

## CHAPTER 1.

# PUTTING LEARNING FIRST: CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES FOR NEW WRITING TEACHER RESEARCH

**Rachel Gramer**

Illinois State University

More than fifteen years ago, Kathleen Yancey asked, “What other kinds of needs would we identify for TA development if our central concern were not local exigence but TA development more generally?” (64). Her question still begs an answer today when we still largely place immediate writing program practices at the core of new writing teacher research. Our study of *programs* and *their* exigencies often centralizes program structures as the primary object of analysis with the consequence, however unintended, of positioning newcomers’ deep learning and long-term development as a liminal concern. Concentrating on local program exigencies makes institutional sense yet remains short-sighted in relation to disciplinary goals of better supporting newcomers in learning to be professionals across diverse sites and contexts (Yancey; Anderson and Romano; Moore and Miller; Moore). Virginia Anderson and Susan Romano argue that graduate programs offer situated, time-bound training that does not often enough prepare them for longer-term lived realities: “The common experience of dislocation and forced self-reinvention suggests that dreams dreamt in graduate culture cannot easily be sustained in the harsh light of working conditions—not, at least, without the vision to explain not so much *what* needs to be done, but *how* it should be done” (6). We continue to struggle as a field—even as we succeed—to support newcomers in the value-laden, often conflicting identity work not of *what* to teach but of *how* to *be/come* a college writing teacher. Further, we continue to struggle in supporting people in the challenging identity work of teaching beyond first-year writing—whether professional and technical writing, or other areas across and beyond English studies—and working in professions beyond academia when hiring patterns in higher education are concerning at best and deeply problematic at worst.

New writing teacher (NWT) research frequently privileges existing program structures (i.e., the practicum, orientation, professional development, and formal faculty mentoring) as a primary site (e.g., Powell et al.; Rickly and Harrington; Dobrin; Guerra and Bawarshi) and disciplinary preoccupations (e.g., academic writing) as central lenses for understanding new writing teachers (Reid; Dryer; Camp), which might reveal (some of) graduate student instructors' perceptions and experiences with their current programs and writing in/for school. However, this scene privileges and norms what we value and influence as a field—rather than beginning with NWT identities, learning, and motivated behaviors at the center of inquiry, as this collection calls us to do. As Sidney Dobrin argues that the practicum is a site for maintaining (and increasing the scope of) the cultural capital of composition (20-28), so too would I argue that our program structures and disciplinary commitments function as a similar means to buttress and expand our claims to disciplinary and institutional territory surrounding writing (Hesse; cf. Adler-Kassner). The unfortunate, normed consequence is that much NWT research predominantly examines newcomers in the sedimented roles of practicum students, academic writers, and composition teachers within specific programs (see also Yancey 41). This collection calls us to make visible and examine more complex positionalities—which we have historically flattened—and to concentrate on diachronic teacher development rather than synchronic teacher “training,” positing that as a field we can benefit from more complex approaches to studying NWTs as human beings whose self-understandings exceed the bounds of any singular domain, activity, or role. This chapter extends this logic to argue that we need methodologically innovative approaches in order to work toward such nuanced understandings of—and to show us what we still don't know about—the NWT enculturation scene that we have inherited, perpetuated, and normed. In other words, we need learner-centered research devoted to newcomers' deep learning and development both in and over time in order to contribute new knowledge and perspectives to our established body of program-centered research (see also Estrem and Reid). In making a distinction between program-centered and learner-centered research, I do not mean that the two are never aligned or cannot overlap. But neither do I conflate the two—or assume that, in negotiating the lived differences and overlaps of program and learner needs, NWTs are structurally encouraged or systematically supported in learning to privilege and advocate for their own motivated learning, goals, and identities in relation to their current program contexts.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 One shift that this chapter enacts away from program-centered research is not to use teaching assistant as its primary terministic screen or to retheorize the TAs hip itself. The title of teaching assistant has a history out of step with the lived experiences of contemporary writing teachers who “assist” no faculty member but are themselves teachers of record (Brown 2000), and putting

This chapter illuminates possible paths for the explicit study of NWT learning. As Heidi Estrem and E. Shelley Reid note, “while research within composition studies has focused quite a bit on *teaching*, there’s not been quite as much focus on *learning*—in this case, learning about teaching” (450). In this chapter, I argue that (re)framing NWT research designs via learning theories is one way to re-story our traditional focus on immediate institutional practices and disciplinary preoccupations, and instead centralize NWTs’ multiple motivations, conflicting goals, and shifting identities as they are being learned in ephemeral, interactional moments that exceed the bounds of any singular spatio-temporal program structure. First, I offer a methodological meta-analysis of NWT research that raises critical questions about what, when, where, and how we study NWTs, with particular attention to how our normed NWT research practices bely assumptions about learning—and evidence of learning—that need to be destabilized and re-examined. I then explicate four relevant learning principles from Ambrose et al.’s *How Learning Works*, one oft-cited text from scholars in education, statistics, psychology, and anthropology, and articulate how each principle might alter—not just extend—our usual lines of NWT inquiry. Finally, I turn to an illustration from a year-long (and continuing) narrative interview study with NWTs. I offer up narrative not as *the* methodology to provide evidence of learning but as *one* capacious possibility for laying bare our own methodological assumptions and giving glimpses into NWTs’ motivations, goals, and identities (see also Yancey et al., Wooten, and Warwick, this volume). Throughout this chapter, I maintain that taking up explicit theories of learning can help us learn how to tell a different kind of story: one that illuminates rather than elides learning and places learners explicitly at the center, rather than remaining implicit or peripheral. As a field, we certainly have a responsibility to acknowledge how TAships benefit institutions and might function as a gateway to rhetoric and composition (or not); we also have perennial opportunities to listen to and continue to improve NWTs’ learning experiences and development—as this collection calls us to do. Ultimately, this chapter directs attention to the fact that NWT research seldom *explicitly* designs studies that *begin with* theories of learning at the outset. As a result, we have not yet developed and adapted methodologies to study learning in the situated contexts of learning to be/come a college writing teacher. And without our own customized, systematic means of centralizing learning and development beyond the time-space of official structures of support and entrenched disciplinary concerns, we re-centralize again and again immediate program exigencies, thus relegating evidence

---

TAships at the center can be seen as a program—or institution—centering move that defines new writing teachers first and foremost in relation to their institutional role rather than a more capacious understanding of newcomers as lifelong learners across contexts, in and over time.

of NWTs' motivated learning to liminal spaces of marginalized importance in our research with long-term consequences for NWTs and those who supervise, mentor, and study them.

## **METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES IN EXISTING PARADIGMS FOR NEW WRITING TEACHER RESEARCH**

Historically, studies of new writing teachers in our field have also been studies of graduate and writing programs and the institutional conditions that support them—or not. Collectively, this work reveals concomitant methodological trends in what we study as well as when, where, and how we study NWTs. In recent research, writing studies scholars have worked to shift what we study; however, this change has not yet radically transformed how we begin and conduct contemporary NWT research. Thus, our methodological trends continue to sediment us in particular narrative grooves that do not illuminate occluded stories about NWT learning. The following methodological meta-analysis is not intended as a critique of any NWT researcher's study design, implementation, or conclusions. It is instead a means of asking us, as a collection of scholars committed to NWT mentoring and support, to reconsider what questions we might ask (and how we might ask them) to better illuminate learning as one means of redressing the liminality of NWT learning, development, and experiences in our research and administrative practice.

