

CHAPTER 13.

DEEP ACCOUNTABILITY:
MOTIVATING OBLIGATIONS
IN DISCIPLINARY WRITING
INSTRUCTION

Lacey Wootton

American University

Abstract. In this essay, I explore the self-constructed forms of accountability (“deep accountability”) and obligation that motivate faculty teaching writing in their discipline, arguing that faculty participants’ motivation arose from intrinsic sources more than institutional requirements. After defining deep accountability, I present findings from an institutional ethnography of emotional labor in disciplinary writing instruction. I conclude that more nuanced understanding of faculty motivation will lead to more collaborative and effective faculty development and that greater understanding of faculty obligations and labor will benefit all faculty.

One of the great things I love about our job is the, the independence that I generally feel that I have, that I can go in the classroom, there is little oversight . . . Unless there’s an uproar among the students, . . . the administration is going to kind of let me do my own thing. . . I think it is, you have to have that internal personal accountability to do the right thing.

—Steven, term-faculty marketing professor

University faculty are usually not closely managed by their supervisors; they design their own research projects, write in isolation, and close their doors behind them when they go into their classrooms. Faculty have much control over their course design, the activities of their classes, and assessment of student work. Moreover, accountability and rewards often center on their scholarship more than their teaching, and academic institutions often don’t value or reward teaching (Kahn, 2020). Even when requirements for teaching exist, the ways faculty are held accountable for meeting them can be unclear, especially in terms of student learning.

And yet, we can safely assume that the majority of faculty will teach disciplinary material and evaluate student learning—and even teach and assess additional material, such as writing in their discipline. Without direct management, thorough external assessment of student learning, or material reward for pursuing teaching excellence, faculty are still motivated to make sound pedagogical decisions, participate in professional development to improve their teaching, and figure out ways to compensate for a lack of pedagogical knowledge. In other words, faculty consistently not only fulfill but often exceed what their employers explicitly ask of them. They reveal deep impulses toward intrinsic motivation.

As professionals, university faculty operate without close oversight and accountability, and as professionals, they are motivated to do their jobs. In fact, this lack of oversight is embedded in definitions of “professionalism.” For example, Tony Scott (2009), contrasting “professionals” and “bureaucrats” among university faculty, emphasized autonomy: professionals “have a high degree of autonomy in their work, . . . don’t have to conform to many explicit roles that determine their daily work” (p. 43). Similarly, in his discussion of professionalism as a general characteristic and in academia, Burton Bledstein (1976) emphasized independence but added that “a professional embraced an ethic of service which taught that dedication to a client’s interest took precedence over personal profit, when the two happened to come into conflict” (pp. 86–87). In other words, while professionals have autonomy, they also should behave ethically and attend to their “clients” best interests. A sense of professionalism carries with it the motivation to do the job.

In this chapter, I explore intrinsic motivation for faculty teaching writing in their disciplines. In these courses, faculty must be motivated not only to teach material within their areas of expertise but also to teach writing, an area of instruction in which they might feel less sure of themselves and even see as a burden. Faculty’s motivation in WAC faculty development has been the subject of research before. Scholars have examined factors in resistance and motivation in WAC instruction and faculty development: class size (Swilky, 1992), reflection (Flash, 2016), faculty agency (Walvoord, et al., 1997), institutional cultures and requirements (Condon, et al., 2016; Polk, 2019), and institutional support for cross-disciplinary communication (Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006). Although this research reveals the need for attention to both intrinsic and extrinsic factors in motivation, my research indicates that faculty attend more closely to the factors that they themselves have constructed.

I will add to existing considerations of motivation in WAC by presenting findings from an institutional ethnography of faculty’s emotional labor in required writing-intensive courses at a private, R2 university; these findings reveal that motivation and obligation have a complicated relationship with institutional structures and professional values. The study revealed that a motivating

force in faculty's deployment of emotional labor was a sense of obligation to their colleagues, their discipline or profession, and their students. This self-constructed "deep accountability" fostered forms of emotional labor that exceeded institutional requirements.

