

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

ADVENTURES
IN ENGLISH EDUCATION:
A CRITICAL STUDY OF PRESERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS
LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING

by

Christopher Ward Ellsasser

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Ruth Vinz, Sponsor

Professor Gregory Hamilton

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date FEB 12 2001

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctorate of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2001

UMI Number: 3007533

Copyright 2001 by
Ellsasser, Christopher Ward

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3007533

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

ADVENTURES IN ENGLISH EDUCATION: A CRITICAL STUDY OF PRESERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING

Christopher Ward Ellsasser

What happens when preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing? To provide a deeper understanding of the value and complexity of learning to teach writing, this study looks at 14 preservice English teachers learning to teach writing during a semester-long, combined writing and teaching writing, English education class. It presents a class-by-class analysis of the interactions that occurred as the preservice English teachers found themselves negotiating contradictory and competing discourses that challenged and affirmed their own perceptions of teaching writing. This study considers data gathered from field notes, interviews, and questionnaires. The study uses Bakhtin's dialogical principle as a conceptual frame and Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as an analog to illuminate understandings of what happens when preservice English teachers learn to teaching writing in the context of an English education class.

This study shows preservice English teachers using dissonant and complimentary discourses to negotiate the borderzone between their world as students and their world as teachers. Negotiating those two worlds put

these preservice English teachers into dialogic, challenging them to create new understandings of writing and teaching writing.

This study shows that learning to teach writing made many differences for these preservice English teachers. It challenged them to problematize preconceived and emerging beliefs of writing and teaching writing. It provided the opportunity to reaffirm preconceived and emerging beliefs of writing and teaching writing. It presented competing discourses of writing and teaching writing. It presented complimentary discourses of writing and teaching writing. It revealed practical implications of teaching writing. It suggested theoretical implications of teaching writing. It showed how beliefs about writing and teaching writing frame writing pedagogy. It showed how experiences with writing and teaching writing color writing pedagogy.

This study shows the ways that learning to teach writing affected these preservice English teachers' awareness of the complicated nature of teaching writing and challenged them to consider who they were becoming as writing teachers. Learning to teach writing did not necessarily prepare them to teach writing "best." But learning to teach writing did seem to challenge them to wonder why they were becoming writing teachers and how they each might approach that process.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Ruth Vinz and Greg Hamilton for extending themselves in so many different ways to accommodate me. Greg trusted me with his own teaching and never let me forget the value of my own writing voice. Ruth challenged me to think beyond my own assumptions and helped me laugh at my own sermonizing.

This work is framed by my understanding of education. I am grateful to my teachers who helped me think differently about teaching and learning. Maxine Greene taught me to look at education through multiple lenses. Ruth taught me the value of uncertainty. Greg Hamilton taught me that teaching and living are the same. Francis Schoonmaker taught me to trust in my inner voice. Gary Griffin taught me that teaching begins with caring.

This work is colored by my own beliefs. I am grateful to my friends, who have shaped my values. Jim McCully helps me embrace the present. John North helps me practice self-reliance. Dan Grondin helps me pursue integrity. Scott Conti helps me believe that friendship is everything. Brian Kennedy helps me value the examined life.

I am grateful to my grandparents for filling me with expectations. I am grateful to my parents for keeping me free and believing in my imagination.

Most of all, I am grateful to Jacqueline for waiting.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	1
Chapter Overview.....	4
I -- COPING WITH THE DILEMMA OF LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING.....	7
The Ethics of Learning to Teach Writing.....	11
Constructivist Teacher Education.....	13
Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogical Principle.....	15
Alice's Adventures in Wonderland.....	16
Responding to Critics	19
Making a Difference	24
II -- A CHAPTER WITHOUT PICTURES OR CONVERSATIONS.....	27
Beliefs about Teaching Writing Practices	30
Teaching Writing Lore: Practice Shaped by Beliefs and Experiences	32
Deep in the Shadow of Science	34
A Shift from Product to Process.....	36
The Emergence of Dialogic Writing Instruction.....	39
Beyond "The" Writing Process	46
Considering Revising as Writing.....	49
Responding to Student Writing	51
Reconsidering Teaching Writing	56
Teacher Education: A Frame for Learning to Teach Writing	60
Beliefs and Learning to Teach Writing	67
A Theory of Learning for Coping with Preservice English Teachers' Beliefs	80