Much NWT research focuses on individual programs and practices and studies; what Yancey calls the delivered curriculum, or “the one we design” (17). Many studies focus on official structures of programmatic enculturation, such as mentoring (Rickly and Harrington; Blackmon and Rose; Christoph et al.), professional development (Yancey; Hea and Turnley), and the practicum (Dobrin; Skorczewski; Welch; Powell et al.). Evidence in this work typically comes in the form of institutional documents (e.g., practica syllabi, Bolin, Burmester, Faber, and Vandenberg), classroom artifacts (e.g., writing assignments, Reid; Juzwik et al.; or teacher portfolios, Kitchens), administrator surveys (Latterell; Burmester), or WPA experiences with the practicum (Huntley; Trubek).<sup>2</sup> Such program data is valuable and necessary (as Laura Davies argues in “Taking the Long View”), has emerged from and contributed to WPA research as intellectual work (see Payne and Enos), and has enabled us to tell stories about how we (think we) teach NWTs in our field. However, this body of research has often made visible what/how faculty-administrators teach rather than what/how

---

2 Many WPA practicum experiences attempt to trace when the course has gone awry, an oft-told story WPA lore of which Huntley and Trubek are two clear examples.

NWTs learn, studying only the delivered curriculum, or “the ‘easy’ curriculum... that is visible—in syllabi, in reading and writing tasks, in course outcomes and goals” (Yancey 41). Yancey’s critique of the delivered curriculum points to why studying such a visible, specific slice of NWT experience is deeply problematic:

The delivered curriculum, all too often, is the curriculum. At the same time, the delivered curriculum (over)relies on students playing a singular role: as it is conventionally played, the school game, which spins off from the delivered curriculum, asks students to tell us what they know, not what they don’t know. It rewards students for strongly asserting their claims to knowledge. . . (41)

Historically, then, what we study—the delivered curriculum—has provided evidence of what we say new teachers should be learning (in syllabi, assignments, and administrator narratives) and has told us what graduate students say they know as they perform the role of Student. While such work often provides evidence of WPA learning and of the institutional constraints of NWT enculturation, substantive evidence of NWT learning remains occluded. And our reliance on looking at/through institutional documents and administrative practices (which are limited in scope, audience, and rhetorical force beyond situated institutional and programmatic bounds) leaves us with unanswered methodological questions: what does evidence of NWT learning look like? what artifacts or actions demonstrate NWT learning? how might we better capture and articulate the nuances of such evidence?

Providing such a restricted view of new teacher enculturation, NWT research relies on relatively limited means of studying NWT experience not only in what we study, but also when and where our research takes place. In focusing attention on the delivered curriculum, NWT research is most often conducted in authorized sites of programmatic learning within institutional bounds—implicitly suggesting that learning takes place at school throughout the academic year. Titrularly, Jessica Restaino’s *First Semester* is the clearest demarcation of what NWT researchers have normed as a temporal locus of study. Agreeing that the first semester is largely when new teachers *begin* to learn how to teach, Restaino notes that “much of what new teachers do [during that first semester] has an air of just keeping it together, proving themselves (to themselves as well as students)” without much time for substantive reflection (24). Even if “self-discovery and professional development may be at work during the first semester,” Restaino identifies this as a time of “isolated chaos” in which NWTs often “[feel] removed from feelings of growth and self-determination” (24). Restaino asks, “What happens if, in these early efforts to survive, to stay afloat, new teachers

learn to teach writing in a way that undermines their potential for the enduring, lasting contributions of instruction, even to their own development as teachers?” (24). If, as a field, we conduct NWT research within the artificial time-boundness of such problematic “early efforts,” then we should call into question how much development can reasonably be accomplished, what we expect to see or to learn from NWTs in this time-space, and the extent to which such data collected during this time provides evidence of deep learning, rather than of pressurized institutional constraints. Such questions are especially salient given what we *know* about learning (see Reid) but cannot articulate often enough: that deep learning takes longer than a single 15-week term, that it precedes and exceeds institutional sites, that it does not begin and end at the moment when students “enter” or “exit” a single class or program, first semester or first year. Estrem and Reid describe it as something that “seems obvious now both in a ‘We already knew that!’ way and in a ‘Why weren’t we thinking more about that?!’ way: learning to teach (writing) is a protean and lengthy process, its uncertain and recursive progress often obscured by the myths of quick competence on which learners, teachers, and institutions rely” (450).

Recent NWT research has turned to methodological innovation in the form of more granular interview studies that focus on the *experienced* curriculum, “the curriculum that *students construct* in the context of both the lived curriculum they bring in with them and the delivered curriculum we seek to share” (Yancey 58, emphasis in original). These studies (Barr Ebest; Dryer; Kitchens; Restaino; Camp; Rodrigue) follow a path first explored by Elizabeth Rankin and Christine Farris in the early 1990s, enacting the long-called for inclusion of graduate student voices (Burmester 127) and relying on NWT perspectives and experiences as visible, valued evidence. However, even as NWT researchers have attempted to shift *what* we study—to the experienced, rather than delivered, curriculum—collectively, we are still entangled in problematic trends of *when and where* we study NWTs and the disciplinary commitments that shape *how we begin* our research, both of which keep us from investigating more fully the lived experiences of NWTs and their complex learning.

Two notable examples of oft-cited granular interview studies in NWT research are Sally Barr Ebest’s and Dylan B. Dryer’s studies, which are conducted during the spatio-temporal commonplace in NWT research (in school during the first semester or year of teaching college writing) and focus on resistance, a repeated locus of analysis often attached to disciplinary commitments in writing studies (e.g., process pedagogy, academic writing). Barr Ebest’s study relies on NWT interviews about and during the practicum, though she does collect such data from NWTs during that transitional time over the course of 10 years. Barr Ebest’s monograph opens with a clear articulation of resistance as her primary

framework for understanding NWT responses to the practicum (6-9), which is one of the most common terministic screens and loci of analyses in NWT research (Hesse; Welch; Powell et al.; Grouling). Similarly, Dryer begins by suggesting NWTs' resistance to the practicum as a certainty and positing that resistance exists in relation to one of our most entrenched disciplinary commitments: academic writing. Dryer writes, "On the whole, GTA resistance to the practicum may be a given, but we have not located that resistance in the deep ambivalence these self- and institutionally designated teachers feel toward the academic writing conventions they have been charged to teach" (423). In his interview study of questions about school literacies and genres,<sup>3</sup> Dryer concludes that NWTs at his institution "expressed considerable anxiety about—and frequent hostility toward—academic writing conventions and then projected disconcertingly reductive versions of these anxieties and writing practices onto students" (421).

This combination of NWT research commonplaces is methodologically problematic for two reasons. First, resistance during the practicum is complicated by administrative power dynamics and perceptions of newcomers by more experienced faculty-teachers-administrators conducting research while working with NWTs during their first semester or year. And second, resistance in NWT research is often correlated with other disciplinary commitments that precede newcomers' actual lived experiences as college writing teachers: resistance to academic writing conventions (Dryer), to process pedagogies that we espouse as a field but do not often enough practice in graduate courses (Barr Ebest), to an emphasis on theory before practice (Powell et al.), or to the single-model pedagogy on offer in any individual program (Farris; Welch). Thus, even recent research that has attempted to study the experienced curriculum has turned our attention back to disciplinary constructs that shape our thinking in often invisible, internalized ways, rather than toward motivated NWT learning. This is unsurprising given that our experienced curriculum is mediated by the disciplinary expertise of NWT researchers as a collective and of individual WPAs situated in their own specific histories, programs, and institutions. While an argument could be made that any study of NWTs is a study of learning, the methodological transparency of recent NWT research illustrates that, as a field, our attention in this area of inquiry is not explicitly focused on NWT learning. Much existing NWT research in writing studies is constrained by—and perhaps more telling of—historical and still-commonplace disciplinary and administrative preoccupations in the contexts of formalized schooling that infuse where and how we begin inquiry and that, therefore, subordinate learning as a liminal concern.