In this chapter, I will demonstrate the ways that disciplinary faculty can be motivated by a sense of obligation, grounded in ideas of accountability that they themselves have constructed. In doing so, I argue that faculty motivation is multifaceted and arises less from institutional requirements and rewards than from self-constructed accountability. Understanding what motivates faculty can help faculty developers create more collaborative and meaningful development, and it can help all faculty see the risks of exploitation when faculty construct "requirements" beyond those that the institution states or rewards. After an overview of methodology, I will present my theory of "deep accountability," which aligns with Arlie Russell Hochschild's (2012) concept of "deep acting" and which highlights the complicated relationship between personal obligation and institutional context. I will then describe the two forms of obligation that study participants experienced (to colleagues and the discipline or profession and to students), highlighting the self-constructed nature of these obligations and the accompanying sense of accountability. I will close with the implications of these findings for faculty developers and faculty concerned with labor requirements.

METHODOLOGY

I conducted my study using institutional ethnography, a methodology developed by Dorothy Smith (2005) that requires exploration of both institutional contexts and individual activities. Institutional ethnography (IE) traces the coordination of workplace activities and the experience of those activities, along with the convergences and divergences between the institutional practices, policies, and requirements and individual experiences. Moreover, Dorothy Smith (2005) maintained that institutions exist through their texts; these texts are essential to understanding the coordination of activities. For these reasons, IE provides a methodological and epistemological standpoint that fosters deeper complex understanding of faculty labor within an institutional context. In the case of my study, it allowed me to explore not only the institutional policies that faculty navigated as they taught disciplinary writing but also the disjunctures between policies and lived experiences. The IE methodology is especially suited to WAC research because WAC programs often involve institutional structures and requirements, faculty and student interrelationships, faculty labor, and curricular and other institutional texts—all elements foregrounded in IE. In fact, Cox et al. (2018) argued for a more systemic, holistic view of WAC, which aligns with the IE view of institutions and labor.

My study sought to understand the emotional labor involved in disciplinary writing instruction within the institutional context: a mid-sized R2 urban university in the Mid-Atlantic region. As part of their undergraduate requirements, students must complete a “W1” requirement (first-year writing) and a “W2” requirement (a second one-semester course that emphasizes writing in their discipline). The W2 requirement was established in 2018, as part of a larger revision of the general-education program; the development of the requirements for W2 courses involved multiple iterations and consultations with faculty. Faculty proposing a new W2 course or the conversion of an existing course to a W2 must demonstrate WAC elements in their proposal: multiple writing assignments, process work and revision, interactive feedback, information-literacy instruction, and low-stakes and writing-to-learn assignments. In the early stages of W2 development, the general-education program offered multiple faculty development opportunities and three faculty learning communities; this support has decreased but not disappeared.

All the participants in this study (18 total) had recently taught or were teaching a W2 course when I interviewed them. About one-third had been involved in the development of their discipline’s W2 course, and eight had participated in a W2 faculty learning community. While no participants expressed eagerness to teach a W2 course, and most of them had been assigned to teach it, none communicated resentment, and all saw it as a reasonable and necessary duty. (In most departments, W2 classes rotated among faculty.) I had 15 participants in three focus groups, and three participants in a series of three individual interviews over the course of the semester. The focus groups afforded responses across a number of disciplines; here, my questions centered on forms of emotional labor and participants’ sense of institutional expectations and rewards. The interviews provided a more chronological scope, as we met at different points of the semester. My first set of interview questions was the same as for the focus groups; the second set involved examination of course materials and instructor feedback on student writing; and in the third, we discussed institutional expectations, personnel review, and faculty development. Participants comprised tenure-line, term (full-time, non-tenure-track), and adjunct (part-time) faculty at a variety of ranks; they came from departments in the arts and humanities, social sciences, sciences, and professional schools. There were nine male-identifying and 6 female-identifying faculty, with 3 faculty of color, in the focus groups, and 2 male-identifying and one female-identifying faculty in the interviews.

