum which would allow students the freedom to excel but also receive extra support taking into account each student’s experience and ability. They suggest that it is a matter of organization of curriculum which can free students to do the work they are most capable to perform at their own pace. I contend that freeing ideas in curriculum structure are also essential to the NWP’s plan for success for teachers as well as students. Curriculum, which Goodlad’s and Anderson’s book supports, must not hinder progress but instead allow free flowing ideas to be used looking for success as did the NWP. Goodlad’s and Anderson’s research gathered from surveys they did with nongraded school systems all over the country are not only interesting in their own right, but also provide another way to let educational practices such as the NWP, change as they are needed to prepare students for their futures. Each of these alternative school changes were important to locate the change sweeping through education that created the kairotic moment for the changes to come through the NWP. (Kairos is an ancient Greek rhetorical concept meaning the right or opportune moment for
something to happen.) Each reform made it easier for the NWP to constantly push for freedom to reform the teaching of writing to fit the context of time and location.

Sizer’s “Essential” Schools No Right Answer

Sizer's network of "essential" schools was also important in revealing the changes coming to classrooms when he says “American high schools today [1991] too readily stress the vulnerability and inexperience of adolescents and underrate the potency and authority that young people can exhibit” (Sizer 33). Sizer went on to exhibit another core issue of Gray’s belief system noting “schools that always insist on the right answer, with no concern as to how a student reaches it, smother the student’s efforts to become effective intuitive thinker” (Sizer 105). These same problems are near to the heart of the Project at its inception and presently. Gray was insistent that there was no one right answer to problems or situations. The process-over-product movement prominent in the NWP’s background was closely tied to Sizer’s ideas, lending more support to my assertion that common ideas pass through cultures, locations, and time; Sizer’s work was written in 1992 but affirms the principles that Gray and the NWP also espoused twenty years earlier. Sizer’s ideas were explained further in an article on the essential school website. Schools played out common principles in various ways, depending on their local context and priorities. Essential schools practiced their common principles, but each school “interprets those basic beliefs in ways that necessarily reflect very different local contexts” (Cushman 1). Diverse experiences particular to a culture and location involved knowing students so that teachers could help each individual find personalized as well as small group support. Essential schools’ plea to let students have a chance to succeed through specialized help, fitted to their cultural needs, is also evidenced in NWP Projects which emphasize support
for students as they are. The NWP helps teachers found ways to reach students through innovation in teaching methods.

Wigginton’s Foxfire Project Stresses Reform across Cultural Barriers

Further, Wigginton's *Foxfire* Project “spawned a movement in social history and education that reflects a growing desire to integrate cultural appreciation and reflection into the sometimes dry and disassociated notions of teaching, thereby creating learning environments that are engaging and integrative” (New Georgia Encyclopedia 2). As I previously discussed in Chapter 1, cultural influences are important to note when studying the change that appears in classrooms which can transfer to other cultural settings. Wigginton’s cultural teaching experience was located in a northern Appalachian community but eventually “linked programs to curriculum reform throughout the United States and the world” (New Georgia Encyclopedia 2). The links from classroom educational reforms and cultural influences were clearly supported through such educator/authors work. The evidence was further proven by importance of easy accessibility to resources for students in their own cultural setting; strangely mostly folklore and practical information on how to accomplish tasks such as slaughtering a pig. The change comes through in the culturally acknowledged material student use their classrooms. Students, previously angry and disinterested in that culture, (also true at the inception of the NWP) for some cultural groups, eagerly deal with their own cultural knowledge they obtain from elder community members. The students use topics that engage them, writing essays particular to their own culture. The essays come together in a magazine, *Foxfire*. Further proof of my premise of the importance of cultural influences as the change which can sweep the country and world, as quoted above, by implementing a cultural model that a student has within his/her own setting. The NWP has no two sites that look alike or function exactly the same. Each site recognized its
context and location and adjusted the scheduling, curriculum, programs offered to fit that particular site.

Meier’s Progressive Reforms Match the NWP’s Reforms

Meier's student-centered Central Park East schools, well known examples of progressive reforms in public education in the 1960s also provide evidence of cultural studies being very important when discussing classroom changes. There were “three sister elementary schools, also founded by Meier, structured as multi-age grouped, open-classroom schools where children moved developmentally at their own pace” (Suiter and Meier 1). Involvement by teachers and parents was important and encouraged for each child’s educational journey. This was also similar to the Project’s precepts that teachers of all ages from all levels of education could participate in and open classroom format again added proof to my recognition of cultural and societal influences being important to contextual ideas which are transferable from one culture and location to another. The NWP proved this reform technique in its earliest summer institutes with masters teachers from all disciplines, ages, grade levels, and experience to join together to make a workable program for the teaching of writing.

Progressive Education Spawned New Ideas for Classrooms: Providing Fertile Ground for the Project

“Open classrooms, schools without walls, cooperative learning, multiage approaches, whole language, the social curriculum, and experiential education,” all have important philosophical roots in progressive education even though much of Dewey’s work (Popkewitz 350). Critics such as Paul Goodman and George Dennison took Dewey's ideas even more radical which led to free school movements. During the cold war anxiety which came to prominence in the 1950s, also a period of cultural conservatism in the USA, progressive
education disintegrated as an identifiable movement. More recent scholars are rediscovering Dewey's work and exploring its relevance to a "postmodern" age. What Dewey wrote a century ago includes “insights into democratic culture and meaningful education suggest hopeful alternatives to the regime of standardization and mechanization that more than ever dominate our schools” (Popkewitz 355). All of these ideas and programs provided fertile ground for the NWP to implement changes, but much of it was reform that drew much criticism and disdain as had Dewey’s. Education as a domain reforms itself in perpetuity similar to Phelps’s theory of a pendulum swinging constantly, returning eventually to a centrist position to only change once again. Reforms come and go but the NWP came and stayed with, of course, reform within the Project itself. These programs were reform, alterative ideas in the education field that built a web of understanding that shaped the terrain upon which the founders of the NWP could build strong foundational ideas of freedom, choice, cultural recognition, and success.

Rhetoric at Work in the NWP

Rhetoric was present in the Project when it started as proven through information in the primary interviews and secondary sources such as Gray’s memoir. Gray and the Project’s founders were at the right spot at the right time which is defined as the rhetorical term kairos. *Kairos* stressed the rhetor’s ability to adapt and to and to take advantage of changing, contingent circumstances. Gray said:

The simple answer is that the Project was in the right spot at the right time. The right spot was a major state university with a tradition of public service, like the University of California Berkeley and the right time was in the mid-70s when the “Why Johnny Can’t Write” stories began to appear in the nation’s press along with the articles reporting the decline in student SAT scores. (58)
Gray’s words actually describe the Project’s own *kairotic* moment. Gray and the Project’s founding partners at Berkeley did just that as Gray put forward in the previous quote and many of the interviewees in this research also quoted or referred to in some way. In ancient times, Isocrates said that educated men and women should be people “who manage well the circumstances which they encounter day by day, and who possess a judgment which is accurate in meeting occasions as they arise and rarely misses the expedient course of action” (*Panathenaicus*). *Kairos* was only one of the rhetorical tools that the original core group of educated people (Gray, Myers, Lavin, and Berkeley Provost Roderic Park) used to develop the Project.

Archival Evidence and Its Interpretations

I found a large unpublished manuscript in the archives at the NWP entitled “The Bay Area Writing Project Model of University-School Collaboration.” This document includes Gray’s plans for the Project, his own background, and comments on other partners in the early Project. This document appears to be the initial draft of Gray’s memoir as there is some duplication of the information in Gray’s published *Teachers at the Center*. Gray speaks of the number of entering freshmen who wrote sample essays so poorly that they were placed in remedial English classes. This document talks about the same time period which Gray describes as the crossroads of cultural change from the fifties to the seventies. Gray delineates the nascent Project’s ties to the dismal writing skills of Berkeley’s entering freshman class. Besides secondary reports and Gray’s own writings about the remediation problem at UC Berkeley, Smith (although a primary source), also comments on the growing high level of remediation required for freshman English students at such a prestigious university as UC Berkeley in her
interview and in written documents she published saying that it remediation courses in English rose almost to fifty per cent of the Freshman Composition enrolled students.

As a high school English teacher and then a university professor, Gray was motivated by economic, social, and educational changes to make a difference. Gray set out to create a different form of professional development for teachers other than the one shot expert in-services then held or even the credentialing department in which he worked provided to teacher. Gray came armed with a rhetorical argument that would convince others of his altruistic purposes while Myers still hints at underlying job security as the true goal.

Gray claims that teachers need freedom to find practices that actually work in specific situations in individual demonstration lessons. Students would always be in the forefront as the reason to use a practice within any classroom if Gray could accomplish his goals. Gray holds teachers accountable for rationalizing these practices (Gray Teachers xiii). Said practices and rationality come only through time, experience, and teachers struggling with their practices so that he envisions the writing Project as a vehicle to strengthen, shorten, and clarify the schemas of these interacting issues by learning from other master teachers. Each participant is an expert in teaching, helping other experts to find new insights to implement in their daily “best practices.”

An Enlightened Approach to Remediation in the NWP

Possibly Gray’s plan for how to fix poor Johnny who could not write appeared as subversive to practices and theory of the time. Instead of targeting the students as deficient, Gray and his early group of supporters including Lavin and Myers, who both speak to this topic in my interviews with them, this group looked to the writing programs and to master teachers who wanted to have more input and possessed years of positive experiences through their own
classroom practices used as Gray says “behind closed doors” without sharing and without input from any level (“Collaboration” 13).

Deeply rooted in Gray’s own writings and in the interviews I conducted with the original group of summer institute planners and participants (Bernstein, Healy, Lavin, Myers, Schwalm, and Smith, all interview subjects), was a commitment of personal time and effort, an eclectic background of knowledge of writing and its processes, and some original creativity. I am convinced that Gray’s use of “‘best practices’” is rhetorical semantics to polish the Project as a bright, shiny new offering, not a reworked nagging innovation that he spent much of his adult education life working to perfect.

From the time invitations in UC Berkeley’s name invited a very small group of educators from all levels and backgrounds to the first summer institute, Gray appears to be the person with all the new ideas about teacher education. While this Project was believed to a completely new approach to educational reform, Gray had revamped ideas that he had tried at least once before without success. Yes, the summer institute was new but the underlying principles were not. Gray helped design the California State Department of Education’s English Teaching Specialists’ Programs, an earlier program that was also based on teachers teaching teachers. I believe the idea was Gray’s, but was not necessarily a completely “new” idea. I argue that Gray sold the idea as new in order to not remind other educators of the failed attempts at launching a new reform program. In the earlier Specialists’ program, he discovered that it was very difficult to coordinate a program for a state as large as California out of one office in Sacramento. Gray’s group soon realized the entire state of California, which had previously tried a similar writing program, was too large to handle administratively, but they also realized that the number of
opportunities for in-service and to recruit camp students as well as summer institute participants needed to be substantial.

The second summer institute had problems which prompted Gray to close it early. Gray attributes most of the problems of that second institute on one particularly difficult English professor who disrupted daily work and looked for ways to irritate other participants. He was tolerated for the first half of the summer because, according to Gray, he was a particularly gifted writer. After his demonstration lesson opened a full fray of vitriolic debates in the class, Gray tried to save things by dividing the group into two separate classrooms, one for people who could support this professor’s arguments and another room for other participants who refused to work with him again (Gray Teachers 67-68). Gray’s intervention did not heal the deep rift caused by the gentleman so that “I found it impossible. It was simply not true to the heart of the Project” (Gray Teachers 68). Gray did not want the Project to have to choose sides about what or how to teach but wanted it to follow his vision of talented teachers coming together to share their expertise so he closed it early.