---

3 See Dryer's "Appendix B Semi-Structured Interview Protocols" (2012, 445-446).

## METHODOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES FOR STUDYING NEW WRITING TEACHER LEARNING

I admire and continue to rely and build upon NWT research and scholars' methodological transparency, which thankfully has drawn into relief how we operationalize NWT inquiry. However, if we seek to illuminate what we don't know, then we need to question and re-envision our beginnings, our study designs, what counts as evidence, and how our methodologies can change to place NWT learning at the center of inquiry. To foreground learning—and redress NWT learning as a vital missing story in our research—we can re-theorize NWT experiences via learning theories, an act that requires substantive shifts in method as well as methodology in what, when, where, and how we conduct such work.

Putting NWT learning at the center requires us to align method and methodology accordingly, presenting us with the challenge of putting learning *first* in our study design<sup>4</sup> and borrowing from interdisciplinary research of those who specialize in learning. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* is not the only or best theoretical framework of learning theories; it is an approachable, oft-cited collection of multiple, overlapping learning theories from decades of research and practice across disciplines. Its authors—Susan A. Ambrose, Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, and Marie K. Norman—are also an interdisciplinary collection of scholars in education, statistics, psychology, and anthropology, associated with faculty development, several through The Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence at Carnegie Mellon.<sup>5</sup> While *How Learning Works* offers specific strategies for improving practice via application of all seven principles, my purpose here is to suggest our need to re-theorize NWT research based on learning principles, not to delineate any specific strategy for doing so.

For the purposes of this chapter, I have selected four principles that are often implicit in NWT research that we might benefit from making explicit: prior knowledge, motivation, mastery, and course climate. Although each of these

---

4 Reid's recent "On Learning to Teach: Letter to a New TA" [2017] is perhaps the most telling example of how much we rely on often tacit understandings of learning without explicitly engaging in methodologies or study designs that elicit evidence of learning more than lore. Reid's letter draws more explicitly on learning theories than the majority of NWT research. But it is addressed to NWTs and many of the details about, and from, learning theory research appear as numerous endnotes, a visual analogy for how learning theories are often subordinated in NWT research: though implicit in our work, learning is seldom foregrounded or made an explicit heuristic lens for conducting research.

5 Ambrose et al. discuss principles of learning primarily for undergraduate student learners; in their last chapter, they explicitly state that college teachers are lifelong learners for whom the same principles apply.



principles seems obvious and may be already tacitly at work in our teaching, mentoring, and researching of NWTs, they are quite challenging both to enact and to study in the everyday messes of complex lives. In this section, I share four principles with a synopsis of how each one, if enacted more fully in situated NWT research design, could illuminate and centralize learning—hand in hand with concomitant methodological shifts in what, when, and where we conduct our research—to help us, as a field, learn more about what we don't know about NWT learning in relation to (and beyond) the rhetoric and composition TAship.

### **STUDENTS' PRIOR KNOWLEDGE CAN SERVE TO HELP OR HINDER LEARNING.**

The prior knowledge principle offers two possibilities for retheorizing NWT research in both what we study and when. The first is the binary construction—help or hinder—which I would argue is always a both/and. And the second is Ambrose et al.'s distinctions between declarative (what) and procedural (how) knowledge (see also Reid 133-35) with the assertion that changes in procedural knowledge take time and are not always immediately visible (26). To the first possibility, NWT research does not elide prior knowledge by any means, yet we could benefit from a more explicit, thorough concentration on how previous knowledge and experience both help *and* hinder learning. NWTs have been portrayed as hindered by their graduate student identities (Grouling), their own reductive views of writing (Rodrigue), a “shallow history of student-teacher interactions” (Dryer 433), a previous lack of difficulty with writing (Reid W201), “the implicit theory they bring to the instructional setting” (Farris 9), or, in the case of pre-service English teachers, the “limited and impoverished cultural resources from which [they] draw as they construct an identity for themselves” (Ritchie and Wilson 35). Our focus on “hinder” rather than “help” might be related to what kinds of prior knowledge we attune to and that “hindrances” are often rendered more visible. A narrowed focus on prior knowledge of/experience with our disciplinary concerns—academic writing, for instance—might tip more toward “hinder” because it excludes from the beginning a more capacious construction of relevant knowledge/experience that NWTs *do* have about situated, relational learning, in and beyond school, that also has a powerful impact on their learning and development as teachers. To the second possibility, Ambrose et al. insist that changes in procedural knowledge take time—time that many WPAs conducting new teacher research likely do not have, a limitation that hinders the depth of inquiry. Barr Ebest's study is one example of the kind of longitudinal study that aligns with WPA institutional work: a study of those who enter our program over a period of time. Yet we have far fewer, if any, examples of inquiry that trace long-term changes in procedural knowledge, especially

as influenced by continually expanding “prior” knowledge, which is not only cumulative but also recursive, recombinatorial, and transformative. Placing this principle at the forefront of NWT inquiry would require both a shift in *when* we study NWTs (for how long) and how we elicit, code, and value newcomers’ prior knowledge to underscore how such knowledge both helps *and* hinders rather than privileging one side in the parity.

### **MOTIVATION DETERMINES, DIRECTS, AND SUSTAINS WHAT STUDENTS LEARN.**

The motivation principle also presents two prospects for shifting what we study in NWT research and how we account for the power of our own positions and perceptions in doing so. Ambrose et al. maintain that individuals’ perceptions of their environment relate to motivational direction, delineating a relatively finite number of reactions to expectations: individuals can accept, reject, evade, or defy any set of environmental expectations (66-82). Scholars have focused on perceptions of environment and conducted a great deal of inquiry into why NWTs accept, reject, evade, or defy the expectations of their individual programs. Nancy Welch’s insider take in “Resisting the Faith: Conversion, Resistance, and the Training of Teachers” is perhaps one of the most oft-cited articulations of what happens when someone rejects rather than accepts a specific model of composition pedagogy, which Farris also traced in *Subject to Change*. Yet much NWT scholarship underscores resistance as the most commonly *perceived* reaction, rather than turning to a more complex theoretical framework that traces and accounts for a multiplicity of complex co-existing responses.<sup>6</sup> Another possibility of the motivation principle directs attention to multiplicity, to multiple goals as well as multiple *types* of goals: performance (both performance-approach and performance-avoidant), learning, work-avoidant, affective, and social goals (Ambrose et al. 71-72). This is especially vital since research indicates that individuals with multiple goals are more likely to be successful (Valle et al.; Ambrose et al. 73). Writing studies can benefit from NWT studies that put motivation at the forefront—not the disciplinary motivation for teacher education (cf. Dobrin 20-28), but individual and/or group motivation for varied success. Put into action in NWT study design, the motivation principle would ask researchers to use their—often WPA—power to defer judgment

---

6 Early on in *Changing the Way We Teach*, Barr Ebest articulates her chosen framework for understanding resistance rather than a multitude of responses. Via Kearney and Plax’s [1992] research of undergraduate student resistance, Barr Ebest shares a list of “student resistance techniques,” including avoiding interactions, failing or refusing to complete assignments, making excuses, challenging teacher authority, or rejecting teacher advice (6-9).

about NWT resistance and instead seek frameworks for accounting for multiple motivational directions, reactions, and types of goals. While many WPAs may assume that not all graduate students in English are evenly motivated to succeed as college writing teachers, we may also assume that they want to be successful at what they do and assume such success includes multiple goals, one of which is their current institutional designation of instructor. Relying on frameworks that put motivation explicitly at the center would engage us in questions of multiplicity—multiple goals as well as multiple types of goals—in ways that exceed a single institutional structure (the practicum, first-year writing, or even the time-space of our administrative relationships with current graduate student instructors) and can also open explicit conversations about how learning to teach writing can be useful beyond first-year writing courses and the academy (learning, for instance, the practice of making tacit knowledge explicit and of recognizing when we're being interpellated as blank slates in the workplace, as Yancey et al. articulate in this collection).