The focus of the research was participants’ experiences of emotional labor in teaching writing in their W2 courses, with attention to the institutional context of that labor. In analyzing those experiences, I found ways that these faculty deployed emotional labor to support students’ writing development, especially to

compensate for their own perceived lack of knowledge of writing pedagogy; they might not have been experts in writing pedagogy, but they had expertise in relating to students. I relied on Hochschild's (2012) foundational definition of emotional labor: "This labor requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others. . . . This kind of labor calls for a coordination of mind and feeling, and it sometimes draws on a source of self that we honor as deep and integral to our individuality" (p. 7). In other words, emotional labor is not necessarily how we feel about our labor, no matter how strong those feelings might be. Instead, it is the self-management of those feelings as part of one's job; emotional labor is commodified.

Forms of faculty emotional labor revealed in my original study included faculty suppressing feelings of frustration in office hours, class meetings, and feedback on writing in order to not discourage students; taking time to deal with students' emotions as part of their regular instructional practice; sharing their own emotional experiences with writing to normalize criticism and the attendant emotions; awareness of students' affective, embodied responses to feedback and writing difficulties; "cheering on" students to motivate them; and redirecting unhappy students to course materials and instruction to sustain motivation. In these cases, participants were not directly teaching disciplinary writing or content; they were deliberately managing students' and their own emotions to "produce the desired effect" of student learning.

In applying the epistemological framework of IE more forcefully, however, I also saw that faculty's motivations for deploying that labor were often divorced from explicit institutional requirements beyond the requirement to "teach writing in this course." While they acknowledged the W2 learning outcomes and requirements as part of their course design and pedagogy, they spoke more about the self-constructed obligations I'll describe below. Moreover, their own personnel reviews do not incorporate writing instruction or even student learning (unless one argues that student evaluations measure student learning—which I would not). The self-constructed forms of obligation and accountability, and the emotional labor they deployed to fulfill those obligations, are not part of institutional assessment, personnel evaluation, or rewards—and yet, emotional labor requires significant time and energy in its focus on individual student needs. I explored this disjuncture between external requirements and the actualities of faculty labor by examining institutional texts related to W2 requirements and personnel evaluations for teaching in conjunction with participants' own descriptions of their labor, and that exploration led me to theorize that faculty motivation was tied to self-constructed "deep accountability," discussed in the next section. The remainder of this article focuses on these forms of obligation and their implications.

DEEP ACCOUNTABILITY: BEYOND INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The participants in this study expressed a strong commitment to teaching in general and to teaching writing in particular. For example, Sam,¹ a term-faculty government professor and focus-group participant, situated his identity in terms of how he supported his students: “I’m also a teacher, because I’m interested in doing a good job for my students and with my students.” But no participants said that the labor of teaching writing in their disciplines was externally valued, despite my questions about institutional requirements and expectations. Moreover, all three interview participants (Miriam, Carl, and Steven), with whom I explored institutional expectations more deeply, consistently demonstrated unfamiliarity with and misunderstanding of the personnel policies that supposedly communicated expectations and the ways faculty were accountable to those expectations. I find it difficult to blame these faculty for their lack of knowledge, however. When I delved into the various policies and guidelines at the university and department levels, I found them to be vague and often contradictory. Compounding this lack of clarity was the sense on the part of all participants that for teaching, what mattered were the numerical student evaluations.

There existed, in other words, something of a vacuum where explicit expectations, assessment, and rewards for teaching would be. And yet all participants were motivated to not only jump through the institutional hoops of the W2 requirements but meaningfully support student writing development.

In the absence of clear institutional requirements and accountability for teaching writing, these participants constructed their own accountability structures that went beyond the institutional requirements of the W2 courses and personnel reviews, a framework of obligations that motivated not only their pedagogical decisions but also their emotional labor—what I am calling “deep accountability.” In using this term, I am inspired by Hochschild’s (2012) idea of “deep acting,” part of her seminal theories of emotional labor. Hochschild argued that people often manage what they feel in accordance with social feeling rules. In other words, they internalize the feeling rules and employ them in emotional self-management. Such self-management is an ordinary part of our social interactions, but it can also be part of emotional labor, which, as I noted, is commodified. According to Hochschild, this deep acting can become so automatic and normalized that is indistinguishable from one’s “real” emotions.