Gray attributed the stormy second institute to the selection process of inviting teachers before an interview process was established. The third institute began with an interview plan in place. Interview sessions allow site administrators and candidates for participation to learn about the scope of the Project and to interact with at least a few of the other candidates. Future sites would profit from the implementation by Gray of the interview key to finding a compatible group of reasonable participants. Gray found then and the NWP still uses these small group interviews to shape a cohesive group of people, not simply cookie cutter replicates of one another, but diverse while still showing a willingness to be cooperative.
Gray’s concept that launched the first summer institute of the BAWP was based on what sounds as if it were a very simplistic model that was, however, a multi-faceted program to improve teaching resources, knowledge bases translated into actual classroom practice, and teaching interaction skills by having teachers teaching teachers. In Gray’s plans there were new ideas that the people who had immediate contact with students would increase and share their ideas and philosophies by demonstrating lessons for other teachers, who could then take some part or the entire demonstration lesson to incorporate and tweak in their own classrooms.

Student writing was not going to improve until the teaching of writing improved, according to Gray who commented that “At that time, in the early 70’s, when writing instruction was starting to come out of the dark ages, with much still to discover, any attempt to design a model curriculum would have been foolhardy and premature” (“Collaboration” 38). This turned out to be an ironic statement since within a few years other educators and administrators would be asking for a copy of the original model to use at their own institutions and schools. Gray seems here to have again used his own powerful carefully designed rhetoric to promote the newness and specialness of the Project to make it more attractive to teachers. He may have had a model at the beginning of the Project before he even had a name for it. I argue, supported by the NWP’s own documents, that the model soon was a given precept inside the NWP. Other educators and sites, calling for a model to follow in their own locations and efforts soon were receiving the newly developed model, which it still exports around the world.

The Finding of a Core Group of Planners

Gray, as early as 1972, began to foster teacher discussions on how to improve “the state of writing in the schools” (Gray “Collaboration” 16). In a few large general meetings with Gray held with English teachers from his close association within the California Council of English,
and UC Berkeley’s English, Rhetoric, the previously discussed Subject-A department (remedial English) departments; Gray found dissension and chaos. Gray recounts:

These meetings were not always pleasant. Teachers and professors who didn’t know one another began to describe the problem as they saw it. Charges, counter-charges, and blame for the sorry state of affairs were lobbed, like hand grenades, back and forth across the table. I soon dropped these general meetings, for had they continued, with the particular mix of people I had brought together, they would have destroyed the very thing I was after, a cooperative and collegial university-school partnership. (“Collaboration” 17)

One of the strongest outcomes of these truncated meetings is the recruitment of a small band of allies to join Gray in his search for answers to writing problems in our schools. The allies proved important to the eventual planning and hard work to come. Gray’s new resourceful allies were Brandt, a Chair of the Department of Rhetoric at UC Berkeley; Lavin, a noted high school teacher in the area; and Myers, a co-worker with Gray in the UC Berkeley credentialing program. Brandt and Lavin had previously published texts on the teaching of writing. Myers understood the business end of getting things done in educational settings and programs as well as being a prominent author and educator, information which I glean from Myers’ interviews and secondary sources. This new group of supporters increased Gray’s Project staff which resulted in shortening the timeline for launching this Project.

Gray states that “In the early 70’s there was already an emerging body of knowledge on writing and the teaching of writing, knowledge from research, from a few key works that had appeared in print” (“Collaboration” 10). They knew the program design they wanted should include sources to touch as many teachers as possible. “Everything I introduced—the work of
Francis Christensen, Jim Moffett, Ken Macrorie, etc—was always new to whatever group of teachers…” that he presented the work to in conversations (Gray “Collaboration” 11). Strong affiliations as these, I believe strengthened the Project’s theoretical stance and community building support. Gray, the center of the planned Project, soon surrounded himself with a core of exceptionally talented educators and administrators, who helped him to increase the quality and quantity of work that this Project needed.

The teachers invited by Gray personally to participate in the institutes were recognized by their principals as outstanding practitioners. They (not the university) would come to the institute as the experts on teaching writing. They would share their knowledge with the other “fellows” and learn how to do workshops for other teachers.

A belief held by the Gray was that all teachers should believe “that they can make a difference in their classrooms and beyond” (Gray Teachers xiii), according to past Executive Director of the NWP, Richard Sterling. Sterling says the underlying principle of Gray’s memoir was his attitude of respect for teachers. Sterling credits Gray with making the writing Project possible because he had a true belief in teachers (Gray Teachers at the Center Forward, ix).

In order to support the growing Project and find the above mentioned workable classroom pedagogical stances, funds became a difficult burden for the NWP. No one was assigned to do fundraising so Gray took on that chore along with the core group of already taxed people. Their first eight of eight grant submission application resulted in seven rejection letters and one did not respond at all, which left the founders with no extra money on the horizon. Gray recruited Michael Scriven to help improve the evaluation section of future grants. Funding was difficult so that Gray had to spend a great deal of time promoting the Project in his own articles, from other teachers, and from others that would appear in newspapers across the country.
Positive public relations opened doors surprisingly to the Carnegie Corporation (at the direct insistence by Alden Dunham, program director at the Carnegie Corporation at New York, to Gray in person), the Andrew Mellon Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

While there was fertile ground for the NWP to implement changes, much of its work was reform that drew much criticism and disdain. However, because of the immediate sense that something had to change in universities, Chancellor Bowker, at the urging of then Provost Park, granted the writing Project the $13,000 it needed to get started (Myers Interview 6). As the NWP expanded, the various sites would provide professional development as long term investments rather than one time services. The NWP filled that gap. It is apparent that change was necessary at UC Berkeley or a Provost would not have supported the program’s ideas with still so many unanswered questions about its structure. I find that this support speaks to Gray’s charisma and the society’s need for change in the teaching field, especially writing. The NWP filled a perceived gap in writing education at a time when it was sorely needed. Thirteen thousand dollars seems a small contribution by current economic standard but if translated into 2012 money that would amount would be equal to almost sixty thousand. This was long before federal funding, which would come almost twenty years later. It also came before Gray was able to receive funding from the National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) to support a newsletter through an endowed gift.

Handwritten Funding and Participation Records

I have in my possession the only copy I know to exist of records for participants, budgets, etc., that Gray had scratched in pencils figures about the first years of the Project. I am including my report taken from those records in Appendix E. The participant numbers grew quickly to
almost triple in the second year of activity (Gray Handwritten Notes Undated 2). I now fully appreciate participation was outstripping the funding. I conclude that Gray was running a successful program that was snowballing so fast that he could not stop very long or he would be buried in his own success. Gray’s charisma, dedication to hard personal work and his ability to switch hats quickly from educator, director, and still take on fundraising proves that an organization needs a capable leader of the charge who is also ready to be the driving force to bring about all aspects of reform. These insider figures are proof that something was working properly in disseminating the Project to more and more people but the funding woes were eating away at Gray and the business end guy, Myers. (Gray Handwritten Notes 1-8).

I also found a timeline document in Gray’s archives, undated, which I believe was produced by Gray covering the progress of funding and awards over the first fifteen years of the Project. I have placed my report based on that document in Appendix F. The records and the timeline demonstrated the exploding number of participants which stretched the budget tightly (Gray Undated Timeline Document 1-8). It includes not only growth reports for the first ten years but also boasts of the awards, honors, and positive publicity that were lavished on the NWP.

Impact on the NWP in the 1964-1984 Period and Now

The NWP works across grade levels and course materials. Bernstein, Gray, Healy, Lavin, Myers, Smith and Schwalm impacted the NWP by their knowledge and capacity to adapt and their willingness to see others grow and progress. Many other directors, teacher/consultants, and presenters made a difference in the fields of rhetoric, composition, and teacher education through their hard work and love of writing and love of teaching writing. I find from all my research and analysis of data that the founders started something very special and unique. More
educators followed in their footsteps drawn by the charisma, intellect, and never ending respect for teacher first evidenced in Gray’s own leadership roles. The NWP is a continuum taking education into the future because it was firmly founded by Gray and his colleagues in theory and practice for progressive teaching improvement.

Gray seldom, if ever, used theory as a word when talking about classroom writing pedagogy and thus so many of the others, as did Myers, standing by Gray’s side during the Project’s inception, also says in his interview that theory was not discussed as it belonged to other departments such as psychology and communication, not English. I previously mentioned Moffett working with Smith and Fyfe, team teachers together, different theories to try almost directly in opposition to what was tried in a similar classroom and Moffett also working closely with Lavin, Gray, and Myers at the same time. I find fingerprints of several theorists such as Moffett and Christiansen developing and testing ideas through Project participants and their students at all grade levels. As a rhetorician working with other rhetoricians, I supported Gray’s and his colleagues’ use of rhetorical opportunities to develop and build the NWP. I would ask for each of you to think of ways in which to enrich your communication, written or oral, to enhance the audience’s understanding of how effective rhetoric is employed in our classroom teaching. This research reveals theorists trying out their new ideas with teachers enrolled in the early summer institutes arranged at Berkeley and experimenting with one teacher or team teachers. I concluded that theory is at the base of all the NWP does.
Chapter 5: Implications and Directions for the Future

The NWP as a Way of Life, Then and Now

The National Writing Project (NWP) was not just the commitment of one short summer institute; it also allowed many master teachers to have a new way of life: as teacher-consultants who branched out to share their knowledge of how to teach writing across disciplines. Additionally, career moves and varying opportunities came to them through their affiliation with the NWP. The work load could be stressful as a direct derivative of the time and amount of work necessary to accomplish change in a given time, but there is also the exhilaration and joy when a new program is launched, a summer camp for students concludes, or a personal accomplishment in teaching or writing is completed to a participant’s personal satisfaction.

Gray’s long term directorship was vital to the NWP; this dissertation is a testimony to a successful educator who was on quest for knowledge all his life. Everything is changing in education, as well as in the global world society that now exists, so continuity is important but so is innovation through the best information available to accomplish a goal such as improving teaching skills in order to provide more support and “best practices” for the students they teach.

In order to join the forces of the early groups of “Project people,” I suggest that teachers as a group or as individuals should question things that are taken for granted in their own field of expertise in order to test if what is given is really true. Each of us as teachers must actively seek to improve our own writing practices. As an engineer or a chemist must have broad based language skills to prepare reports, give presentations, and present their findings in the professional world; teachers of writing need to be skilled writers. Written communication is the prime mode of sharing documentation such as research results, in obtaining grant funds, and in succeeding in most professional fields. I discovered through this research that the NWP does
have the resources and desire to change what needs to be fixed and the knowledge to know what
is not broken. The subjectivity of language does not excuse one from pursuing excellence in our
efforts in the classrooms at whatever level we teach. Any program that wishes to prosper must
first build a strong underpinning of theory on which to build its practices.

As I read for this Project, I heard staunch voices joining together to support the Project’s
programs and goals but I also heard echoes of some dissenting voices wanting to change
particular ways in which to deal with their individual situations. The impact of the NWP is a
national force tirelessly pursuing reform. Support is usually just a telephone call away to NWP
national headquarters as well as at a key stroke on the computers used in each site. Some
particular issues such as leadership styles by directors and the sheer amount of work
accomplished by a site are also growing opportunities for professional master teachers to find
approaches to dealing with the culture, city, and school districts they service as well as the
school-university partnerships just as they were in the early years.

Moreover, I hold the belief that the definitions of words so far reaching as “theory” and
“rhetoric” are not easily agreed on topics. There are as many definitions of rhetoric through time
as there are people who still use it as only a pejorative word meaning an empty, wordy device
used deliberately to confuse issues rather than what it really is a tool of writing meant to
persuade informed audiences. Timing and language are very important in our profession and
must be implemented properly so that others are ready to hear about new ideas and information
and share understanding of the language to keep our craft alive. I support the issue of
adaptability being at the core of survival in a changing world which applies equally to the
education fields of writing and teacher education.
A new type of professional learning communities started with the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) would nurture teachers to become better teachers (Smith, “After 22 Years” 26). The NWP worked with engaging inquiry, in the classroom and out, in order to discover new teaching practices. Current scholars are realizing the importance of the original building blocks used to found the NWP that can still be applied to teaching writing today with students from a different time and different circumstances as well as teachers with different pedagogies and different theoretical foundations.