**TO DEVELOP MASTERY, STUDENTS MUST DEVELOP THE SKILLS,  
PRACTICE INTEGRATING THEM, AND KNOW WHEN TO APPLY THEM.**

If foregrounded, the mastery principle might support NWT researchers in shifting what and when we study NWTs in order to contribute new perspectives on the development of mastery, a frequent underlying concern in NWT research. Ambrose et al.'s discussion of mastery directs us to our need to trace the intricacies of NWT development in/across four stages: from unconscious incompetence to conscious incompetence, and from conscious competence to unconscious competence, which Reid nods to (131-32) but which has not been the explicit focus of substantive empirical study. Further, they also concentrate on the cognitive load of unpacking the complex tasks of teaching. Ambrose et al. use facilitating discussion as one example that “requires several subskills: the ability to pose appropriate questions, listen empathically, maintain flow, respectively correct misconceptions, [and] manage time effectively” (220)—complexities that we have yet to study empirically with NWTs. Newcomers' cognitive load also includes material conditions and affect or emotional labor—which Restaino attends to as one type of labor, and Elizabeth Saur and Jason Palmeri extend in their “Letter to a New TA: Affect Addendum.” Yet affect or emotional labor was not the focus of Restaino's study, and Saur and Palmeri offer “maxims for teachers” (146) based on their administrative experience and lore.<sup>7</sup> If made

7 In recent affect research in writing program administration, scholars have predominantly focused on administrators rather than new teachers. See, for example, Davies' “Grief and the New WPA” (2017); Jackson, McKinney, and Caswell's “Writing Center Administration and/as Emo-

the locus of study from the outset, unpacking competency and cognitive load, which takes time and occurs across semesters and institutions, could reveal results that speak back to and alongside some commonplace disciplinary narratives (e.g., resistance, “impoverished” identities) about newcomers’ development of mastery and expertise in needed ways (see Wooten’s chapter, this volume).

### LEVEL OF LEARNER DEVELOPMENT INTERACTS WITH COURSE CLIMATE TO IMPACT LEARNING

On its face, the course climate principle seems to appear frequently in NWT research on the practicum; however, Ambrose et al.’s framework is more expansive than the statement of the principle seems, in part because it focuses on social identity development, also in stages (acceptance, resistance, redefinition, and internalization)(166-69), which points to a different spatio-temporal locus of study for NWT researchers. NWT research has few attempts to study social identities; Barr Ebest’s study of gender is one, which yielded more telling results about age and years of teaching experience. Ambrose et al. focus on how development and identity interact with course climate, emphasizing that levels of perceived marginalization and centralization are affected by stereotypes, tone, faculty-student and student-student interactions, and course content (170-79). We already have a robust body of research on course content (i.e., the practicum). Yet, if “the broader climate in which we learn about teaching matters” and “climate will have an impact on us whether we realize it or not” (Ambrose et al. 222), then NWT research could use and expand the course climate principle to trace NWTs’ interactions with faculty and students—including students in their writing courses as well as peer graduate student instructors (calls also made by Grouling, and Estrem and Reid)—in addition to institutional, disciplinary, and broader cultural climates also at work in their learning and development as teachers. Since teacher identity is likely to be a continued interest and investment for NWT researchers and our field more broadly, the study of NWT social identity development in and beyond course content seems especially important since newcomers are learning and experiencing multiple social identities, many of which they bring in with them that intersect with the professional identities they are learning—which include but are not limited to teaching first-year writing.

---

tional Labor” (2016); Micciche’s “More than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work” (2002) and *Doing Emotion* (2007); also the CFP for the 2020 edited collection *The Things We Carry: Strategies for Recognizing and Negotiating Emotional Labor in Writing Program Administration* (Wooten et al.). See also Wooten’s chapter in this collection, “The Pursuit of (Un)Happiness.”

## NIGEL'S EARLY WRITING TEACHER LEARNING: A TWO-STORY START

In a recent year-long (and continuing longitudinal) interview study, I explicitly sought to *begin* my study design to research the learning of five graduate student instructors who are new writing teachers. To do so, I operationalize narrative to examine patterns within and across NWT individual stories of teaching and learning over time (as Warwick calls for in “From Deficit to Asset: Rethinking Graduate Student Narratives” in this volume). Narrative is one generative means to study NWT learning, relying on stories at a slant rather than on self-reported responses to direct questions about prior knowledge, motivation, or social identities. As other contributors to this collection note, narratives demonstrate how identities come to be over time, influenced by diverse experiences with writing, schooling, teaching, and learning (Yancey et al, this volume); and narrative is also a means of maintaining rather than flattening the complexities of lived experiences of graduate student writing instructors (Warwick, this volume). Both simple and endlessly complex, narrative is one methodology aligned with key understandings of learning from Ambrose et al. as well as other learning theorists (e.g., Engeström, Engeström, and Vähäaho; Gutiérrez and Stone; Rogoff; Sford and Prusak; Gee, *Situated Language*; Lave and Wenger; Wenger): that learning is a deeply motivated whole-person process, often tacit and dispersed unevenly over time, mediated by participation in multiple, shifting social groups across/through context-driven activities. This section offers stories from one NWT, Nigel, during his second semester of teaching that illustrate how the principles above might be used as an explicit framework that, together, speak to each other and illuminate NWT learning in needed ways.

When asked about an experience with someone he considers to be a good teacher, Nigel recounts his interactions with a two-year college writing teacher who ignited his interest in composition. Using three of the four learning principles discussed above, this story reveals (1) prior knowledge that helped, rather than hindered, Nigel’s conception of learning; (2) insights into Nigel’s motivational direction and multiple types of goals, both personal and professional; and (3) the complexities of both faculty-student interactions and Nigel’s complex social identities as a working-class and working student:

The reason I was into composition to begin with was my first community college course. So my first day on campus too, so that meant a lot to me. J.A. was the guy’s name. It was the first class, just sort of everything you expected I think in a college professor: old, had a beard like an Amish man, literally a tweed jacket and a radio voice. . . . So he asked us what we

thought composition was, and nobody had any answers. Like, “you enrolled in the class and you had no idea what it was about? That’s okay, I understand, freshmen. That’s okay.” And then he proceeded to give us definitions of composition and ways of figuring it out. And his whole teaching philosophy that I latched onto was “I’m here to help you figure things out and help you think through things.” What a cool idea, right? It’s not catching mistakes, or catching language that’s necessarily bad, or “oh you did this scientific thing wrong.” He’s like, “I’m here to help you figure out ways of thinking.”