While I relied on Hochschild’s (2012) work in my own examination of emotional labor, I also realized that academic labor lacks the heavy-handed management and accountability experienced by her participants. I thus extended

1 All participant names are pseudonyms.

her concept of deep acting to the ways that faculty in my study experienced a deep sense of obligation within self-constructed accountability structures: deep accountability. These structures were born more out of participants' sense of themselves as professionals than institutional personnel requirements. Focus-group participant Karen, a tenured psychology professor, pointed directly to the lack of influence of institutional requirements: "I'd say that I don't really have channels for institutional expectations that I know of, or that I've heard, so that I don't really feel a lot of pressure in general from the department, ... that I need to personally teach writing." Instead, as Steven, a term-faculty marketing professor and interviewee, put it when we discussed how the institution evaluated his writing instruction, "You know, I think it is, you have to have that internal personal accountability to do the right thing."² Steven echoed Bledstein's (1976) idea of a professional "ethic of service."

The self-constructed structures became internalized to the extent that they felt like natural forms of obligation and responsibility, and they guided not only what faculty did but what they deeply felt they *must* do to act in accordance with their professional identity. This internalization ran deeply enough that participants felt obligated to do more than what the institution's policies required of them. One way this obligation played out was in emotional labor, which was not explicitly managed or required by the institution, but which was an essential part of their efforts to fulfill their responsibilities (both institutionally codified and perceived) to their students.

Yet while this deep accountability and its attendant impulse to meet obligations prompted participants to support students' writing development, exceeding institutional requirements also poses risks. For example, Gill (2009), in her analysis of academia and neoliberalism, pointed to faculty's internalization of the neoliberal "audit culture" (p. 46), which, combined with professional identity and values, results in extensive self-management (obviating the need for external management): "We appear ... to be model neoliberal subjects whose working practices and 'psychic habitus' ... constitute us as self-regulating, calculating, conscientious and responsabilised" (p. 47). Not only does the institution not need to exert explicit management on faculty in order for them to fulfill their obligations—faculty will, according to Gill, exceed the management requirements that do exist, not in spite of, but because of their own academic agency: "The 'freedom,' 'flexibility' and 'autonomy' of neoliberal forms of governmentality has proved far more effective for extracting 'surplus value' or at least vastly more time

2 Across the board, participants did express alignment with and support for the curricular requirements of the W2 courses, although they also expressed frustration with their own perceived lack of abilities, class sizes, etc. No participants, however, said that they believed the university would assess their writing instruction or students' writing improvement.

spent working, than any older modalities of power” (p. 47). In other words, the impulses and obligations that faculty feel as autonomous professionals can also be a source of labor exploitation—or perhaps self-exploitation, as participants gave more than the university asked or rewarded them for. In the case of my participants, there was no institutional accountability or assessment for students’ writing development or for the emotional labor faculty employed to foster that development, nor were there rewards for the time and energy involved. The complex interrelationships that Gill described allow the institution to get more labor out of faculty than they reward them for or even acknowledge—while also not explicitly requiring that labor and thus not explicitly exploiting them. Yet, despite these risks, and despite the lack of external accountability and rewards, as I will show in the next section, these obligations are an important motivator in disciplinary faculty’s work with student writing.³

FORMS OF OBLIGATION

In this study, deep accountability revealed itself in two primary areas of obligation: to colleagues and their discipline or profession, and to students. In both cases, there were no institutional or disciplinary mechanisms to hold faculty accountable for student learning. While the general-education program did assess W2 courses, this assessment was programmatic, not focused on student learning in individual courses; moreover, at the time of this study, only course materials were assessed. As I have discussed, participants didn’t see the institutional expectations for teaching as clear, meaningful, or relevant, and the main mechanism they did point to—student evaluations of teaching—didn’t measure students’ learning or writing development. Nonetheless, all the study participants had constructed systems of obligation and accountability that they pointed to as primary motivating factors in their teaching. This self-constructed deep accountability drove participants’ efforts with students.