Funding Crucial Also Problematic

Funding for programs including summer institutes and in-service opportunities for teachers since the NWP lost its federal major federal funding is actively being pursued by the NWP and other highly competitive writing programs with some good plans and resulting options to continue the educational base of support needed to accomplish current needs and for future endeavors. The NWP is reaching out to older sources of private funding, developing new strategies to use social media through the internet for visibility and quick up-to-date models of fundraising from people or organizations that have little or no experience with the NWP, and reconnecting with people who are part of the present and history through the well-established NWP website; the NWP is still pursuing federal funds reinstatement to previous levels through several approaches.

The NWP websites previously published several alternative grant opportunities in 2005 which may well possibly make up the difference between the $25.6 million and the new federal funding level of $11.3 million. The 2005 NWP website blurb lists the American Association of Women Education Foundation, which supports a variety of programs for research, fellowships, community Projects and symposia; The International Reading Association, which is dedicated to
promoting levels in literacy and quality reading instruction; The Walter S. Johnson Foundation’s Public Education program, which includes grants for teacher development; National Book Scholarship Fund (NBSF) which distributes books for New Readers Press and other materials for literacy outreach programs; and The Starbucks Foundation’s, which focuses on literacy including a Writing Program for Older Youth (ages 12-21). These are only a handful of the opportunities available according to the NWP to make up the gap of lost federal funding (Grant Opportunities 1-2).

On a Stressful Economic Loss

An interesting perspective changed for the NWP as I was finishing the research and after my Institutional Review Board (IRB) was officially closed. The NWP lost its federal set-aside funding completely. New legislation eliminated federal funding that had been a mainstay for over 30 years and that helped the NWP to expand to many colleges and universities that also contributed matching grants so that this loss actually caused a doubled financial impact. I conclude this loss may make the period of the founding years of the even more important for future administrators and educators to reference while rebuilding the lost funding sources. I proceeded to examine if my research in the early years pre-federal funding will possibly be even more enlightening and useful as the highly competitive funding field reacts to this loss. It is once again a time of tension economically and educationally, and the NWP may find some interesting clues to be able to rebound from this loss in troubled times similar to the 1960s and 1970s. This Project now is back at its roots fighting in a crowded field of organizations and educational programs for grants and private funding. This search for funds comes at a time in which our country is facing great stresses on its educational resources and results. The climate of test stress that brought the NWP to fruition again is at work in a nation reacting to the aggressive program
of a federally mandated program “No Child Left Behind” that has been highly negatively critiqued.

Thus, I searched for any newly published articles that addressed the loss of federal funding for the NWP. I found some interesting backup for my assumptions in current literature commenting on competition and problems. A reporter for Education Week, who covers federal policy and Congress, reported on stimulus programs and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/No Child Left Behind. She said that “More than a dozen education programs—including high-profile efforts focused on literacy, teaching, and learning face the prospect of a permanent federal funding loss after they were chopped from a stopgap spending measure signed into law by President Obama” (Klein 1). The NWP was one of these programs chopped from federal funding by the pen stroke of President Obama but only one of several. That slashing of several programs’ federal funding stiffens the competitive field for all of the programs and will make the job even harder for the NWP which had received funding for 20 years and had become dependent on those funds and matching college and university grants.

Moving forward, I turned to the NWP online as a source for information about the organization’s response to the loss of federal funding. The following press release was issued by the newest (only the third in its 38 year history) NWP Executive Director, Sharon J, Washington dated March 6, 2012, stating that President Obama had signed a bill on March 2, 2011 which eliminated direct federal funding for the National Writing Project (Washington 1). Washington went on to report that the NWP network of 70,000 teachers in 200 universities was put in grave jeopardy and those involved provide and deliver localized, high-quality professional development. While she may be showing some bias in such a statement and the further statements she made in that press release for her own program, it seems to me to be pertinent to
see how the NWP thinks of itself as an organic entity whose “teaching consultants have played major role in influencing students' academic success” (Washington 2). The press release also says the NWP had for twenty years been a national program authorized by the Department of Education through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and for many years had received bi-partisan support (2). Washington backs up this statement with rigorous research studies from internal NWP surveys and evaluations and external sources such as the Scriven report, which have identified and demonstrated improvement in writing performance among students whose teachers participate in NWP programs. The results for said students outpaced those of students in comparable classrooms. The NWP website has recently called for contributions from leaders, teacher consultants, and all who support the Project to help replace some of the lost funding.

The NWP Recovers Some of the Loss through a New Source of Funding

Another article published in September 2011, in Education Week authored by an assistant editor specializing in teacher issues, speaks about a new $25 million fund that will be based on competition and the problems involved in President Obama’s major funding cuts. This author stressed the importance of replacement funds possibly becoming available in 2012. He elaborated that several high-profile teacher-training and professional-development groups that recently lost federal set-asides including Teach For America, The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the NWP will have an opportunity to recapture some funding “under the terms of a newly unveiled $25 million federal competition” (Shachuk 3). He went on to discuss that many other groups will be eligible to apply under the terms of the written competition rules that will become open only to national nonprofit organizations, and will call for applicants to cite research evidence of their effectiveness (Shachuk 4). He concludes that this
program rewards Projects who have proven to be successful. Programs with proven successful history as the NWP has are just this year receiving part of this newly available plan award; however, this fund offsets less than half of the previous sum received in the last year of funding. This award recognizes the success of the NWP. This new funding is called Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) grants and would be available to the above mentioned groups who had received a combined sum of $59,200,000 in fiscal year 2010. The NWP needed to work swiftly to obtain part of this alternate federal funding which is only available for $25,000,000 (less than half of the past awards to the three organizations listed earlier) in reduced funds disbursement in an already crowded field and it did. According to a recent report, “The National Writing Project, a Berkeley, Calif., based non-profit, got $11.3 million grant to train K-12 teacher-leaders in writing instruction. That’s not as much as the $25.6 million the group used to get when it got federal funding as a "national authorized program," or "earmark,” depending on whom you talk to” (Klein “TFA” 1).

Other alternate funding sources are actively being pursued by the NWP to obtain sufficient funds to continue to operate at earlier years funding levels. This investigation into the way things worked at the founding of the Project will be more significant to people working to keep this or any other writing or education program sufficiently funded. When the NWP limped through its first years and for twenty years beyond the critical start up costs, many staffers and university personnel had to pull together to do some creative and innovative searches for funds which had no history of success at its inception. The group of experienced educators, supportive University officials, and a strong cohort of people inside or near to and outside these two named groups, and outsider supporters, all of whom wanted to help with then current problems which were declared by media and society as at least a perceived literacy crisis. All of these original
advocates for the Project pulled together to do creative and innovative searches for funds. The Project was a team effort working on unproven reforms to classroom pedagogy, some appearing subversive to former standards, in the teaching of writing.

Some of the input from the interviewed founders may well bring forth some data that others could follow as guides to build funding as Gray had done in the years before federal funding was available. I find some areas that may have already been affected within the NWP possibly due to this loss of funding, a few sites are closing due to the lack of funds as did the WTWP at UTEP, but some of the reasons those few sites have closed may not only be the loss of funding. Layoffs at the NWP headquarters have happened already according to emails I have received and NWP website articles. The NWP website presents confident affirmation that this organization will react well to this major change in the organization to survive the funding cuts, which is similar to the times Gray operated as the fundraising arm of the early Project as well as the founder and director of the Project. Current leaders already have many support systems that work in the present to help allay any fears of non-survival. There does not seem to be any definitive immediate solutions or researched materials published in any of the major literature sources yet, but the NWP remains confident in its role as teachers teaching teachers. This research can provide the clues to building a funding source that will keep the NWP functional and to supplement the partial reinstatement of federal funds for 2012. The importance of the loss of federal funding can make this historical research more useful to future fundraisers who may profit by taking cues from the founding resourceful participants by helping them find other ways to receive funds than from grants and federal set asides. One such idea could be putting summer writing camps for students, which are funded by schools districts or payment by individual student fees by the parents of promising young writers, in the community in which the students
reside rather than holding these lucrative budget increasing camps on the affiliated university campus. University space is tight and sometimes expensive to use. The costs and inconvenience of transporting students would disappear if the students could walk to a community center or school that is open in the summer session.

It takes innovation and partnerships to enable a Project to continue and thrive especially in tough times for a national and world economy that are reeling from globalization effects of business and financial problems which are connected by the speed of communication with the European and emerging economies such as Brazil, Russian, India, and China. As one market closes, the later open economy for the day feels the ripples. U.S. markets react to the closing stature and signs of problems or improvement in the markets mention in the last sentence. Societal and cultural influences become, once again, a controlling factor in the Project’s ability to receive funds with not only our own countries funding worries, but includes the global fluctuations and priorities of different cultures and locations.

Political Parties Not Driven To Fund Educational Reform

Future possibilities for educators do not seem to be the hot political issue in the 2012 Presidential election. As I have pointed out in other chapters, the NWP’s foundations were constructed in the early 1970s. Time, Newsweek, the New York Times, plus local media produced many articles about the breakdown of writing inabilities among young students, as did the ever growing influence of television programming which featured educational issues closely. Articles about failed educational programs are once again still prominent in the media; brought forth by the standardized testing and stories regarding “teaching to the test.” The College Board recently released its fifth report in a series, Teachers Are the Center of Education/Teacher Voices, in support of their belief of the power and commitment of teachers. In this report, the College
Board says “It does not appear to be a priority of the debates or political advertising by either party that our students need funds and strong teacher programs to support Projects, [and] new systems, while working with cutting edge rhetoric, composition, and writing excellence” (College Board 1).

The NWP must step forward in order to be important to a society which is aware of educational problems due to growth in immigrant populations and their descendants. To keep pace with immigration and birth rates of many immigrant populations, our country needs programs that allow teachers to innovate in order to meet their students’ language deficiencies and cultural differences evidenced in and outside the classroom. However, House Education and the Workforce Committee Chairman Kline (R-MN) is not backing away from his intent to reduce the federal role in education. He is introducing an ESEA bill that would eliminate funding for several vital programs including the NWP which the Obama administration slated for consolidation in FY 2012. Kline’s committee’s press release on May 13, 2011 about this bill describes the 43 programs slated for elimination as “inefficient,” “unnecessary,” and even “wasteful.” Even though an English Language Learners (ELL) briefing cites the NWP, as key to one teacher’s success in her students’ English reading and writing achievement. In order to fight budget cuts and misrepresentations of the Project, leaders and individual need to step forward with innovative programs to survive (Kingston 1)

Just as Gray and his group had to recover from a unsettling moment when the second summer institute collapsed in problems and was cut short, the current group of leaders and teacher consultants need to face the adversity around the funding issues today and work through whatever connections, allies, and resources they can find to keep the NWP alive in support of
teachers with innovative programs. Through the teachers the students receive the help they so often need.

The Project’s current participants have many more monetary demands and responsibilities in comparison to the founding group. The NWP is currently a large organization with inadequate funding due to the budgets cuts. The founders were starting a program in which supply and demand of funding grew along with the program. The current Project leaders also have the burden of supplying funds to already existing sites which are somewhat dependent on pre-budget cut expected funds. They will need innovation, coordination, and smart budget management to support the existing sites and programs just as Gray and his colleagues faced so long ago in building an expanding program. Teachers and their leaders have an obligation to meet the high standards set by the original founders of the NWP in the classroom which is possible through programs such as the NWP.