So we did all these weird assignments where—“All right, everybody think of as many white edible things as you can.” And then he’d interview us in front of class. “How many did you get? All right, where did you start? How did you do it? Did you start with like major like grains and go all grain? Did you do this?” We all had different ways of going into it, and I’m like, “this is a fascinating field. This is what this guy does? How fun is that?”

Or, “Name every country that begins with the letter ‘I.’” “Okay, where did you start? You started in Italy. Then what did you do? You figured out spatially.” Some people were trying to go alphabetically because they had seen these maps, and so I’m like, “This is a cool thing, just engage with how people think and ways of organizing.”

So I go, “That’s what I want to do in life.” And I told my friends or told girlfriends [when they asked], “what do you want to do?” “Okay, so there’s this professor I had in college, and he was all very much like, ‘so there’s a light switch over there, Nigel. Here’s one way to get over there. There’s another light switch on this wall. Whenever you’re ready, just you know, you don’t have to be in a dim room.’”

This story gives us, first, a counter-narrative to deeply ingrained disciplinary assumptions about the persisting power of the bad teacher and/or literacy shaming stories that we have sought to redress in our curriculum (i.e., the literacy narrative as part of first-year writing) and that led many scholars to seek more complex literacy experiences beyond school (e.g., Brandt; Barton and Hamilton; Williams and Zenger). In Nigel’s story, instead, his prior knowledge of, and experiences with, college-level writing *help* his learning as a NWT. Nigel’s story exposes thoughts about writing that align with some of our disciplinary

commitments: writing is not about “catching mistakes,” labeling language as “bad,” or pointing out what writers have done “wrong.” Such understandings of writing also align with J.A.’s performance as a writing teacher who takes on a primary role of questioner, helping students explicitly and collaboratively “figure out” ways of thinking. Together, this prior knowledge and experience *help*, rather than hinder, Nigel’s learning and development—revealed in later stories of his own teaching—as a NWT who wants to help students figure out ways of thinking, make sure they collaborate in order to see that individuals have “different ways of going into” thinking, and “just engage with how people think and ways of organizing.” Further, this story offers a more nuanced counter-narrative to a script that has become too often assumed: that NWTs have had educational experiences that are too authoritarian or too shallow (Ritchie and Wilson 35; Dryer 433), with limited conceptions of writing (Farris 9; Rodrigue), and through which NWTs learn about literacy in spite of their teachers rather than alongside them.

Nigel’s story also offers a complex counter-narrative to rejecting or resisting the environmental expectations of a writing course or program, illuminating more nuanced complexities of what he already knows as a NWT. Nigel is clearly motivated to accept J.A.’s approach to composition pedagogy, which according to much NWT scholarship places him in the minority alongside NWTs more likely to reject contemporary disciplinary perspectives on writing theories and pedagogies. Nigel declares early on in his college career, “That’s what I want to do in life,” which is also atypical of most first-year writing students. Yet, while perhaps an outlier in his alignment with preferred disciplinary understandings of writing, Nigel illustrates something we would be wise to elicit in any study of NWTs: an understanding of learning and mental model of how learning works. He seems aware of multiple paths to any learning experience (i.e., more than one light switch, more than one path toward each) and of learning as motivated rather than forced, something that happens over time, in times not of a teacher’s choosing: “Whenever you’re ready, you don’t have to be in a dim room.” Using principles of prior knowledge and motivation as a framework highlights, Nigel’s accurate meta-awareness of learning—and his motivation for *wanting* to become a teacher—a story that speaks back to and alongside existing stories in NWT research. For instance, Nigel’s narrative stands in stark juxtaposition with teachers in Rankin’s study who had come to see teaching as an undervalued and therefore dispreferred profession (119-20).

In addition to motivational direction, Nigel’s stories about J.A. can also be productively analyzed—his learning highlighted and theorized—using another aspect of the motivation principle (multiple types of goals) as it intersects with the course climate principle (social identity development in interaction with

course climate). When asked if his experience with J.A. might have changed how he performed as a student, Nigel's follow-up story highlights the importance of multiple types of goals and a teacher-student relationship that served as motivation beyond the course content and is relevant to how Nigel relates to students in his sections as a teacher years later:

To a degree I sort of expected it to be just writing, and I enjoyed writing. But I also was working as the editor for the newspaper at the time and really was worried about taking student loans. So that class I cared a lot about because that class felt like it was investing in me, too. He knew my name. I saw him around campus. So when my measly little editor stipend came in, I bought the Raymond Carver book as opposed to buying the Intro to Psychology book, which I'm like, "I will just Google those things."

. . . And if I was going to skip a class during the week because I didn't have gas money or just didn't want to go—which are like two very different reasons to do it [laughs], but they both existed—it would never have been that MWF course. I'd be like, I'll skip my Tuesday courses. I don't want to bump into him and. . . not have gone.

This addition to Nigel's story reveals interrelated layers of personal and professional motivation in relation to goals that are both social and affective—all in the contexts of the material constraints inflecting his education. Personally, Nigel's story underscores the experiences of a NWT who began as a two-year college student, a social identity with its own set of affective and material complications that is an increasingly statistical norm but is often unmarked or overlooked in much of our scholarship and especially invisible in NWT research. Professionally, as a working-class student with an off-campus job, Nigel was motivated to improve his own performance on the job and connects his writing course to that professional goal. Such motivated identity development interacts with Nigel's co-existing goal of making and maintaining a relationship with J.A. as his instructor—a goal that intersects in multiple ways with the material constraints of what Nigel could afford. While Nigel says he felt as if the class was investing in him, his story also suggests he invested in the class because of his relationship with J.A. as someone he admired and did not want to disappoint and because of his feelings that J.A.'s class was "fun" and "fascinating." It's questionable that any collection of Carver short stories would have a straightforward transferrable impact on Nigel's job at the newspaper; and clearly he was concerned with the financial strain of student loans to pay for books as well as transportation. Yet



he bought the book for, and made sure to attend, J.A.'s class, the one whose instructor he appreciated then and still wants to model in his current teaching. It's equally unlikely that many writing studies scholars reading this would assign Carver as a text in a first-year writing course. And yet, Nigel's story points us to complexities of lived experience that help NWTs learn, be motivated to be present, to teach, and to write—even though they do not necessarily align with some disciplinary preferences for contemporary writing pedagogy. This story illuminates what Ambrose et al. identify as interaction with the course climate, but not with the content—which is a commonplace focus of NWT research on the practicum. Instead, Nigel's story shows us a snapshot of the mediational influence of faculty-student interactions and demonstrates how a social goal can have overlapping affective components that exceed the bounds of what we study if we focus only or primarily on course content—or build a study based on questions we deem relevant to that content—e.g., academic writing.