Others Shape a Passive Self	82
An Active Self Interacts with Others.....	84
Borderzones as Learning Opportunities.....	86
Ways that <i>Alice's Adventures in Wonderland</i> Raises Questions about what Learning to Teach Writing Does to Preservice English Teachers	89
What Role does Self-esteem Play in Learning to Teach Writing?.....	91
What Does Being an Outsider do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	94
What Does Belonging to a Learning Community do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	96
What Does Learning to Teach Writing in a Teacher Education Environment do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	98
What Does Being a Student of Writing do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	99
What Does Defining the Self for Others do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	100
What does Encountering the Unfixed Nature of Teaching Writing do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?.....	102
What does Encountering Teaching Writing Language do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	102
What does Learning about the Teaching Writing Stories of Others do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?.....	103
What do Competing Teaching Writing Discourses do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?	104

Principles for Further Inquiry	105
Research Questions.....	110
III -- METHOD OF INQUIRY.....	112
My Question	114
Conceptual Frame.....	117
Acknowledging the Filtering of my Perspective.....	119
Gathering the Data.....	122
Coding the Data	125
The Data Collection Site.....	151
The Place.....	151
The Program.	152
Getting to Class	153
The Classes.....	156
Personal Introductions - The Name Game and Writing Maps	156
Being a Writer - Reviewing Goals and Defining What Writers Do	158
Getting Personal - Sharing Special Places and Imagining Teaching Writing.....	159
Defining Good Writing - Discussing the Multiple Possibilities.....	160
Responding to Writing - Fish Bowling a Student-teacher Conference ..	161
Experiencing Each Other's Teaching - Presenting Mini-lessons	162
School Visit - Observing the Teaching of Writing.....	164
Visiting with Experienced Teachers - Talking with Experts	164
Identifying Teaching Purposes - Framing a Rubric	166
Measuring Quality - Composing a Rubric	167
Writing Celebration - Reading the "Finished" Pieces	169

Limitations	169
IV - - THE OTHERS	172
Multiple Paths to One Class	181
Considering the Interplay of Discourses	185
The Class as Other	188
Talk of Professionalism	190
Learning the Names of the Others.....	196
Meeting the Others as Writers	203
Writer as Other	208
Empathy as Learning Lever.....	209
Schooling Norms as Others	212
The Writer Within as Other	214
Teaching Writing as Other.....	220
Acknowledging the Incompleteness of Others.....	222
Teaching Writing Dilemmas as Others.....	224
"Good" Writing as Other	234
Learning to Respond by Listening to Why Others Respond.....	240
The Revealing Nature of Dissonance	241
Novices as Others.....	243
Students as Others Who Impact Learning to Respond to Writing	245
Imagining Students as Writing Teacher Evaluators	251
English Educator as Other	254
School as Other.....	263
Hearing Rationales for the Observed Behaviors of the Other Teachers	269
Classroom Teachers as Others	284

Sharing Incompleteness	286
Sharing Successful Practices.....	294
English Education Professor as Other.....	299
Preservice English Teacher's Student Self as Other	304
Recognizing the Difference Others Make.....	311
V – SEEING THE VALUE AND COMPLEXITIES OF LEARNING TO	
TEACH WRITING	314
Waking from a "Curious" Study	318
Learning to Teach Writing in the Light of Alice's Adventures	319
The Class - Learning Names and Swimming in a Pool of Tears.....	320
Writers - Defining What Writers Do and Talking with a Pigeon.....	322
Teaching Writing - Imagining Teaching Writing and Playing Croquet	323
Good Writing: Defining Good Writing and Having Tea	325
Novices - Practicing Teaching Writing and Meeting the Mock Turtle ..	327
School - Observing the Teaching of Writing and Meeting the Duchess	331
Classroom Teachers - Talking with Experts and Knowing a Cheshire Cat	
.....	334
English Educator - Framing a Rubric and Witnessing a Trial.....	336
Self - Reading "Finished" Pieces and Recalling a Dream.....	339
The Paradoxes of Learning to Teach Writing and Their Implications	340
Affirming and Rejecting Beliefs	342
Succeeding and Failing at Writing	344
Adopting and Refuting Practices.....	345
Celebrating and Denouncing Differences	346
Clarifying and Complicating Practices	348