At the inception of the Project, Gray shared the concept of teachers teaching teachers with early organizing and sponsoring entities proved to be an excellent example of how to partner and innovate for today’s educators and outside organizations. With strong foundations, within and outside the organization, Gray and his colleagues were enabled to launch the first summer institute of the Project to broaden teaching resources. The knowledge base collected by the first groups of summer institute success and failures translated into actual changes in classroom practices, teaching interactions, and new successful skill sets being shared by the teachers at the center. The teachers who had immediate contact with students increased and shared their considerable ideas and philosophies by demonstrating lessons for other teachers, who could then enjoy the privileges of adapting that lesson or some small aspect of it to their own classroom practices.
The Project continues to be a place for theory bound practices to evolve into action within the educational community—by simply providing a forum for all those voices to be heard as long as the educators involved can be innovative, creative, and fundraisers par excellence. Sterling, the second Director of the NWP following Gray, claimed that in the early years the summer institute was concerned with the intellectual integrity of teachers and “both the teachers and the instructors bring in theoretical and research material” (Goldberg 395) to be evaluated and worked within the collaborative setting.

Gray believed for his entire educational career of 50 years much ahead of the founding of the NWP that a teacher is the best person to teach other teachers and this belief is a “revolutionary notion” (Teachers 139). His deep faith and respect for teachers is an idea that carries on today. Revolutionary, subversive, and innovative were all adjectives that applied to the NWP at its conception and need to remain at the core belief system of teachers leading the Project today. This research contextualizes that revolution and innovation by documenting the experiences of not only the leaders but the master teacher participants who were there. The NWP began as a reaction to stimuli from cultural changes and societal pressures to build a bridge between theory and practice that survives today as a reform movement. Future educators and researchers have some fertile ground in which to direct the writing of the twenty-first century students who have so many more tools, i.e., computers, writing labs, writing centers, and by having teachers who grew up standing on the shoulders of giants in the field of rhetoric, composition, and teacher education.

Theoretic Underpinnings Revealed by Historical Context Examination

The historical beginnings of the NWP can teach us about the theoretical underpinnings and practices that first participants brought to the Project and what influenced the building of this
new program to meet the writing needs of students at all levels, K-University. By looking more closely at the interview answers and archival material plus tying secondary source material to the interview participants, I discover what theoretical framework and scholars influenced the founding group. This work can possibly be a guideline for future educators to start other similar Projects to fit present cultural, societal, and rhetorical needs of current and future students. It could also provide some clues to innovation in funding sources and building budgets that are not as susceptible to political or economic shifting policy winds so tied to the economy. Funding for such programs and teachers since the NWP lost its federal major federal funding has been found in several places.

Teachers Need Freedom to Change Their Pedagogy Based “Best Practices”

Gray, his colleagues at UC Berkeley, and other educators brought forth the idea that teachers need freedom to find practices that actually worked in specific situations keeping students ever present at the forefront of the reasons for pedagogy used within classrooms. He also wanted to bring experienced teachers out from behind the closed doors of their classrooms to share their time proven success “best practices.” He held the teachers accountable for rationalizing these practices (Gray, *Memoir xiii*). “best practices” and rationality to support those skills develop only through dedicating time for teachers, their leaders, and support staff to work enhancing and sharing pedagogical foundations; and to provide rich opportunities for growing their experiences and sharing their own knowledge with other teaches. Many teachers are eager to receive new approaches to classroom “best practices” with the will to teach others through sharing their own success stories. Gray envisioned the writing Project as a vehicle to strengthen, to deepen clarity for teachers’ schemas from their own practices of interacting with other master teachers so that they could learn to help each other. This deeply rooted core issue
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of the NWP helps teachers to find new insights on Gray’s important questions of what (pedagogy) and why (theoretical underpinnings) teachers use to produce their own “best practices.”

This core of understanding and implementing the sharing and receiving of ideas are present in Gray’s writings, in the interviews conducted with the original group of summer institute planners and participants (Miles Myers, Alvin “Cap” Lavin, Mary Ann Smith, Mary K. Healy, and Ruby Bernstein, who were all interview subjects) and the writings of Sterling, the second director of the NWP at Gray’s retirement; involved a tremendous commitment of personal time and effort, an abundance of knowledge of writing and its processes, and unique creativity that Gray believed every teacher should possess. He honored teachers for their master teacher knowledge base that resulted in “‘best practices’” and for other educators and non-educators alike to honor these master teachers. In order to help teachers and leaders to be ready and able to use theory underlying their own “‘best practices’” in today’s classrooms, support is needed, as it was in the early years of the organization.

Call to Action: Meet the Educational Needs of Society

The educational community must supply no less than the best education for the future. These students demand and deserve the best support efforts so that they may go forward to forge their own new theories and “‘best practices’” in whatever career field they pursue post school. After graduating from college, the NWP could bring past students touched by the Project together to coordinate current fundraising styles for the NWP as the NWP young teacher-consultants and staff have already done including depending heavily on the internet with presences on Facebook and Twitter to capture new audiences who may not be familiar with the NWP, reconnecting to bond with past and present NWP teacher-consultants through the
campaigns on their website to help preserve the NWP, and looking for alternate funding sources previously active in writing education reform programs.

I call for teachers at whatever level to do the same type of interaction which Gray did with their colleagues. Show interest, ask questions, be ready to listen or console in order to keep the channels of communication flowing. This is one of the more important lessons I learned about the NWP through this research. It is hard work and requires tremendous dedication, but done properly group education opportunities dissimilar to other efforts already tried can make a difference.

Society as a whole needs to be invested in the standards (not standardized tests) to enhance the educational opportunities in the globalized environment in which the NWP continues to work. I watched and admired the optimism of the Project’s participants (Gray Timeline). I encourage other teachers, administrators, and interested parties to become proactive change agents in their own educational experience and that of their students. Curriculum reform can carry us all into the new frontiers developing strong yet flexible changes which ensure the growth in writing, teacher education, and curriculum design.

I challenge educators to give no more than Gray and his innovative, creative, hardworking inner core of “Project people” did so long ago to keep improving the teaching of writing. This research calls for action by all teachers, administrators, and educators at all levels not working as teachers any longer but as business consultants to maintain growth standards, facilitate curriculum reform, and devote themselves to keep active with research and new innovative programs and ideas. Similar to the work a scientist would do by growing organism in the medium within a Petri dish in a lab, ideas can be cultured and fueled by opportunities to grow
in many avenues gaining experienced based knowledge. These ideas can prosper in current societal and cultural movements as ideas did in the NWP’s founding years.

Gray’s Two Favorite Questions: What and Why and Reading:

Important to the Core Values of the NWP

The clues in this research come mostly from the primary interview subjects about what was important and why it was important in the early years. I asked each interview subject to answer a question that arose from a statement Gray made near the very end of his memoir. “The emphasis on the why as well as the what is important: it provides a theoretical underpinning and it accents a considered approach to writing beyond mere gimmickry” (Gray Teachers 143). I determined that “why” was simply the motivational theory underlying “what,” the lesson plan and purpose that the teacher developed. Myers says in his first interview that this confusion was explained in earlier pages of Gray’s book (1). Myers adds that Gray “thought there was a lot about writing that we know that basically people didn’t know much about because they never received any training about it in any program they had as an English teacher” (Interview 1). It is my firm belief that Gray was intent on showing interest and respect as he interacted with the primary stakeholders in his daily practices when dealing with teachers. The two words, why and what, become conventions to show his interest to extend each teacher’s authority in the classroom. This standard question, according to most of the primary interview subjects was a conversation starter for Gray along with his second standard question “What are you reading now?” Gray really showed interest in a person he thought was qualified to teach masterfully and wanted to know them as well as their educational stances. The NWP does a solid job of respecting teachers just as Gray did so many years ago. The Project is a life changing experience for most teachers. Each NWP participant is asked to put forth their best effort to teach other
teachers what they learned through hard fought endurance and experience in the trenches of their classrooms. Many teachers never experience the empowerment that master teachers enjoy while working within the NWP.

In Conclusion: Core Practices of Sharing, Adaptability to Changing Expectations, and Site Individuality

The strength of a program can be judged by its adaptability and agility in dealing with ever changing expectations. Through the shared knowledge base of master teachers asking, each individual to step outside his/her comfort zone in many cases, to become a teacher-consultant. Gray once talked about education coming out of the dark ages many years ago; the NWP has assisted teachers to approach their classroom strategies in new ways, to promote the writing skills of their students, and to achieve personal growth in their professional career sharing their “best practices.” Teachers as Change Agents

- “Teachers play a vital role in leading sustained efforts to improve learning in our schools” (NWP Website).

- Teacher-leaders:
  - Study and share practices
  - Enhance student writing and learning
  - Work collaboratively with other educators
  - Design resources
  - Take on new roles in effecting positive change (NWP Website).

Sharing by Teaching Others

- NWP shares power through peer work with leadership roles changing.
The sharing of power links NWP participants in a joint effort.

Sharing holds the NWP together.

The NWP recognizes the worth of teachers across grade levels and disciplines working together as experts to learn to teach writing from each other.

Each NWP site is an entity unto itself with different schedules in particular areas and for certain groups and yet is networked through the NWP. Each site is still related through support from the NWP, shared belief systems, and NWP websites and publications. Exposure to other groups happens through the Web, in the yearly national conference as well as state, district, and local site Projects and meetings. Sharing is still a core principle, but not all sites ever did or ever will look alike. As each student is an individual, each site acquires its own individualistic practices, strengths, and weaknesses. The NWP is known for its positive impact on teachers, students, and educator training.
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Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form One

Kay Lester Mooy will be studying the history of the National Writing Project theories and foundation from 1974-2006 regarding the teaching of writing by interviewing participants in the historical first meetings of the Bay Area Writing Project in Berkeley, CA. and later participants who made the movement grow to reach all fifty states today. I will also be reading articles by some of the same people, the memoir of James Gray, the founding father, and other articles written about the Project by outsiders and insiders.

My participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled, and I may discontinue participation at any time without any penalty. Mooy will use names with the participants’ informed consent and will permit the subject to read the material in their section of my report before submitting it to her dissertation committee to ensure that it fairly and adequately represents my viewpoint and interview answers. The interviews will be taped with the permission of the interviewee and the tapes shall be transcribed. The tapes will be stored for a period of three years at the home address of Kay Mooy, 11853 Pete Rose Drive, El Paso, TX 79936 and then destroyed.

This will be a descriptive dissertation; there is no perceived risk to any participants.

The benefits to the subjects of this study may revolve around the ability to tell their story publicly about the National Writing Project.

I hereby consent to being a part of this study.

Signature of Researcher: _______________________________________________________

Printed Name: Kay Lester Mooy ________________________________________________

Signature of subject: _________________________________________________________
Two copies of this will be signed, the researcher keeps one, and the subject keeps one. If the subject has any questions about the study, they may contact Kay Mooy at 915-595-3456 or 915-920-3456 or if they have any questions about their rights as a research subject or about the manner in which this study was conducted, she may contact the IRB Administrator, Institutional Coordinator for Research Review, by telephone at 915-747-7393 or by email at irb.orsp@utep.edu.

My original IRB permit expired so that I was required to initiate a second IRB permit through the IRB at UTEP.

**Informed Consent Form Two**

**University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board**

**Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects**

**Protocol Title:** Interviews Regarding the History of the National Writing Project in 1974

**Principal Investigator:** Kay Lester Mooy, PhD Candidate

**UTEP:** Department of English, Rhetoric and Composition Studies PhD Program

**Introduction**

You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research Project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form
that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

**Why is this study being done?**

You have been asked to take part in a research study of the history of the National Writing Project in 1974 and its implications for writing instruction as part of research for a PhD Candidate’s dissertation research. The study will be about the teaching of writing obtained through interviews with participants in the Bay Area Writing Project in Berkeley, CA and later participants who currently are part of the outgrowth of that Project, the National Writing Project. Archival materials and the memoir of James Gray, the founding father, will also be included in the study along with other articles and books written about the two Projects by outsiders and insiders. Your participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled, and you may discontinue participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. This will be a descriptive dissertation. Approximately, twenty subjects will be enrolling in this study at UTEP or in their present location. You are being asked to be in the study because you were a participant or founder in the origins of the National Writing Project or are a current participant in the National Writing Project.