A later story of Nigel's, one from his classroom teaching, is one that he might *not* want to share with a NWT about a specific student interaction. Using two of the four learning principles discussed earlier, this story reveals: (1) complex layers of competence and cognitive load that are difficult to trace and disentangle in even a singular interaction; and (2) the vital importance of unpacking faculty-student interactions (as a part of course climate) when the NWT is the teacher and not the student. At the storyboarding stage of a multimodal digital project, a student had generic college campus images for her video argument debunking prejudices against body modification and tattoos. After Nigel encouraged the entire class to produce their own artifacts to work toward a better developed ethos, this student “took that to heart” in a way that complicated the questioning strategy Nigel borrowed from J.A.'s classroom. Nigel's interaction draws into relief the complexities of his competence and cognitive load, in the moment of teaching, largely due to his unexpected embodied and affective responses as a male teacher working with a female student:

I had another student—the student who was writing about body modification—share modeling pictures, which were maybe R rated. So she had a tattoo here [points to lower front torso], and they were professionally taken. But totally puts me in a weird place. “Oh that's you, scantily clad in your rough video draft—okay. Now what do I do?” Do I—I totally wanted to say, “I'm so glad that you embraced this, you owned this sort of thing, and that this is your ethos you can talk about it. Because even as you know I've got some [tattoos] here and here and here [points to arms], I embrace that. But it puts me as

a teacher—you're sending me photos that, I don't know, you could find—they'd be on television, nothing pornographic, obscene about them. But they're toeing the line pretty hard."

. . . And I felt like the student made this sort of—took my advice to heart, but maybe in a way that should be pressed on a little bit. So I talked to her after class. I go, "so it should be—understand this is a weird place for me as your teacher to receive that. And I think it makes a lot of sense. . . and the first thing I wanted to tell you was 'is this something you'd be willing to show maybe a future boss? Something you'd be willing to have on the Internet?' Even that is sort of tied in with these prejudices against body modifications and tattoos and stuff."

I go, "I think maybe there's a different way to show your ethos that makes me a little less you know uncomfortable, and we'd be able to show in class if we have the time to show it in class. So you know I'm not going to take off points or anything like that. I actually think it was a really smart move rhetorically, and I think it's disruptive in a lot of ways. But I mean if I were—I just don't know what to do about this". . . She was like, "oh, I just, you know, it was the best picture I had to sort of demonstrate this." And I was like, "well, do you have tattooed friends that are artists? You could focus on what they're doing here, or like stock images or something, but you can see your face in it too?"

. . . And I still think it was a savvy thing to do, savvy performance um, but whether it's savvy enough in that particular situation? [laughs] Or whether it's the type of savviness you want in that type of [situation]? [shrugs]

Nigel's story points to intersections of gendered embodiment, rhetoric, education, and authority in the classroom during his first semester of teaching. His strategy of asking students to produce their own artifacts backfires, according to his retelling, and requires him to adjust, feeling the need to "press on" the student's choices, a moment that may illuminate conscious incompetence for Nigel, who remains unsure of whether or not he has supported the student in figuring out how to be rhetorically "savvy." At the same time, using Ambrose et al.'s mastery principle, Nigel's story could be telling of his development along a more complex synchronous spectrum: conscious of how a solid strategy for teaching digital projects can be problematic, conscious of his need to adjust his questions, and perhaps not yet conscious that he does more than adjust the question asked. He shifts strategies, responding with a question that is so guided, it is an embedded suggestion

to use stock tattoo images or photos from tattoo artist friends. Nigel knows he does not want to be the kind of teacher who tells his students exactly what to do; yet he is also learning that teaching—like rhetoric—can create conditions in which we act in conflicting ways to meet multiple goals for student learning, not always articulating, or conscious of, how we do so. Nigel’s story is an illustration of Wooten’s point in “The Pursuit of (Un)Happiness” (this volume) that previous “good teachers” can be a location of happiness for NWTs that can collide with infelicitous structures for current working conditions and student learning needs.

Expanding on the mastery principle, Nigel’s story can also be one means of capturing a snapshot moment of Nigel’s cognitive load as a NWT interacting with a student—and further underscoring the challenges of doing so when mastery interacts with other principles like course climate. Just as Ambrose et al. unpack the intricacies of leading a class discussion (2010, 220), so too can Nigel’s story provide evidence of how many subskills are involved in a seemingly simple interaction. He communicates honestly his own affective responses (i.e., discomfort), affirms the student’s choices, questions the logic of her thinking, encourages her to consider the consequences of her composing—beyond the project grade—and even acknowledges his own uncertainty about the preferred course of action before offering one possible next step. Nigel’s retelling of the story also shows his awareness of options he did not take in that moment: leading with an encouraging reply and connecting the student’s work with his own experience to establish his ethos. Nigel’s cognitive load as a NWT could likely be unpacked from any story of everyday teacher-student interactions, just as affective load could likely be unpacked simultaneously: what he feels for himself (discomfort, confusion, uncertainty) and what he feels compelled to perform for others (encouragement, reassurance, sincerity) all affective responses to teaching situations that, as Wooten suggests in this collection, are otherwise occluded. In any case, Nigel’s experiences with exercising pedagogical strategies—asking his students to deploy rhetorical strategies to improve their ethos in relation to a specific audience—are affective as much as they are rhetorical, revealing his learning about how teaching should work as much as how writing does work. And his stories primarily uncover the mediational influence of otherwise ephemeral, occluded interactions—not with practicum or composition knowledge, or with previous experiences of writing, but with current experiences of teaching (to learn) and learning (to teach)—to borrow Malea Powell’s titular construction.

In this single story, both Nigel and the student are clearly multimotivated (him to protect a student, to ease his own discomfort, to encourage students to create artifacts and texts that fit their ethos and purpose; her to earn a grade, to present a text to the class, to speak up about an issue important to her personally) in ways that reveal a range of social identities and commitments across domains

of activity (from imagined workplaces and friends' tattoo parlors to the university classroom) in cultures that precede, exceed, and infuse the writing classroom. In inviting students to bring themselves into the classroom, Nigel finds himself in more powerfully charged interactions surrounding potentially sexualized images that a student might present to the class and circulate beyond—as the project encourages. Though he seeks to model J.A.'s primary strategy of questioning, Nigel is not in J.A.'s classroom anymore, finding himself outside the realm of relatively innocuous questions (about white foods, names of countries) as a young male teacher in a classroom with young female student bodies both present in the room and represented in artifacts for digital composing projects, particularly considering the broader cultural climate of viral videos showing street harassment and the influence of campus rape cases across the nation on localized conversations about sexual assault. This story of Nigel's teaching interaction emphasizes complex issues of gender and sexuality in powerful ways that entangle with issues of writing—process, rhetoric, multimodality—and highlight the complexities of competence and cognitive load for NWTs learning to teach through student interactions, an influential mediational force underexplored in NWT research.

Ultimately, Nigel's stories illustrate how learning theories might illuminate NWT learning in generative ways. They also demonstrate how much we can learn about a NWT's teaching identity, learning, and development in ways that exceed official program structures like the practicum and that might not be uncovered by a narrowed focus on a single disciplinary preoccupation like academic literacies. Nigel's stories do not suggest he lacks prior knowledge about writing or is struggling with grading or academic writing. Instead, they show valuable prior knowledge and experience that *helps* Nigel's development and multiple types of goals—social and affective—that we do not equally privilege in our research. Nigel's stories also show us the complexities of competence and cognitive—and affective—load when NWTs are learning on the spot through situated student interactions in the context of multiple climates beyond the courses we teach or programs we supervise. Equally important is what these stories currently cannot show us: change in procedural knowledge over time. In addition to offering one means of studying NWT learning, Nigel's stories are one means of reinforcing what we know about learning: that it can be mundane, is often open-ended or truncated, and happens in everyday interactions that take time to process, interpret, and reflect on (see Estrem and Reid 450).