Crossing Bridges and Hitting Barriers.....	350
Preservice English Teachers as Prospective Change Agents.....	351
Coloring Our Stories with Empirical Evidence	361
My Hope.....	368
Appendix A.....	388
Post Class Questionnaire	388
Initial Interview Questions	390
Appendix C.....	391
Consent Form	391
Appendix D.....	393

Preface

The current teacher shortage and pressure to provide alternative routes for teacher preparation place subject-specific teacher education in jeopardy. Critics argue that teaching is learned from experience and that discipline knowledge provides a sufficient knowledge base for teachers (Cohen, 1988). But learning from experience alone can be miseducative (Dewey, 1938), and disciplinary knowledge alone does not provide teachers with the preparation they need to teach (Wilson, 1988). Teachers need an understanding of how students learn about particular subjects (McDiarmid, 1990). In order to address the criticism that teacher education makes no difference, this study presents evidence that subject-specific teacher education made a difference for 14 preservice English teachers learning to teach writing during a semester-long, combined writing and teaching writing, English education class.

The study is guided by this question: What happens when preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing? In order to explore that question, the study presents my perception of the class-by-class interactions that took place as the preservice English teachers found themselves negotiating contradictory and competing discourses that addressed their own perceptions of who they were becoming as writing teachers. The study uses Bakhtin's dialogical principle as a conceptual frame for examining the interplay that took place in regards to writing discourses and teaching writing discourses. The study uses Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as an analog to illuminate the analysis of what learning to teaching writing did to these 14 preservice English teachers coping with the

professional education dilemma of learning to teach writing without actually teaching writing.

The study presents my accounts of these preservice English teachers using both the dissonant and complimentary discourses of "others" to negotiate the "borderzone" between the world they knew as English students and the world they were imagining as English teachers. The accounts of these preservice English teachers learning-about-teaching-writing that are presented in this study suggest that negotiating the "borderzone" between those two worlds put these preservice English teachers into dialogic by challenging them to consider more complex understandings of writing, teaching writing, and who they were becoming as writing teachers.

This study acknowledges recent findings that teacher education makes a "difference" for inservice English teachers learning to teach writing (Kennedy, 1998). In order to test that finding in the narrower field of preservice English teacher preparation, this study shows the story of what happened when 14 preservice English teachers came together in the context of an English education class to learn about teaching writing. That story is analyzed with three goals in mind. First, to better understand the nature of learning to teach writing. Second, to assess the value of providing preservice English teachers with such an experience. Third, to consider what can be done to support preservice English teachers' efforts to understand who they are becoming as writing teachers.

This study considers data that I gathered from field notes, interviews, and questionnaires. My analysis of that data is guided by Bakhtin's theory that all "true understanding is dialogic in nature" (Voloshinov, 1973, p. 102).

The empirical assertions that I derived from the analysis are illuminated by the analog of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The study concludes with my reconsideration of the preservice English teachers' pivotal learning situations in light of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, outlining the paradoxical nature of teaching the teaching of writing, and my discussion of alternatives for coping with the dilemmas of learning to teach writing.

The study aims to contribute to the field of English education in three ways. Firstly, it presents my portrayal of the learning of teaching writing experience, so we can better understand what happened when these 14 preservice English teachers interacted with others around the subject of teaching writing. Secondly, it addresses the complexity of learning to teach writing, so we can assess the value of learning to teach writing prior to teaching writing. Thirdly, it shows my perception of the learning to teach writing in light of Bakhtin's dialogical principle and Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, so we can consider both the interplay among preservice English teachers and others and the individual experiences of preservice English teachers learning to teach writing. Each of these three contributions is made with the hope that the study will help us to better understand how to support preservice English teachers' efforts to enter their first year of teaching grounded by complex and dialogic understandings of who they are becoming as writing teachers.

This study finds that learning to teach writing challenges preservice English teachers to consider the complex nature of teaching writing. Learning to teach writing did make a "difference" for these preservice English teachers. The "difference" that learning to teach writing made for these 14

preservice English teachers was not that they emerged having learned any particular way to teach writing, or that they filled some teaching-writing deficit and realized a complete image of themselves as writing teachers. One "difference" for these preservice English teachers was that they were exposed to the complexity of teaching writing. Through their interactions with "others," these preservice English teachers seemed to emerge from their learning to teach writing experiences more wide-awake to the alternative possibilities open to those who teach writing, and more aware of open-ended nature of the process of becoming a teacher of writing.