If you decide to enroll in this study, your involvement will last about five hours (interview and review of transcripts of that interview, and follow up questions on the original interview).

**What is involved in the study?**

If you agree to take part in this study, the research team will contact you to set up an appointment for an interview either in person or by telephone with tape recordings of either,
interview you at the specified time, record the interview, prepare a transcript of the interview, and present the transcript to you for review or corrections of statements in that transcript. The transcripts will be examined to ascertain the role each interviewed person played in the founding of the organization (then known as the Bay Area Project housed at Berkeley) or play now in writing education. Included will be the educational background of each interviewee and their opinions of the educational environment that called them to join the Project. This information will then be combined to find agreements, disagreements, and trends of thought on writing education and the programs involved in teaching writing then and now.

**What are the risks and discomforts of the study?**

There are no known risks associated with this research; however, there could be some risk from misrepresentation of your position or from us or personal material in a public venue. You might be quoted out of context or misconstrued as to motive or obligation in the Project. The overall research Project may dilute any personal publication that you would like to in the future. The study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

**What will happen if I am injured in this study?**

The University of Texas at El Paso and its affiliates do not offer to pay for or cover the cost of medical treatment for research related illness or injury. No funds have been set aside to pay or reimburse you in the event of such injury or illness. You will not give up any of your legal rights by signing this consent form. You should report any such injury to Kay Lester Mooy (914-595-3456) and to administrator of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UTEP by telephone at (915-747-8841) or through email irb.orsp@utep.edu.
Are there benefits to taking part in this study?

The benefits of this study to you may revolve around the ability to tell your story publicly about your participation in the Bay Area Writing Project and/or the National Writing Project. There will be no direct benefits to you for taking part in this study. This research may help us to understand the teaching of writing as a rhetorical process and as a response to the rhetorical situation in which it exists.

What other options are there?

You have the option not to take part in this study. There will be no penalties involved if you choose not to take part in this study.

Who is paying for this study?

There is no internal or external funding for this study except as paid for by the principle investigator, Kay Lester Mooy.

What are my costs?

There are no direct costs.

Will I be paid to participate in this study?

You will not be paid for taking part in this research study.

What If I Want to Withdraw, or Am Asked to Withdraw from This Study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you do not take part in the study, there will be no penalty.

If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. However, we encourage you to talk to a member of the research group so that they know why you are leaving the study. If there are any new findings during the study that may affect whether you want to continue to take part, you will be told about them.
The researcher may decide to stop your participation without your permission, if he or she thinks that being in the study may cause you harm, or if the focus of the study changes.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may call Kay Mooy (915-595-3456).

If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UTEP at (915-747-8841) or by email to the IRB administrator at irb.orsp@utep.edu.

What about confidentiality?

Your name will be used according to the informed consent that you will sign and you will be permitted to read the material including your interview information to ensure that it fairly and adequately represents your viewpoint and interview answers. The interviews will be taped with your permission and the tapes will be transcribed. The tapes will be stored for a period of three years at the home address of Kay Mooy, 11853 Pete Rose Drive, El Paso, TX 79936 and then destroyed.

Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- The sponsor or an agent for the sponsor
- Department of Health and Human Services
- UTEP Institutional Review Board.

Because of the need to release information to these parties, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The results of this research study may be presented at meetings or in publications.
All records will be stored at the home address of Kay Mooy, 11853 Pete Rose Drive, El Paso, TX 79936. The tapes will be stored for a period of three years and then destroyed.

**Mandatory reporting**

If information is revealed about child abuse or neglect, or potentially dangerous future behavior to others, the law requires that this information be reported to the proper authorities.

**Authorization Statement**

I have read each page of this paper about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information on results of the study later if I wish.

Participant Name: ____________________________ Date: ______________

Participant Signature: ________________________ Time: ______________

Consent form explained/witnessed by: ______________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________________

Printed name: __________________________________________________________________

Date: ____________________________ Time: ____________________________
Appendix B: Early Interview Questions
(Used with Bernstein, Healy, Myers, and Smith)

1. What educational position did you hold at the time you were invited to join the Bay Area Writing Project’s first organizational meeting?

2. What philosophy of education or writing were you teaching from at that time or what was the prevalent philosophy of education or writing that was espoused at that time in 1974?

3. Why did you accept Jim Gray’s first invitation? What did you expect to hear or gain from that meeting?

4. What did that group of people meeting together change for education, for them, or for you just by calling attention to the problems in teaching writing?

5. What changes did you see, feel, or implement because you were a part of this larger group working to change the teaching of writing?

6. How have those changes weathered over time to present day?

7. What do you think accounts for the success of the National Writing Project from those early meetings to today?
Appendix C: Final Questions Used for Later Interviews
(Used with Lavin/Myers/Smith combined interview and with Schwallm)

1. In what capacity were you (or are you) involved in education or writing instruction and the National Writing Project and when?

2. What changes, if any, have you seen in writing education or the teaching of writing in classrooms based on theory or “best practices” taught in the National Writing Project?

3. How would you say these changes affected program requirements or course work in your own classrooms and in the National Writing Project, if at all?

4. When would you estimate these changes occurred?

5. What influences do you believe contributed to these changes?

6. Do you have any other information that might prove helpful to me in my study?
Appendix D: Educational Backgrounds of Major Stakeholders

Bernstein

Bernstein received her BA in Journalism from Stanford University in 1953. She then received her MA in Secondary Education in 1972 from San Francisco State University. She held a California Secondary Credential in Language Arts and Social Studies. She taught 34 years as a high school English teacher in the Northgate and Ygnacio Valley High Schools, Mt. Diablo Unified School District from 1962-1996. She then taught 12 years as an adjunct English teacher at Laney College in Oakland, CA, 199-2008. For many years, she was a reader for SATII and Advanced Placement English Composition exams and was able to sharpen student writing and increase verbal scores. Her specialty is the teaching of writing. In 1974 she became a participant in the first summer institute at UC Berkeley, BAWP.

Gray

Gray attended high school in Milwaukee, Wisconsin who took a course on the English novel that he says in his memoir “led to my becoming an English teacher and influenced my
understanding of teachers and teaching. It provided me with a model to work toward in my early teaching years” (Gray Teachers 1). He then attended the University of Wisconsin at Madison as a comparative literature major and received his BA. He stayed there to receive his MA. After working for several years in non related blue and white collar jobs he decided to enroll in Wisconsin State University which is now the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee in the teacher education department. His first teaching job was in Wisconsin and then her moved to California and was hired to teach in the San Leandro High School in Oakland. He then taught at UC Berkeley.

Healy

Healy received her Bachelor’s in English from Montclair State University in New Jersey. She earned a MA and a PhD in Assessment. She took her MAT with Gray at UC Berkeley. She received her Ph.D. in English Education from New York University. Healy was a middle school teacher at the time of the first BAWP summer institute. She taught for about nine years in Marin County, a very well to do area, which was ahead of the educational learning and teaching curve at that time in an affluent district. A Harvard team came in to teach a group of teachers about team teaching and reading in the discipline. She also worked on the Puente Bridge Project. (Healy Interview 1) Healy held several University of California positions. She was actively involved in the formation and development of the BAWP, co–directing it with
James Gray in the Graduate School of Education from 1978-1985. During this period, she also served as the NWP’s Regional Director for International Sites, directing summer Projects and institutes for teachers in Malaysia, Singapore, Japan, Australia, Sweden, Finland, Norway, and England. Healy knew Britton, Martin, and Medway, all from the British Schools where they did an enormous amount of writing and merged literature and writing essays (Healy Interview 1).

Her publications include articles on writing and pedagogy. She has always been particularly interested in the role of oral and written language in the teaching of subjects across the curriculum. She co-authored the chapter "Language Across the Curriculum" in The Handbook of Research in Teaching the English Language Arts (Macmillan, 1991). From 1986 to 1992, she co-edited the journal English Education for the National Council of Teachers of English.

In 1998, when Puente received major funding for further expansion in California’s high schools and community colleges, Healy returned full time to Puente as Director of Training and Program Services. In this role, she directed and oversaw all of the Project’s statewide training and research and assessment activities until her retirement in November 2002. Since then, she has been active as an educational consultant, presenting a range of school district writing workshops. She was Co-Director of BAWP for many years. She worked with learning logs, assessments, and taking the NWP international. She knew Britton, Martin, and Medway, all from the British Schools where they did an enormous amount of writing and merged literature and writing essays (Healy Interview 1). She also worked on the Puente Bridge Project.
Lavin did Post Graduate UC Berkeley, Dominican Graduate English Studies in writing in San Rafael, held a BA from University of San Francisco in English and Philosophy, taught at Sir Francis Drake High School and was the only high school teacher to attend the Dartmouth Convention in 1966. Lavin also completed Graduate English Studies at San Francisco State University. His main theoretical training was in generative sentence tagmemic, Chomsky, and with French theorists and models (Lavin CV). Other theorists important to Lavin were Vygotsky, Moffett, Booth, and Christiansen (Interview 25). One idea that Lavin held forth was that you become so much better at reading if you’re writing in the forms you read. He thought that new criticism, at its best, was very well advised – and called it just close reading. “I think that had a lot to do, not just with me, but a number of us cut our teeth on that” (Interview 25). He and his fellow academic fellows thought the way to it was through form, and that that enabled you to find the meaning and work with it more easily. Anyway, he thought that that – then, that idea of using models and a close reading of those, and then out of that passage, that you make them go into and read closely and carefully – that it illustrates a skill or a cluster of skills and they might be from active verbs to something like tone or metaphor. They might be at paragraph-level or whatever.
Myers received his BA from Berkeley in Language and Literacy from the School of Education. His MA in English was also from Berkeley MAT in English and his PhD from Berkeley in Language and Literacy in the Berkeley School of Education. Myers had worked as an Oakland teacher and head of the Department of English. He worked with Gray in the credentialing department at UC Berkeley. He was named Executive Director of the National Conference for Teaching English in 1990. He has had a distinguished career in education and publishing and is still closely allied with the NWP.

Schwalm was involved in writing instruction from teaching as an adjunct in the Chicago area in 1967 while he was in grad school until he retired 8 days ago from ASU. In the interim, He taught in the Department of Rhetoric at UC Berkeley, the Department of English at Ohio State University, the Department of English at UTEP, and the Department of English at Arizona State. He began his career as a specialist in 18th Century British literature, rhetoric and
composition increasingly became his primary academic focus, really starting with his work in the Department of Rhetoric—where all faculty in the department taught freshman rhetoric courses. Schwalm was a WPA at UTEP and at ASU. For the last 15 years at ASU, he was a central administrator (Vice Provost and/or Dean) at two new campuses of ASU, responsible for the start-up and development of the new campuses, including the development of writing programs (Interview 1). He also currently works as an assessment consultant.

**Smith**

Smith graduated from University of Oregon with a BA with a major in journalism. She obtained her Master’s Degree in Teacher Education from New York University and then received her teaching credentials from UC Berkeley, in the program run by Gray. She was for many years governmental relationships and public affairs director for the NWP.

Smith spoke of her own reason for participating in the first summer institute and her own position at the beginning of the program: “When I became acquainted with the NWP, I think [it was] mainly because of my relationship with Jim. At the time I started the summer institute, I was a middle school teacher in a junior high school” (Smith Interview 5).