ACCOUNTABILITY TO COLLEAGUES AND THE DISCIPLINE OR PROFESSION

In this section, I’ll discuss the forms of deep accountability to their colleagues and to their discipline or profession that participants described. These forms reveal a sense of obligation to prepare students for future writing and research situations—and they also reveal the reality that it’s unlikely that faculty would ever be held formally accountable in those future situations.

³ To be clear, participants did pay attention to and even care about the outcomes and requirements for W2 courses. But when they discussed *why* they devoted time and energy to students’ emotional management, they invoked the forms of accountability they had constructed for themselves.

Participants expressed a sense of obligation to those colleagues who would next encounter their student writers, as well as resentment toward those colleagues who they suspected did not sufficiently prepare students, revealing a culture of deep mutual accountability. For example, Miriam, term faculty in art history, said: “Sometimes, you know, a student will have done a lower-level course with me, and then they’ll go on to do a more upper-level course with another colleague, and I do feel like, ... I hope they’re okay. I hope I’ve taught them all right on the lower-level stuff before they go on to the higher level.” Although it’s possible that other faculty in Miriam’s department might question how well students are prepared for their classes, there were no actual structures to institutionalize tracking of students from one class to another.

But participants also felt that their colleagues had obligations to prepare students, and they expressed negative views of colleagues who they believed were not doing their part in supporting student writing. Steven, for example, expressed resentment toward his colleagues who he thought devoted insufficient attention to working with student writing in the W2 classes. He felt that his colleagues were doing students a disservice when they paid little more than lip service to the W2 requirements because employers were demanding better writing preparation. Similarly, Liz, a tenured history professor and focus-group member, explained the problem as a matter of student support and learning reinforcement, starting from the first-year writing class: “You know, when people walk into other classes, are we holding them to those standards, because we all know, you can have somebody teach you something your first semester, and if nobody ... holds you to it for the next seven, you don’t learn it. ... So, ... I think there are lots of very high expectations about what we, we should be doing, but personally, I don’t feel like we can give the students the support they need.” In these cases, participants were frustrated that their colleagues were not upholding the same professional standards that they were—not practicing the same kind of accountability that Miriam described above. (While no participants expressed this point, I suspect that concerns about their colleagues judging them could play a role in their self-constructed obligations.) These responses revealed a culture of deep accountability to colleagues for sufficiently preparing students for whoever would get them next, whether that was a colleague, a graduate-school professor, or an employer.

This preparation often took the form of training students in disciplinary conventions for writing. Discussing the major writing project in his chemistry class, Carl said, “And then they had to put that [data] into the context of a results and discussion section ... so when I write a research paper, there’s a results and discussion section. So ... it’s a fairly standard thing we have to write.” Carl felt he should train students to engage in the practices of chemistry researchers (“we”);

he was accountable to these disciplinary conventions. Karen described a similar process of training students to enter the “we” of disciplinary writing: “And I feel like if they just ... end the course knowing what generally a psychological report looks like and what the components are, and they can even put together a really nice methods section and remember all of the components of that methods section in ... conventionally how we write them, then I think they’ve learned something.” This obligation to prepare students to write as, say, chemists or psychologists—to be part of that disciplinary “we”—is central to the concept of the W2 classes; these courses are meant to be disciplinary writing courses, and W2 faculty have an obligation to support that preparation. If faculty do not align with this disciplinary accountability, there is little point to the W2 course.

But it is also interesting that participants felt a sense of obligation and accountability to the discipline more broadly, although “the discipline” would enact no official accountability. Most of their students would not go on to be scholars in their fields, and unless they did graduate work, it was unlikely that other scholars would discover that Karen had never taught her students to write “a really nice methods section”. The participants felt accountable to a *concept* of the discipline and disciplinary writing. As professionals within a discipline, they held themselves accountable for promulgating the values and conventions of the discipline. Indeed, part of the professional identity of a faculty member is inculcating new members of the discipline. Moreover, such attention to disciplinary knowledge and conventions *through* writing is a hallmark of WAC; perhaps without realizing it, and certainly without expressing it, participants were enacting the epistemological functions of disciplinary rhetoric and supporting students in learning how to think and construct knowledge in their discipline through learning how to write in their discipline.