## CONCLUSIONS

Examining Nigel's stories using some of Ambrose et al.'s learning principles, alongside the NWT research methodological meta-analysis, has drawn into

relief three vital points about the affordances of retheorizing NWT research via learning theories. First, writing studies can benefit from research that puts learners/NWTs at the center of inquiry, an important de-centering of immediate program needs. Historically, much of our writing program research has excelled in a certain kind of problem-solving, often framed as advocacy; in NWT inquiry, this work has concentrated on programmatic structures and studied groups of learners in relation to those structures. This is what good program research does. And yet, since we know our structures are historically inherited, often inefficient and under supported, and still riddled by a myriad of inequities and contradictions, research that puts program structures at the center—even to be helpful for those whom that structure should benefit—is itself structured to keep learners liminal, bringing them in as we perceive they relate to the institutional structure or disciplinary commitment under scrutiny. As a feminist WPA, I acknowledge our need for writing program research that examines the efficacy of our structures, institutions, and program support, yet I am also cautious of implementing changes based on any study that puts program structures or disciplinary commitments at its methodological center and beginning, however unintentionally, and uses gathered data to make broader identarian claims about learners/NWTs.

Second, in addition to putting learners/NWTs at the center of our work, we should be more careful to put learning first in NWT research designs. Retheorizing via learning theories calls for methodologies that enable requisite shifts in study design, not just retheorizing during data analysis but *before* data collection. This is the difference between a grounded-theory approach to an academic literacy study (during which evidence and themes of learning might emerge) and a narrative approach to a learning study (when questions are designed to elicit indirect evidence of tacit learning). In other words, to study learning, many of our methods might remain (e.g., interview, document collection), but the questions themselves and the methodologies we use to ask those questions should change. As Mary P. Sheridan suggests of ethnography, “we in writing studies need to adapt existing research practices for our own purposes even as we draw upon *in informed ways*, the dominant ethnographic paradigms” (80). So too would we need to adapt our practices *in informed ways*, to make learning theories and principles work for us in NWT research. Turning to interdisciplinary, longitudinal learning research, as in Ambrose et al.’s *How Learning Works*, is one generative way to push further into the unknown and into underexplored areas of inquiry, including NWT multimotivation, rapidly shifting competence, and the interactional influence of others on newcomers’ teaching in writing classrooms right now.

Finally, putting learning first, at the center of our work, requires time. In “Time to Grow Them: Practicing Slow Research in a Fast Field,” Julie Lindquist argues that the kinds of research we value as a discipline are often heavily influenced by

institutional priorities and cultural economies—and are perhaps not the kinds of research most valuable to/for our work. Lindquist recommends that writing researchers understand what questions current research hasn't allowed us to ask (or leaves unasked) and make intelligible the relationships between “slow” research, disciplinary values, and labor economies of production (655-63). Lindquist's call to inquire into and push against “business as usual” in disciplinary research is vital for NWT inquiry because the time we research newcomers is not the only or best time when NWTs are learning. As Lindquist argues for slow research in learning about adult writers, I maintain that designing explicit studies of long-term NWT learning can be a productive way to use administrative, disciplinary, and institutional power to better problem-*pose*, rather than only problem-*solve*, alongside and for those who enter our field, practica, and writing classrooms as newcomers each year.

It is this act—of doing things together rather than trying to convert newcomers to bolster the cultural capital of composition—that Paul Prior suggests *is* disciplinary enculturation: “Disciplinary enculturation then refers not to novices being initiated, but to the continual processes whereby an ambiguous cast of *relative newcomers and relative old-timers* (re)produce themselves, their practices, and their communities. These images of participation in disciplinary practices point to *doing things* rather than having something or being someplace; they suggest process views of disciplines” (xii, emphasis mine). In the case of NWT *preparation*, “doing things” might focus more on the practicum, mentoring, and administrative practices. But in the case of broader NWT *research*, “doing things” can focus on the collaborative act of eliciting and articulating how learning and multimotivation work beyond the practicum, what prior experiences newcomers have that *help* them learn (and how those experiences continue to accumulate), or how *all* writing teachers are continually bumping up against uncomfortable moments with conscious incompetence, though we also norm that process. Further, if, as Warwick reminds us in this collection, we have a disciplinary commitment to preparation, our teacher preparation should not be limited only to teaching (first-year) writing; we are also committed, therefore, to opening conversations about how being a teacher helps us learn any number of workplace skills and dispositions toward language, collaboration, and being lifelong learners (this volume). Putting learning at the center of NWT research can help us, as a field, to learn what we don't know and bring us all productively closer to making writing studies enculturation a feminist process that attends to learning and learners first.

## WORKS CITED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda. “2017 CCCC Chair's Address: Because Writing Is Never Just Writing.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol.69, no. 2, 2017, pp. 317-40.

- Ambrose, Susan A., et al. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Anderson, Virginia, and Susan Romano, editors. *Culture Shock and the Practice of Profession: Training the Next Wave in Rhetoric and Composition*. Hampton Press, 2006.
- Barr Ebest, Sally. *Changing the Way We Teach: Writing and Resistance in the Training of Teaching Assistants*. Southern Illinois UP, 2005.
- Barton, David, and Mary Hamilton. *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. Routledge, 1998.
- Blackmon, Samantha, and Shirley K. Rose. "Plug and Play: Technology and Mentoring Teachers of Writing." *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney Dobrin, National Council of Teachers of English, 2005, pp. 98-112.
- Bolin, Bill, Beth Burmester, Brenton Faber, and Peter Vandenberg. "A Forum on Doctoral Pedagogy." Special issue of *Composition Studies/Freshman English News*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1995, pp. 1-132.
- Brandt, Deborah. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 49, no. 2, 1998, pp. 165-85.
- Brown, Stuart C. "Obscured Agenda and Hidden Failures: Teaching Assistants, Graduate Education, and First-Year Writing Courses." *Reforming College Composition: Writing the Wrongs*, edited by Ray Wallace, Alan Jackson, and Susan Lewis Wallace, Greenwood Press, 2000, pp. 203-12.
- Burmester, Beth. "Writing (into) the Academic Past, Present, and Future: Graduate Students, Curriculum Reform, and Doctoral Education in English Studies." *Composition Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2000, pp.113-35.
- Camp, Heather C. "Exploring Identity-based Challenges to English Teachers' Professional Growth." *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2013, pp.16-32.
- Christoph, Julie Nelson, Rebecca S. Nowacek, Mary Lou Odom, and Bonnie Kathryn Smith. "Three Models of Mentorship: Feminist Leadership and the Graduate Student WPA." *Performing Feminism*, edited by Krista Ratcliffe and Rebecca Rickly, Hampton Press, 2010, pp. 93-108.
- Davies, Laura. "Grief and the New WPA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2017, pp. 40-51.
- . "Taking the Long View: Investigating the History of a Writing Program's Teacher Evaluation System." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2013, pp. 81-111.
- Dobrin, Sidney I., editor. *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2005.
- Dryer, Dylan B. "At a Mirror, Darkly: the Imagined Undergraduate Writers of Ten Novice Composition Instructors." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2012, pp. 420-452.
- Engeström, Yrjö, Ritva Engeström, and Tarja Vähäaho. "When the Center Does Not Hold: The Importance of Knotworking." *Activity Theory and Social Practice: Cultural-Historical Approaches*, edited by Seth Chaiklin, Mariane Hedegaard, and Uffe Juul Jensen, Aarhus UP, 1999, pp. 345-74.