Smith spoke of her own experience with writing: “When I was in school, we never wrote. We underlined the subject once and the predicate twice during my entire education. I was very interested in writing. I edited the literary magazine but I never wrote for it. I really didn’t know how but I knew that I wanted to write” (Smith Interview 5). Smith said that she was
first taught how to write was at the University of Oregon in the journalism school. Gray told Smith when she came in for her interview for the teacher credential program she had have to take his advance writing course because she did not have enough writing experience. She never took English courses because she was in the honors program at Oregon. You could get credit for a class as long as you took the comprehensive exam saying that she waited to take the exam until the end so she read all the books own her own because “I didn’t want any teacher to tell what me to think about my reading. I didn’t want any of those dummy research papers. I had really had from high school so I was never going to take it again. So I didn’t have a lot of English credits” (Smith Interview 6). She also worked very closely with Moffett during here early years with the Project as he lived on Street very near to Berkeley and close to her school where she was team teaching with Jo Fyfe. Moffett was extremely important to the beginning years of the Project. Myers described him as being right in the middle of things working with Smith and Fyfe giving one set of directions to each teacher and then comparing the results.

Tolman Hall, UC Berkeley, Where it All Began…
Appendix E: Handwritten Records from Gray

Covering Budgets, Participants, Figures, and Site Control

For the 1974-1975, Gray recorded in pencil that the summer institute had 26 participants, state and county had thirty, Santa Rosa had twenty-five, Mt. Didian had fifteen participants in ten meetings to equal one hundred fifty participants, and San Rafael High School had fifteen. Also on this sheet of torn out notebook paper it says in ink eight programs with thirty participants to equal two hundred forty participants plus another twenty-six to total two hundred sixty-six. The next page lists figures for 1975-1976 a total of seven hundred forty-nine participants at Sub-A, fifteen; summer institute, twenty-seven; open pay, thirty-two; and state county as thirty. In ink again are added the figures of twenty programs times thirty participants for six hundred total with the fifteen, twenty-seven, and thirty-two added for a total of six hundred seventy-four. Further down on that same page six hundred seventy-four is added to seventy-four for the grand total of seven hundred forty-nine participants. The numbers grew quickly to almost triple in the second year of activity. I am assuming these are the figures for summer institutes and in-service programs. On the next page marked 76-77 the top line says National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant # 1 plus 1st Award. The figures to the left of the page reflect twenty-eight thousand seven hundred seventy dollars plus thirty-four thousand seventy-five dollars for a total of sixty-two thousand eight hundred forty-five dollars. This page carries the first reference to BAWP which had twenty-five in the summer institute, fifteen in Sub A, seventy in open, and twenty-six times thirty (seven hundred eighty). Beneath these numbers Gray wrote eight hundred ninety as the total of the above numbers plus two hundred forty CWP plus one hundred fifty NWP, and two hundred NWP. Moving along to 77-78 the page says forty-one sites NEH had twenty-five in the summer institute, fifteen in Sub A, seventy in open, and twenty-six times
thirty (seven hundred eighty). Beneath these numbers Gray wrote eight hundred ninety as the total of the above numbers plus two hundred forty CWP plus one hundred fifty NWP, and two hundred NWP. Moving along to 77-78, the page says there were forty-one sites due to the NEH 2nd Award. The budget figures that follow are twenty-nine thousand two hundred sixty three dollars and twenty-five thousand five hundred fifty dollars for 2nd Award. The budget figures that follow are twenty-nine thousand two hundred sixty three dollars and twenty-five thousand five hundred fifty dollars for a total of fifty-four thousand eight hundred thirteen dollars. BAWP again is listed with twenty-five in the summer institute, seventy open, Sub-A fifteen, School Districts, forty-one times thirty (Twelve hundred thirty), Alaska seven times thirty (two hundred ten), Virgin Islands four times thirty (one hundred twenty) (one hundred twenty, ENG thirty, Web six per (thirty), AA twenty for a total of seventeen hundred fifty participants. The NWP is listed as forty times twenty-five (one thousand twenty five) SD one thousand for a total of two thousand twenty-five participants. The California Writing Project (CWP) lists two hundred plus AA eighty plus SD eighteen hundred for a total of two thousand eighty. I now fully appreciate participation was outstripping the funding. I conclude that Gray was running a successful program that was snowballing so fast that he could not stop very long or he would be buried in his own success. Other companies and organizations have felt similar growth pains that lead to financial failure. Gray’s charisma, dedication to hard personal work, and his ability to switch hats quickly from educator, director, and still take on fundraising proves that an organization needs a capable leader of the charge for change who is also ready to be the implement to bring about all aspects of reform.

The next page included is 78-79 which says simply twenty-nine thousand seven hundred eighty-ne dollars, plus twenty-three thousand fifty dollars totaling sixty-two thousand eight
thirty-one dollars. The California Writing Project (CWP) lists thirty-four hundred participants. The NWP lists eight thousand eight hundred participants. And the BAWP lists twelve hundred seventy-five participants. I can’t imagine how Gray was handling or juggling the budget to service so many people. The last page I have is 82-83 and is not very fleshed out and I cannot account for the missing years. BAWP lists two thousand four hundred fourteen participants from various sources and conferences are listed at ten times for a total of five hundred. Puente is written but with nothing under or near it and is written in ink rather than in pencil. These insider figures are proof that something was working properly in disseminating the Project to more and more people but the funding woes were eating away at Gray and the business end guy, Myers. (Gray Handwritten Notes).
Appendix F: Undated Timeline from Gray’s Archives

That document says that in 1973-1974, BAWP received a five-year commitment from the UC Berkeley with future funding subject to the success of the first year’s program. In 1974-1975, BAWP co-sponsored the Conference of the Teaching of Composition with the Central California Council of Teachers of English. Additional funding was received from the College of Letters and Science. The Director of BAWP was released from other duties during the course of the year initially for 30% and rising to full time by the Spring Quarter. UC Berkeley committed funding for BAWP through 1977-78, totaling two hundred sixty seven thousand dollars for the full five years. From 1975-1976, twenty invitations were received from Bay Area School Districts for full year BAWP in-service programs. The cost to each district during this period was one-two thousand dollars. The BAWP Co-Director, Lavin, was brought onto the campus full-time, supported by university funds. BAWP helped to plan the Duke University Writing Project with support from the Sachem Fund. The Carnegie Corporation of New York funds a long-term outside evaluation of BAWP to be conducted by Professor Michael Scriven. The National Endowment for the Humanities funds the UC Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project and invites BAWP to submit an amendment to support BAWP-modeled writing Projects at campuses nationwide.

Twenty-eight invitations were received from Bay Area School Districts in 1976-1977 for school-year in-service programs. The National Endowment for the Humanities funded the first NWP amendment to the BAWP grant; the amendment to support and additional eight sites within California. Outside of California, new sites were approved at Rutgers University; University of Colorado, Boulder; and Pace College/BOCES, New York.
Also in that same year, California Title IV-C named BAWP an Exemplary Program. Sixteen California schools districts received Title IV-C Adoption Grants on the BAWP model from 1977-78. The national press paid increased attention with articles in the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, and an article in American Education which was picked up by the Associated Press and reprinted nationwide; and BAWP is featured in an ABC Documentary on American Education. Gray as the BAWP Director was invited to appear on McNeil/Lehrer Report on television. And the numbers just kept growing. BAWP received forty-one invitations from local school districts for in-service staff development programs at an increased cost to the districts of one thousand seven hundred fifty dollars. The National Endowment for the Humanities funded the second NWP site amendment. Sites increased to forty-one. BAWP organizes a statewide summer training program for teachers with UC statewide Outreach Programs. Seventy thousand dollars was available to five California Writing Project (CWP) sites to train one hundred teachers. BAWP received the seventh annual Western Electric Fund Appreciation Award in recognition of outstanding achievement in meeting today’s educational needs” (Timeline 1-3).
## Data Collection Activities and the Five Traditions (Creswell 112-113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Activity</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Phenomenology</th>
<th>Grounded Theory</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is traditionally studied? (site/individual(s))</td>
<td>Single individual, accessible and distinctive</td>
<td>Multiple individuals who have experienced the phenomenon</td>
<td>Multiple individuals who have responded to action or participated in a process about a central phenomenon</td>
<td>Members of a culture-sharing group or individuals representative of the group</td>
<td>A bounded system such as a process, activity, event, program, or multiple individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are typical access and rapport issues? (access and rapport)</td>
<td>Gaining permission from individuals, obtaining access to information in archives</td>
<td>Finding people who have experienced the phenomenon</td>
<td>Locating a homogeneous sample</td>
<td>Gaining access through gatekeeper, gaining confidence of informants</td>
<td>Gaining access through gatekeeper, gaining confidence of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does one select sites or individuals to study? (purposeful sampling strategies)</td>
<td>Several strategies depending on person (e.g., convenient, politically important, typical, a critical case)</td>
<td>Finding individuals who have experienced the phenomenon, a &quot;criterion&quot; sample</td>
<td>Finding a homogeneous sample, a &quot;theory-based&quot; sample, a &quot;theoretical&quot; sample</td>
<td>Finding a cultural group to which one is a &quot;stranger,&quot; a &quot;representative&quot; sample</td>
<td>Finding a &quot;case&quot; or &quot;cases,&quot; an &quot;atypical&quot; case, or a &quot;maximum variation&quot; or &quot;extreme&quot; case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of information typically is collected? (forms of data)</td>
<td>Documents and archival material, open-ended interviews, subject journaling, participant observation, casual chatting</td>
<td>Interviews with up to 10 people</td>
<td>Primarily interviews with 20-30 people to achieve detail in the theory</td>
<td>Participant observations, interviews, artifacts, and documents</td>
<td>Extensive forms such as documents and records, interviews, observation, and physical artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is information recorded? (recording information)</td>
<td>Notes, interview protocol</td>
<td>Long interview protocol</td>
<td>Interview protocol, memoing</td>
<td>Fieldnotes, interview and observational protocols</td>
<td>Field notes, interview and observational protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are common data collection issues? (field issues)</td>
<td>Access to materials, authenticity of account and materials</td>
<td>Bracketing one’s experiences, logistics of interviewing</td>
<td>Interviewing issues (e.g., logistics, openness)</td>
<td>Field issues (e.g., reflexivity, reactivity, reciprocal, &quot;going native,&quot; divulging private information, deception)</td>
<td>Interviewing and observing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is information typically stored? (storing data)</td>
<td>File folders, computer files</td>
<td>Transcriptions, computer files</td>
<td>Transcriptions, computer files</td>
<td>Field notes, transcriptions, computer files</td>
<td>Fieldnotes, transcriptions, computer files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reporting Approaches for Each Tradition (Creswell 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Approaches</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Phenomenology</th>
<th>Grounded Theory</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General structure of study | • Introduction (problem, questions)  
• Research procedures (a biography, significance of individual, data collection, analysis outcomes)  
• Report of objective experiences  
• Individuals theorize about their lives  
• Narrative segments identified  
• Patterns of meaning identified (events, processes, epiphanies, themes)  
• Summary (Adapted from Denzin, 1989a, 1989b) | • Introduction (problem, questions)  
• Research procedures (a phenomenology and philosophical assumptions, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
• Significant statements  
• Meanings of statements  
• Themes of meanings  
• Exhaustive description of phenomenon (Adapted from Moustakas, 1994) | • Introduction (problem, questions)  
• Research procedures (grounded theory, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
• Open coding  
• Axial coding  
• Selective coding and theoretical propositions and models  
• Discussion of theory and contrasts with extant literature (Adapted from Strauss & Corbin, 1990) | • Introduction (problem, questions)  
• Research procedures (ethnography, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
• Description of culture  
• Analysis of cultural themes  
• Interpretation, lessons learned, questions raised (Adapted from Wolcott, 1994b) | • Entry vignette  
• Introduction (problem, questions, case study, data collection, analysis, outcomes)  
• Description of the case(s) and its (their) context  
• Development of issues  
• Detail about selected issues  
• Assertions  
• Closing vignette (Adapted from Stake, 1995) |

**NOTE:** Table shows general structure of study. Bulleted points might be a separate section in a journal article or book or a separate chapter in a dissertation.
## Visual Matrix Coding Grid

### Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwallm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Theory Foundation</td>
<td>Bernstein received her BA in Journalism from Stanford University in 1953.</td>
<td>Middle school teacher. BA from Montclair State in New Jersey, MA and PhD in Assessment. I took my MAT with Jim.</td>
<td>Teaching: 1954-2004 University of California, Berkeley: Graduate and Undergraduate courses in Literature, Writing, and English Education</td>
<td>BA from Berkeley in Language and Literacy from the School of Education. MA English from Berkeley MAT in English &amp; PhD from Berkeley in Language and Literacy School of Education</td>
<td>I have been involved in writing instruction since I began teaching as an adjunct in the Chicago area in 1967 while I was in grad school. I taught in the Department of Rhetoric at UC Berkeley, the Department of English at Ohio State University, the Department of English at UTEP and the Department of English at Arizona State.</td>
<td>University of Oregon BA major in journalism, New York University Master's Degree in Teacher Education, Berkeley for my teaching credentials. I am currently governmental relationships and public affairs director for the NWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* MA in Secondary Education in 1972 from San Francisco State University.</td>
<td>* Co-Director of BAWP for many years.</td>
<td>* Co-Founder and Director, Bay Area Writing Project</td>
<td>* Oakland teacher and head of the Department of English</td>
<td>* Rhetoric and composition increasingly became my primary academic focus. I was a WPA at UTEP and at ASU. For the last 15 years at ASU, I have been a central administrator (Vice Provost and/or Dean) at two new campuses of ASU, responsible for the start-up and development</td>
<td>* I became acquainted with the NWP because of my relationship with Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Credentialed in California for Secondary Credential in Language Arts and Social Studies.</td>
<td>* worked with learning logs, and assessments</td>
<td>* Dominican University: English curriculum and Advanced Composition</td>
<td>* Executive director of NCTE 1990</td>
<td>* When I started the institute, I was a middle school teacher in a junior high school.</td>
<td>* When I was in school, we never wrote. We underlined the subject once and the predicate twice during my entire education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* She taught 34 years as a high school English teacher in the Northgate and Ygnacio Valley High Schools, Mt. Diablo Unified School District from 1962-1996.</td>
<td>* Helped take NWP international</td>
<td>* University of California, Berkeley, Graduate English Studies</td>
<td>* University of San Francisco, English &amp; Philosophy Majors Secondary Teaching Credential Dominican University, Graduate</td>
<td>* When I was in school, we never wrote. We underlined the subject once and the predicate twice during my entire education.</td>
<td>* When I was in school, we never wrote. We underlined the subject once and the predicate twice during my entire education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Taught 12 years as an adjunct English teacher at Laney College in Oakland, CA, 199-2008.</td>
<td>* Taught 9 years in Marine County, which was ahead of the curve? A Harvard team came in to teach us about team teaching &amp; reading in the discipline.</td>
<td>* I knew Britton, Martin, and Medway, all from the British Schools where they did an</td>
<td>* University of San Francisco, English &amp; Philosophy Majors Secondary Teaching Credential Dominican University, Graduate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td>Healy</td>
<td>Lavin</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Schwalm</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For many years, she was a reader for SATII and Advanced Placement English Composition exams and was able to sharpen student writing and increase verbal scores.</td>
<td>enormous amount of writing and merged literature and writing essays.</td>
<td>English Studies</td>
<td>English curriculum and supervision</td>
<td>of the new campuses, including the development of writing programs.</td>
<td>I was very interested in writing. I edited the literary magazine but I never wrote for it. I really didn’t know how but I knew that I wanted to write.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Her specialty is the teaching of writing. In 1974 she became a participant in the first summer institute at UC Berkeley, BAWP.</td>
<td>“I worked on the Puente Bridge Project.”</td>
<td>* College of Marin: Modern Novel, Writing Courses, Philosophy, Courses on Flannery O’Connor, Graham Greene, Walker Percy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Sir Francis Drake High School: Advanced Placement, Humanities, Poetry, English classes, Grades 9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>“My specific involvement with the NWP goes back to Berkeley. I taught in the Department of Rhetoric from 1970-1976.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Riordan High School: World History, English 9-12, Varsity Basketball Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorists in Context</td>
<td>Worked with Moffett and Christiansen.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>I met James Moffett through Jim. I knew Jimmy (James) Britton.</td>
<td>Jim Moffett was living in Berkeley over here on Sioux Street and we</td>
<td>1971-1973, we piloted the Moffett materials; he was living in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We were all involved in teaching freshman rhetoric, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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James Britton and I worked closely together on many Projects.  

Jim Gray was my teacher in the credentialing program.

Christiansen’s work with The Generative Sentence was a theory that I taught from in my own classes.

were all connected to him and his action. He actually taught some of our programs where people come every summer before we had a name for them. He represented a person who had really good ideas that basically people didn’t know about. So that was set of ideas that we as teachers knew about and wanted to pursue as part of our teaching and also made composition more important than it was.

It was usually used to monitor whether or not you knew the work.”

“They had some very special people come in Moffett was one of them, Francis Christiansen was one. Then the department of ed would send teacher consultants out to various parts of the city to do programs at the request of the intellectual leader in the area was William J. (Bill) Brandt. He (with Robert Beloof, Leonard Nathan, and Carroll Selph) had written the textbook we used in the course, The Craft of Writing, along with some sort of reader. Beloof was a poet and expert in oral interpretation, Nathan was a noted poet, and I haven’t the faintest idea who Selph was. (We had a lot of interesting characters in that department e.g.—Tom Sloane, Tom Connolly, Art Quin, John Gage—grad student, Larry Green—grad student.) One day, probably during the spring of 1974, I was walking down the hall, and Brandt waved me into his office and introduced me to a guy he was talking with, Jim Gray. Bill wanted to know if I was interested in doing three or four sessions on rhetorical approaches to...
and also on the cost of the school district. It was a great collection of people, a great program of getting together and working things out through the presentations and what not. I knew a team that did one of them that was called English as Woodshop that was published in English.

Among my varied responsibilities at Poly, I developed the writing and learning center (it was not in a basement). I also was responsible for bringing up our freshman writing program, but I convinced Duane Roen to do that for us. Couldn’t be in better hands.

Jim was my supervisor in the teacher credential program. When we went
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;OSU was a good place for my own professional development. I had a chance to work closely with Susan Miller (the elder—my age), Ed Corbett, Frank O'Hare, Sarah Garnes, Ron Fortune, and a whole bunch of great grad student—like Andrea Lunsford and Bob Connors—who went on to be comp superstars.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We taught two classes in our public system and he liked the idea that during the second semester we would teach one class using the Moffett approach and one class using the McCorrie approach and then we would compare what happened with the kids because they were both good approaches so that we were actually conducting research as we were doing our student teaching. So you see he was all about approach and theory and thinking about how it worked in the classroom.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practice & Classroom Changes**

"Writing crisis was genuine."

"We started trying to keep students together for two years with the same"

There was, in the late 70's and early 80's a promising strain of rhet/comp research that was focusing on student development, learning

"Jim had a belief that great teachers did have a theory behind what they did. That they realized what they were doing that and they actually knew why they
Sometimes "meant turning past models and worn-out traditions upside down" (Gray and Sterling 1-2).

* "Good teachers don't get the kind of attention they should get so this special group let us learn from others in a company that allowed for disagreement."

* "Jim was obsessed with good teaching so he provided us with tools to use in a position of power in our classrooms.”

Processes, and pre-existing knowledge, as they relate to pedagogy. This research gets sidetracked by faculty-centered culture studies stuff, interesting in itself, but not much relevant to the teaching of writing. (I think this happened because pursuing the learner centered theme required us to learn science or social science research methods that we did not know, did not much care for, and were not generally offered in our graduate programs. It also required research teams, something not much understood in a discipline that rewards independent researchers. This was aggravated by the migration of literary and critical theory types into rhet/comp.

Were doing it whether they knew that because they had tried it out and worked with over time and somehow worked whether they had started with a theory. They didn’t like the idea that a teacher had to quote some other theorist. You know if I had a great idea I had to say and somebody else supports it. So, in the summer institute, you didn’t even want to read someone and match it to their practice. You wanted them to read why but to also hear it as well and once that someone was teaching and able to articulate that theory it is amazing because many of us do have like a hunch, an idea of why this work not that we could really articulate it because there was really no one in our school who was really interested. So when you get a group of teachers together you say this is what I do and I do it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>following the job market and bringing their methodological baggage with them—see earlier comments about the need to disentangle rhet/comp from literature).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My point here is that my work with the NWP and the WTWP raised my consciousness considerably about where writing pedagogy needed to go and meshed well with other research that has been emerging. Really good teachers, the kind who were nominated as NWP fellows, tend to be learner centered teachers often without being fully conscious of the fact. And they often find themselves at war with school curriculum and teaching materials that are not learner centered. The NWP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other things, too. Here’s what it is and here’s when I use it with students but maybe all year at different times or maybe after develop to a different point. And here’s how I do and here’s why I think it’s important and why I think it works.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “And he wanted us to do this from the get go. That was pretty hard to do during our practice teaching, You were lucky just to figure out how long 50 minutes was let alone me throwing out two approaches and comparing them. But that influence, my teaching that I would be a teacher and also an observer of my teaching at the same time and that I could try different approaches and without shortchanging any student and compare the benefits for the kids and so that whole mindset, that my teaching
Bernstein  |  Healy  |  Lavin  |  Myers  |  Schwalm  |  Smith  
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
helped those teachers to understand themselves and to gain the recognition that they deserved. It helped us, in post secondary institutions, where curriculum is not quite as politically driven (see phonics wars in public schools), to transform our curricula. 

Thus we changed our whole FYC curriculum to focus on reading-based or data-based writing, in which students would have to more or less master some new body of information before they could write the assigned paper, using writing to help them do so. 

We assessed writing at the school.

We held the first summer institute in the summer of 1984. (Evelyn Posey was one of the was about being a careful observer and about solid approaches to the teaching of writing and about applying them carefully and properly and carefully. That’s how I went into teaching. Because what Jim did in another class was that he changed modes and he talked a lot, he didn’t model good teaching at all, he just talked for three hours. And during those three hours, he described everything from how to set up a classroom library, and where to buy used books, and how to get kids to read them widely, to how to teach literature, and involve kids in great works of literature, to how to teach writing, to how to do improvisation and drama in the classroom, he never wasted one minute having us try anything.”

We assessed writing at the school.
fellows in the 1st summer institute.) I directed the WTWP for 3 years, first with Ginna Rhodes and then with Pat Withers. Gina and Pat and I saw ourselves primarily as organizers and catalysts. But we also made an effort to show how current research and theory in teaching writing supported the strategies that our teachers had found successful and would help them to develop additional strategies. We tried to do this with a light hand. The institute was very exciting and exhausting. Until I got this fully involved in the institute, I had no idea of the impact that it would have on the fellows and me.