Participants also expressed a sense of accountability to post-graduation professional work. Steven and Carl both emphasized this area of obligation. They recognized the importance of writing in their fields. Steven referred to future employers’ complaints about students’ writing ability: “I do recognize the importance because anytime we talk to employers or anyone ... who has been in the work world for a while, ... people talk about how poor the writing skills are for most college graduates coming out these days, and especially in the business world. So, ... I recognize that there’s a deficiency there. Again, I’m not going to be able to solve it all in my one class, but it’s certainly something that it’s worth addressing.” Putting aside the persistence of the “kids these days can’t write” complaints over many generations, Steven felt accountable to future employers to do his part to send them graduates with good writing skills.

Similarly, although he did not focus on students’ deficiencies, Carl expressed an obligation to future employers: “If a student goes out and is working at a

testing facility, they need to be able to write their ... technical reports in a very specific way, and, and so our students are comfortable doing that at graduation, they're going to be better off when they go to their job. So we all see it as part of our responsibility that this kind of training is important." Here, Carl described a more communal obligation on the part of his colleagues and himself toward fulfilling professional obligations.

As with disciplinary accountability, there were no official accountability mechanisms here; no one would come back to Carl or Steven to complain about their former students' writing. But they used their knowledge of actual professional practices to construct a sense of obligation to prepare students for those practices. The future situations were real, even if the accountability was not. But this area of accountability is also important because it aligns with a value across much of higher education that is frequently criticized: a focus on professional preparation and job skills, as though a university course of study is simply a job-training program. Although this university has no broad institutional mandates for job preparation, and there is a thriving general-education program grounded in liberal-arts values, faculty are certainly aware of students' needs to find employment after graduation, and they can see evidence of it in university marketing materials touting high job-placement numbers for graduates. But it is still up to faculty to construct the particular obligations and forms of (imagined) accountability, as well as to devise teaching and learning opportunities to meet those obligations. Even in this area, deep accountability was the driving force, not external, institutional requirements.

ACCOUNTABILITY TO STUDENTS

In this section, I'll turn to participants' sense of obligation to their students. More than any other area, participants felt accountable to students. For many participants, "students as humans" mattered, in the classroom and beyond. They wanted them to learn and to be successful, and they held themselves responsible. As I've discussed, participants described feeling accountable to colleagues and the discipline or profession, when there was not any actual mechanism to hold them accountable. But their students would be accountable for what they knew in those other contexts, and so in an indirect way, that accountability to peers was accountability to students, too; even their accountability to colleagues and the discipline or profession was grounded in notions of student success.

To be clear, participants did hold students responsible for their own learning. They noted a few areas in which they felt that students were not sufficiently acting in the best interests of their learning, focusing on problems with communication and following instructions. For example, focus-group member Joseph, a term-faculty international studies professor, talked about the frustration of working with

students in office hours, only to see little evidence of that work in their papers: “But it’s actually the conversations with students where they lay out a pretty good idea, and you say, yeah, you can do that. You just have to ... remember this and this and you can do it. And then I feel that all they hear is, you can do it. And what I get written is totally different from what we just talked about, like so different that you wonder if they’re even in that conversation.” A similar problem with communication came up in discussions of students following assignment instructions. This irritation was not directed at students’ writing ability but at students’ inability to comprehend and follow assignment instructions or to follow through on what was discussed in office hours—areas that these faculty believed students did have the ability, and responsibility, to control. These reactions matter because they underscore participants’ humanity; they aren’t saints devoted to students’ needs and to the psychic rewards that might come from meeting those needs. Participants felt frustration, irritation, impatience, and even anger—and yet they deployed emotional labor to self-manage those human responses.