- Estrem, Heidi, and E. Shelley Reid. "What New Writing Teachers Talk about When They Talk about Teaching." *Pedagogy*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2012, pp. 449-480.
- Farris, Christine. *Subject to Change: New Composition Instructors' Theory and Practice*. Hampton Press, 1996.
- Gee, James Paul. *Situated Language and Learning: A Critique of Traditional Schooling*. Routledge, 2004.
- Grouling, Jennifer. "Resistance and Identity Formation: The Journey of the Graduate Student-Teacher." *Composition Forum*, vol. 32, 2015.
- Guerra, Juan C., and Anis Bawarshi. "Managing Transitions: Reorienting Perceptions in a Practicum Course." *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney Dobrin, National Council of Teachers of English, 2005, pp. 43-66.
- Gutiérrez, Kris D., and Lynda D. Stone. "Synchronic and Diachronic Dimensions of Social Practice: An Emerging Methodology for Cultural-Historical Perspectives on Literacy Learning." *Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research: Constructing Meaning through Collaborative Inquiry*, edited by Carol D. Lee and Peter Smagorinsky, Cambridge UP, 2000, pp.150-64.
- Hea, Amy C. Kimme, and Melinda Turnley. "A Tale of Two Tech Chicks: Negotiating Gendered Assumptions about Program Administration and Technology." *Performing Feminism*, edited by Krista Ratcliffe and Rebecca Rickly, Hampton Press, 2010, pp. 109-124.
- Hesse, Douglas. "Teachers as Students, Reflecting Resistance." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 2, 1993, pp. 224-231.
- . "2005 CCCC Chair's Address: Who Owns Writing?" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 57, no. 2, 2005, pp. 335-57.
- Huntley, Lu Ellen. "Finding Myself Lost in the Practicum." *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney Dobrin, National Council of Teachers of English, 2005, pp. 284-300.
- Jackson, Rebecca, Jackie Grutsch McKinney, and Nicole I. Caswell. "Writing Center Administration and/as Emotional Labor." *Composition Forum*, vol. 34, 2016.
- Juzwik, Mary M., Anne Whitney, April Baker Bell, and Amanda Smith. 2014. "Re-thinking Personal Narrative in the Pedagogy of Writing Teacher Preparation." *Teaching/ Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, vol. 3, no.1, 2014, pp. 27-35.
- Kearney, Patricia, and Timothy G. Plax. "Student Resistance to Control." *Power in the Classroom: Communication, Control, and Concern*, edited by Virginia P. Richmond and James C. McCroskey, Erlbaum, 1992, pp. 85-100.
- Kitchens, Juliette C. *The Postdisciplinary of Lore: Professional and Pedagogical Development in a Graduate Student Community of Practice*. 2012.Georgia State University, PhD dissertation.
- Latterell, Catherine G. "Training the Workforce: An Overview of GTA Education Curricula." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1996, pp. 7-23.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Lindquist, Julie. "Time to Grow Them: Practicing Slow Research in a Fast Field." *JAC*, vol. 32, no. 3-4, 2012, pp. 645-666.



- Micciche, Laura R. *Doing Emotion: Rhetoric, Writing, Teaching*. Boyton/Cook Press, 2007.
- . "More Than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work." *College English*, vol. 64, no. 4, 2002, pp. 432-58.
- Moore, Cindy. "Mentoring for Change." *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*, edited by Amy Goodburn, Donna LeCourt, and Carrie Leverenz, Parlor Press, 2012.
- Moore, Cindy, and Hildy Miller. *A Guide to Professional Development for Graduate Students in English*, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006.
- Payne, Darin, and Theresa Enos. "TA Education as Dialogic Response: Furthering the Intellectual Work of the Profession through WPA." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing*, edited by Betty P. Pytlik and Sarah Liggett, Oxford UP, 2001, pp. 50-62.
- Powell, Katrina M., Peggy O'Neill, Cassandra Mach Phillips, and Brian Huot. "Negotiating Resistance and Change: One Composition Program's Struggle Not to Convert." *Preparing College Teachers*, edited by Betty P. Pytlik and Sarah Liggett, Oxford UP, 2001, pp. 121-134.
- Powell, Malea. "Learning (Teaching) to Teach (Learn)." *Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers*, edited by Peter Vandenberg, Sue Hum, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006, pp. 571-580.
- Prior, Paul. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Pytlik, Betty P, and Sarah Liggett, editors. *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. Oxford UP, 2002.
- Rankin, Elizabeth. *Seeing Yourself As a Teacher: Conversations with Five New Teachers in a University Writing Program*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1994.
- Ratcliffe, Krista, and Rebecca Rickly, editors. *Performing Feminism and Administration in Rhetoric and Composition Studies*. Hampton Press, 2010.
- Reid, E. Shelley. "On Learning to Teach: Letter to a New TA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2017, pp.129-145.
- . "Teaching Writing Teachers Writing: Difficulty, Exploration, and Critical Reflection." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2009, pp. W197-W221.
- Restaino, Jessica. *First Semester: Graduate Students, Teaching Writing, and the Challenge of Middle Ground*. Southern Illinois UP, 2012.
- Rickly, Rebecca J., and Susanmarie Harrington. "Feminist Approaches to Mentoring Teaching Assistants: Conflict, Power, and Collaboration." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing*, edited by Betty P. Pytlik and Sarah Liggett, Oxford UP, 2001, pp. 108-20.
- Ritchie, Joy, and David Wilson. *Teacher Narrative as Critical Inquiry: Rewriting the Script*. Teachers College Press, 2000.
- Rodrigue, Tanya K. 2013. "Listening Across the Curriculum: What Disciplinary TAs Can Teach Us about TA Professional Development in the Teaching of Writing." *Teaching/ Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2013, pp. 33-41.
- Rogoff, Barbara. "Observing Sociocultural Activity on Three Planes: Participatory Appropriation, Guided Participation, and Apprenticeship." *Sociocultural Studies of Mind*, edited by James V. Wertsch, Pablo del Río, and Amelia Alvarez, Cambridge UP, 1995, pp. 139-64.

- Saur, Elizabeth, and Jason Palmeri. "Letter to a New TA: Affect Addendum." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2017, pp.146-153.
- Sfard, Anna, and Anna Prusak. "Telling Identities: In Search of an Analytic Tool for Investigating Learning as a Culturally Shaped Activity." *Educational Researcher*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2005, pp.14-22.
- Sheridan, Mary P. "Making Ethnography Our Own: Why and How Writing Studies Must Redefine Core Research Practices." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Southern Illinois UP, 2012, pp. 73-85.
- Skorczewski, Dawn. "From Playing the Role to Being Yourself: Becoming the Teacher in the Writing Classroom." *Teaching Composition: Background Readings*, edited by T. R. Johnson, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008, pp. 99-116.
- Trubek, Anne. "Chickens, Eggs, and the Composition Practicum." *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney Dobrin, National Council of Teachers of English, 2005, pp.160-182.
- Valle, Antonio, et al. "Multiple goals, motivation and academic learning." *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 73, no. 1, 2003, pp.71-87.
- Welch, Nancy. "Resisting the Faith: Conversion, Resistance, and the Training of Teachers." *College English*, vol. 55, no. 4, 1993, pp. 387-401.
- Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Williams, Bronwyn T. and Amy A. Zenger. *New Media Literacies and Participatory Popular Culture Across Borders*. Routledge, 2012.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "The Professionalization of TA Development Programs: A Heuristic for Curriculum Design." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing*, edited by Betty P. Pytlak and Sarah Liggett, Oxford UP, 2001, pp.63-74.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. *Teaching Literature as Reflective Practice*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2004.