* In many ways, the teacher empowerment and dissemination Holistic scoring was a huge discovery. Here the teaching of writing as a process was unpacked.*
features of the BAWP were more important than any particular theory of composition. The BAWP was addressing the problem that most K-12 writing teachers have no training whatsoever in the teaching of writing. Also, the BAWP emerged at about the same time as "open admission" policies were having a significant impact on the teaching of writing at public universities & at the community colleges then emerging as a post secondary opportunity for a lot of "new" students that had not been seen in college before. By the early 70s, this was already starting the transformation of FYC from being a "barrier" course to being an "enabling" course—that is, from a course designed to see if students
<table>
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<tr>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal and Cultural influences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Memoir:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The second reason was equally important to Jim and to all of us to some degree was apparent to Jim that the WTWP was designed into the local economy so that it would not be dependent on grant money in the long run.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The WTWP was designed into the local economy so that it would not be dependent on grant money in the long run.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, yeah, the first in their families there was a crisis, but I could not fix it, nor could anyone else for at least five years.</td>
<td>In preliminary research, I found that many of the interviewees and James Gray in his memoir</td>
<td>&quot;The second reason was equally important to Jim and to all of us to some degree was apparent to Jim that the&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bernstein, Healy, Lavin, Myers, Schwalm, Smith
There were communities within a city, say an Asian community in inner schools in which the students were to go to college. *mentioned the Project as a response to a literacy crisis and many of them questioned if this type of crisis was not a cyclical myth of the educational community. Whenever something happened in society as a whole, the general public seemed to turn to the educational community to find reasons for the phenomena or place blame. Were any or all of these factors responsible for a literacy crisis or the mere perception of a literacy crisis? I will attempt to find the reason for this perceived or real literacy crisis without making it a central issue in the research. credential program was dying. They were laying teachers off. No one was getting jobs. And the program the emphasis was on space. One of them was the summer before the 1974 Institute. They were talking about laying off all these people who were working as teachers. And so one of the deans met with leaders in charge of administration to start to figure out ways of changing the general program that the school of ed was offering in order to not have to fire these people. There actually was allusion to obtain tenure so I will cut this short but what happened was that Matlin put up some money and one of the people that got money was Jim to see if he could figure out a way to do another program that From the get go, we had buy-in from the districts (and I mean with money—they agreed to provide the stipends for the fellows and to pay them to do workshops subsequently) and from the university (we ran the institute as a 6 hour summer graduate course—which paid the costs, and I got some clerical help and a summer salary supplement) so that the program could function as long as people felt that it was worth it. The districts—initially Ysleta and El Paso, but soon expanding to more area districts and to New Mexico—helped us to identify outstanding teachers, and we agreed to expand to all of K-12 rather than confining eligibility to high school teachers (this was a great choice that truly enriched the experience for.
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<td>*mentioned the Project as a response to a literacy crisis and many of them questioned if this type of crisis was not a cyclical myth of the educational community. Whenever something happened in society as a whole, the general public seemed to turn to the educational community to find reasons for the phenomena or place blame. Were any or all of these factors responsible for a literacy crisis or the mere perception of a literacy crisis?</td>
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<td>credential program was dying. They were laying teachers off. No one was getting jobs. And the program the emphasis was on space. One of them was the summer before the 1974 Institute. They were talking about laying off all these people who were working as teachers. And so one of the deans met with leaders in charge of administration to start to figure out ways of changing the general program that the school of ed was offering in order to not have to fire these people. There actually was allusion to obtain tenure so I will cut this short but what happened was that Matlin put up some money and one of the people that got money was Jim to see if he could figure out a way to do another program that</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the get go, we had buy-in from the districts (and I mean with money—they agreed to provide the stipends for the fellows and to pay them to do workshops subsequently) and from the university (we ran the institute as a 6 hour summer graduate course—which paid the costs, and I got some clerical help and a summer salary supplement) so that the program could function as long as people felt that it was worth it. The districts—initially Ysleta and El Paso, but soon expanding to more area districts and to New Mexico—helped us to identify outstanding teachers, and we agreed to expand to all of K-12 rather than confining eligibility to high school teachers (this was a great choice that truly enriched the experience for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would attract people who were already in schools and experienced to come back. So Jim looked at it, it was great, and he loved to do it. He had had some prior experiences that were really important, one was called the English Teacher Special Program which was run by George Maslach, he was in the department of ed. Jim went up there and the two of them had this program of bringing teachers together to develop their specialty interest."

"He had also worked with someone in up in the UC Extension Office and she was in the county office and she used the county office to manage another creative teacher consultant Project. She all involved; there was surprising theoretical unity between kindergarten writing readiness activities and the “best practices” in high school."

"..."
was so good and so tough and Jim mentions her in his book. That gave him background. The third big influence was the State Conference. That conference, every discussion group was beautifully run by classroom teachers. So the idea of teachers being able to do this. The idea that there was plenty to know. The idea that this would be exciting. All of those Things contributed to the general model and all he was basically doing was taking the pieces of those things into university formal entity, that you see. The planning meetings that were held were just so so. People had ideas all over the place but basically Jim knew what he wanted to do.”

“MM: We would go and have dinner at the Faculty Club. Matlin
paid partly to build up a political base to support these programs so that wouldn’t have to fire anyone. Cap was there. There were people from the Department of Rhetoric Brandt was there. People from English. I think maybe Cruz may have gone up there. Well, we had all of us had the experience with the different subjects and we knew how it would work.

Because of Helen Strickland’s thing so we knew what was possible. Figuring out a management system was really different because you couldn’t do it the way the state program had, we couldn’t do it the way the country office did it for political reasons, and we had a great dean on this campus who was a biologist and he ended up
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>being just below the president, Park, a protectionist because he wanted us to control how this got described because some wanted to describe it as doing something about boneheaded on the UC campus and some wanted to describe it as getting those dumb teachers to think the prevailing mood was to put money in to get those rotten people fixed. So the idea of controlling the message was really big and we basically controlled it as a professionalization Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Influences</td>
<td>You are a product of your time.</td>
<td>“There was no education in composition and rhetoric and that kind of theory. Most of that had gone over to the Department of Rhetoric but most of the teachers who were teaching English came out of the Department of English not the Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was, in the late 70’s and early 80’s a promising strain of rhet/comp research that was focusing on student development, learning processes, and pre-existing knowledge, as they relate to pedagogy. This research got</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And Rhet was a new invention actually we didn’t have a Rhet department here at Berkeley until very late. I am not sure of the date. It was very interesting in its history. In the beginning there was a department called Speech, and Speech was primarily a department ordinarily studied disabilities – you know people who could not talk fluently, and I don’t know the year on this, but at some point, they started reorganizing that department, Bob Phillip was part of it.

People came over from English and various places and made this new department they called Rhetoric, but it was really the old speech sidetracked by faculty-centered culture studies stuff, interesting in itself, but not much relevant to the teaching of writing."

*I*

"I have maintained my interest in rhetoric & composition throughout my years as a central administrator. The WPA lister serve discussion since founding it in 1991, and active all along in the WPA organization, providing the central administrator’s perspective on issues surrounding writing instruction.
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<th>Healy</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhet.</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
| And Rhet was a new invention actually we didn’t have a Rhet department here at Berkeley until very late. I am not sure of the date. It was very interesting in its history. In the beginning there was a department called Speech, and Speech was primarily a department ordinarily studied disabilities – you know people who could not talk fluently, and I don’t know the year on this, but at some point, they started reorganizing that department, Bob Phillip was part of it. | " | | sidetracked by faculty-centered culture studies stuff, interesting in itself, but not much relevant to the teaching of writing."
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| People came over from English and various places and made this new department they called Rhetoric, but it was really the old speech | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bernstein</th>
<th>Healy</th>
<th>Lavin</th>
<th>Myers</th>
<th>Schwalm</th>
<th>Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And all their graduates from speech came to rhetoric and it was on rhetoric of print, film, media, all things having to do with the rhetorical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>So I think we learn in talking with other people about what they do and in sharing with them, other teachers.</td>
<td>Our audience was recognized teachers, a company of our peers, and experienced outside observers.</td>
<td>Came to UTEP in 1980, specifically as a rhetoric and comp specialist and as director of the graduate Professional Writing and Rhetoric program. We had a very strong and active group of rhetoric/comp people in the department at that time, and Tommy Boley had a lot of good things going on with K-12 teachers, who had some extraordinary leadership in Bonnie Lesley and Gina Rhodes. He got me involved with them in the first month I was there, doing a workshop at Bel Aire High School. It struck me immediately that El Paso was a perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
place to establish an NWP site. By that time, the BAWP had evolved into the National Writing Project, with sites established nation wide, generally following the same model that the BAWP started with, modified by what had been learned in the intervening years. In 1981, I wrote a grant proposal to FIPSE ($500K) to establish a novel NWP site that included parallel tracks for composition and ESL. About the time Arturo Madrid was replaced by Sven Grunig as FIPSE director, southwestern ESL proposals were no longer chic. So, I renewed my contact with Jim Gray and, in 1982-83, wrote a proposal to NWP for $25,000 in startup funds to set up a traditional NWP site WTWP in El Paso.
### Appendix H: Other Theorists Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Practice and Classroom Changes</th>
<th>Cultural and Societal Changes</th>
<th>Rhetorical Influences</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applebee</strong></td>
<td>This body of literature was compelling to the NWP founders who mentioned voices in the profession of writing teachers that were crying out for change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Writing involves a variety of recursively operating sub-processes (e.g., planning, monitoring, drafting, revising, editing) rather than a linear sequence; writers differ in their uses of the processes; and the processes vary depending on the nature of the writing” (Applebee 582).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Britton</strong></td>
<td>In contrast to the American emphasis on “disciplinary rigor, standard curricula, and standard objective evaluation,” (Russell 1994:11) Britton, et al. (1975) identified three functional types of writing: transactional, for communicating information; poetic, for creating beautiful objects; and expressive, for exploring and reflecting upon ideas.</td>
<td>Important to the writing to learn movement is this last category, expressive writing, which Britton and his colleagues argued could play a cardinal role in learning at every development-tal stage, in part because it resembled what Vygotsky had identified as “inner speech” (39).</td>
<td>James Britton and Janet Emig are primarily responsible for turning the concept of process over product into a pedagogical approach. Britton and his colleagues lent substantial credence to the idea that cross-curricular writing programs could enhance student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Practice and Classroom Changes</td>
<td>Cultural and Societal Changes</td>
<td>Rhetorical Influences</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975), and by emphasizing the powerful ways in which language organizes experience (Britton, 1970).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivism</td>
<td>A body of articles based on cognitivism (amassed in the 1970s and 1980s) spoke out about the writing theory of the past that came to the conclusion that writing is truly a learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow</td>
<td>An example of the theoretical voice of an expressivist coming forth in research during the 1960s is Peter Elbow, who published <em>Writing Without Teachers</em>, a book that labeled him as an Expressivist, and, as he recognizes, &quot;so often cited as representing a whole 'school' in composition studies&quot; (&quot;Reconsiderations&quot; 173).</td>
<td>There are some arguments over the tenets of Expressivism even by people closely identified with that theoretical stance and, of course, by those who seek to critique it. Although there are significant disagreements within the works of the authors identified as &quot;Expressivists,&quot; they were largely cast under the umbrella term and viewed as bringing a sort of touchy-feely, student-centered quality to writing and the teaching of. Articles and books about teaching composition began to make heavy use of terms and concepts such as voice, personal power, connectedness, and self. They were spread throughout the rhetoric of counter cultures at the time, concepts which were roughly analogous in tone and sentiment to the rhetoric of consciousness-raising, community building, solidarity, and liberation that were in wide circulation as. This shift of rhetoric to counter culture concerns is the birthplace of the ideology of the Bay Area Writing Project founders. Elbow addresses his users, not his academic readers, by using the language and constructs of popular culture. Diaries and journaling, personal writing, and writing processes to include freewriting and numerous revisions not simply edits of student writing are all basic tenets of the NWP.</td>
<td>Elbow also asserts that to make open space for the sort of writing pedagogy Expressivists wanted, they tapped into the cultural capital of the movements taking place in society and popular culture using the rhetoric of popular culture which was also saturated with rhetoric of self-realization and self-actualization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Practice and Classroom Changes</td>
<td>Cultural and Societal Changes</td>
<td>Rhetorical Influences</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emig</td>
<td>The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971) Emig’s 1977 landmark article, “Writing as a Mode of Learning,” that stands as a charter document for writing to learn movement.</td>
<td>Process-over-product presented writing as a complex, recursive process worthy of being studied and taught in its own right.</td>
<td>parts of the feminist, black power, anti-war, and other movements taking place in the late 60s &amp; early 70s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piaget/ Skinner</td>
<td>Myers said that these theorists would have been talked about in the Department of Psychology or the Department of Education but not in the Department of English.</td>
<td>The basic tenets of B.F. Skinner’s behaviorism and Piaget’s learning theory were the driving Force in the field of writing as well as in psychology during the late 1960’s in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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