Despite their sometimes negative emotions toward student behaviors, participants’ deep accountability—which, again, was largely self-constructed—to students appeared to serve as a centrally motivating force in their teaching, prompting them to attend to students’ pedagogical, personal, and emotional needs and devise ways to succeed in sometimes constrained material conditions (such as large class sizes). It also revealed the importance of relationships and attention to human needs in writing instruction.

Some participants communicated awareness of students’ material context when they discussed accountability, highlighting their obligations to them as people. For example, Steven described a sense of accountability to his students in transactional terms: “I feel some personal accountability to students. ... I know some people hate the term referring to our students as our clients or our customers. But again, they’re paying a lot of money for this, and you know, my ultimate goal in a professional-based field is to set them up for success in that future career.” Instead of reducing his teaching labor to crass “give the paying customers what they want” terms, Steven demonstrated his awareness of students’ material context (i.e., an expensive school that puts a high financial burden on many of its students) and of his obligations to their futures—awareness, that is, of the people currently in his classes and the people they would be after they leave. There was no external body checking that Steven prepared his students for the workplace; his obligations arose out of his concern for the people in his classes.

Miriam, too, felt obligations to her students, and she also had a transactional sense of accountability, although hers was grounded in her course materials. She wanted to ensure that she delivered on what her course had promised to students: “Just being accountable ... to what the students expected of the course. ... I always

cover all of the material that I say I'm going to cover. We do all of the assignments, ... and I really try and give them this fully rounded course that I promised them at the beginning." Note that Miriam described this "transaction" in terms of the people involved—herself and her students—instead of institutional or disciplinary outcomes.

But Miriam also cared about the human element of teaching, not just about whether the content was mastered: "Despite any of the requirements or anything, ... I genuinely ... want these students to learn and understand this that and the other, ... not even for their course or for their degree but like them as human beings. I want them to appreciate art and architecture and be able to understand it, ... just for humanity, just to be a human, appreciate culture and civilization." Miriam believed she was accountable to students in terms of the course material, but she also felt accountable to their human development, to the kinds of people they were becoming. Like Steven, who cared that his students left his classes with the means to have a career, Miriam cared about her students beyond the classroom; she was invested in the ways they might move through the culture.

Carl's comments about accountability to students were restricted to their development within his class, but these comments, too, revealed deep accountability and obligation through his repeated use of the word "need" as he described his struggles with navigating students' inaccurate perceptions of their own abilities without causing them to feel like giving up: "There are two things we need to really thread in all this. ... We need to be able to give instruction and correction and ... guidance. But we need to do it in a way, right—And so sometimes there's lots of guidance that we need to give, and ... the students' own perception of where they think they should be and where they actually are, versus where we think that they should be and where they actually are, are completely different." What Carl was trying to articulate here was the need to provide "correction"—criticism—and to bring students to a higher ability level while not completely undermining their (inaccurate) self-image because to do so would be counterproductive in terms of student improvement. What was notable, though, was his repeated use of the word "need"; Carl viewed that tricky balance as an obligation. Instead of an externally imposed requirement, this obligation was an internalized "we need," a professional obligation that he participated in and held himself accountable to, echoing the sense of professional obligation and deep accountability to students that Steven and Miriam expressed.

IMPLICATIONS

The nuances of these faculty's accountability, obligation, and motivation provide insights that can be useful to those involved in WAC faculty development,

including faculty developers and WAC faculty themselves, as well as to all faculty concerned about institutional requirements and expectations.

While institutional requirements for W2 courses guided faculty's course design, these study participants' feelings of deep accountability and obligation led to their more localized pedagogical decisions and their emotional labor. But the interview participants (Carl, Miriam, and Steven) also revealed that their desire to support students' writing development and meet their perceived obligations led them to avail themselves of professional-development opportunities. Crucially, they emphasized that while they valued professional development, they wanted to access it on their terms—when they wanted it, in the forms they wanted it, because they wanted it—and not because of institutional mandates (echoing Walvoord et al.'s [1997] findings about faculty agency in professional development). In other words, they were motivated to participate in faculty development, but they insisted that the motivation be intrinsic.

Awareness of both deep accountability and faculty's desire for agency provides affordances and cautions for those involved in WAC programs. On the one hand, these study participants believe that their teaching and students' writing development are important, echoing William Condon et al.'s (2016) findings that faculty do value teaching. They are motivated to support student writing—a clear affordance for faculty developers. And understanding the nature of that motivation creates avenues for more collaborative faculty development, in which, for example, faculty developers and WAC faculty might reflect on their perceived obligations and then develop pedagogical approaches to meet them. Deep accountability here becomes a generative force, in which analyzing the obligations can lead to effective teaching practices.

But deep accountability suggests cautions, too. As I have discussed, the very professionalism that fosters autonomy can also prompt labor that exceeds what the institution requires and rewards. These study participants were already doing more labor than the university required; faculty development should not increase their burdens. I'm not suggesting that faculty "work to the rule," nor am I encouraging heavy-handed institutional management and micro-oriented rewards structures. But I am urging faculty developers to attend to faculty's desire for agency in faculty development and to development activities that will have clear payoffs—including not only greater effectiveness but also the kinds of efficiency that can be interwoven with effectiveness.

Moreover, faculty developers and WAC researchers should attend to the different experiences of emotional labor and accountability by various faculty groups. In this study, some participants expressed concern about the pressures contingent faculty and women might face, but none provided examples of actual experience of that pressure. For example, some term faculty said that term faculty could be more

vulnerable to criticism from unhappy students, but none had experienced that. Similarly, multiple research studies reveal biases in student evaluations of teaching against women and faculty of color (e.g., Fan, et al., 2019; Heffernan, 2021), but none of these participants said that their evaluations demonstrated such effects.⁴

Attention to faculty labor applies beyond faculty development, of course. All faculty, whether in WAC programs or not, can benefit from reflection on their labor and what motivates it: Where are we exceeding institutional requirements? Why do we do the work we do? Is the institution compensating us for our forms of labor, even if that compensation is indirect? How can we demonstrate our “excess” labor in ways that the institution acknowledges and values? How can we advocate for changes to institutional policies that would recognize our labor without leading to heavy-handed management or reductive metrics? Tackling such difficult questions begins with honest discussion of the ways that we create our own obligations and sources of motivation.

REFERENCES

- Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education in America*. Norton.
- Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Indiana University Press.
- Cox, M., Galin, J. R., & Melzer, D. (2018). *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(2), 1–16. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0209749>
- Flash, P. (2016). From appraised to revised: Faculty in the disciplines change what they never knew they knew. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 226–249). Utah State University Press.
- Gill, R. (2009). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of the neo-liberal university. In R. Ryan-Flood & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process* (pp. 39–55). Routledge. <https://futureu.education/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/hidden-injuries-of-neo-liberal-academia.pdf>
- Heffernan, T. (2021). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of research surrounding student evaluations of courses and teaching. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education*, *47*(1), 144–154. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075>

⁴ I am currently analyzing data from a follow-up study that examined the experiences of emotional labor by WAC faculty of color; this data indicates that these participants employed emotional labor in additional ways to, for example, establish credibility and authority with students.

- Hochschild, A.R. (2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. University of California Press.
- Kahn, S. (2020). We value teaching too much to keep devaluing it. *College English*, 82(6), 591–611. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ce202030805>
- Polk, T. (2019). The material contexts of writing assignment design. *The WAC Journal*, 30, 86–107. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2019.30.1.04>
- Scott, T. (2009). *Dangerous writing: Understanding the political economy of composition*. Utah State University Press. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1165&context=usupress_pubs
- Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. AltaMira Press.
- Swilky, J. (1992). Reconsidering faculty resistance to writing reform. *Writing Program Administration*, 16(1–2), 50–61. <http://wpacouncil.org/journal/index.html>
- Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T. (2006). *Engaged writers, dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. Heinemann.
- Walvoord, B. E., Hunt, L. L., Dowling, Jr., H. F., & McMahon, J. D. (1997). *In the long run: A study of faculty in three writing-across-the-curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.