Chapter Overview

Chapter one provides a rationale for conducting a critical study of preservice English teachers learning to teach writing. The chapter argues that looking at what learning to teach writing did to 14 preservice English teachers contributes to the field of English education in three ways. Firstly, it provides a more complete understanding of the complex and complicated processes of learning to teach writing. Secondly, it reveals the complexity of learning to teach writing, so we can assess the value of learning to teach writing prior to teaching writing. Thirdly, it shows learning to teach writing in light of Bakhtin's dialogical principle and Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, so we can consider how preservice English teachers learn to teach writing.

Chapter Two provides a review of five areas of the learning to teach writing landscape. Section one discusses the role that beliefs play in shaping

the teaching of writing practices that preservice English teachers encounter while learning to teach writing. Section two examines the ways that the structure of teacher education frames preservice English teachers' experiences learning to teach writing. Section three reviews how preservice English teachers' beliefs affect their efforts to learn teaching writing practices in the context of a teacher education environment. Section four considers Bakhtin's dialogical principle as a means of better understanding how to cope with preservice English teachers' beliefs and the impact they have on their initial learning to teach writing experience. Section five provides an analysis of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*, which raises questions aimed at increasing understanding of what happens when preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing.

Chapter Three presents the design of the study and discusses how my perspective as an observer colored the data collection. The chapter presents the guiding research question, describes the process of gathering the data, discusses the process of coding the data, and reviews the process used to analyze the data. The chapter concludes with a description of the data collection site, a review of the study's limitations, profiles of the preservice English teachers, and an overview of what took place during the class.

Chapter Four describes and analyzes what happened when the 14 preservice English teachers learned about teaching writing. The chapter presents a critical look at the story of the preservice teachers learning to teach writing. The chapter draws from three primary bodies of data: field notes of the teaching of writing class, interviews with the preservice English teachers

and their English education professor, and a questionnaire distributed to the preservice English teachers at the end of the semester.

Chapter Five is composed of five sections. The first section revisits the pivotal moments of the teaching of writing class in light of analogous moments in Alice's adventure to further illuminate what learning to teach writing did to the preservice English teachers. The second section looks at the larger school reform movement and considers the ways in which learning to teach writing might help preservice English teachers become change agents in their own field. The third section discusses the paradoxical nature of learning to teach writing and offers English educators suggestions for supporting preservice English teachers coping with those paradoxes. The fourth section considers implications for preservice English teachers, English education programs and schools. The chapter concludes with some final thoughts about the dangers posed by the current demand for more efficient teacher preparation and the need for further research about the complexity and value of subject-specific teacher education.

I -- COPING WITH THE DILEMMA OF LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING

Teaching is not something one learns to do, once and for all, and then practices, problem-free, for a lifetime, anymore than one knows how to have friends, and follows a static set of directions called "friendships" through each encounter. Teaching depends on growth and development, and it is practiced in dynamic situations that are never the same twice.

William Ayers, 1993, *To Teach*, p. 127

I remember the first weekend I spent meticulously grading a stack of eighth grade students' essays about Harper Lee's To Kill a Mocking Bird. It was my first year of teaching and my sole qualification was that I had gone to high school and learned about writing. I had no idea how to teach writing, but I was clear that about one thing: I would not teach it the way I was taught. There would be no memorization of grammar rules, no fill-in-the-blank exercises, and I would not use a red pen to turn my students' writing into red-ink-dripping sacrifices. I knew that I would do everything differently than it had been done to me, but beyond that I hadn't a clue.

It was with this mix of certainty and wonder that I lugged home my first stack of essays. I nervously approached each of the thirty-five essays determined to offer illuminating insights and make corrections that would both help my students' writing blossom into brilliant prose and provide clear justification for the single capital letter that I would circle at the end of my closing comment. I used a pencil to show that my comments were merely suggestions, and I tried to limit my own writing to the margins. For two solid

days and deep into Sunday evening I graded and worried. When Monday morning arrived, I proudly placed the stack of essays back into my bag and set off for my first period class.

I arrived at school sleep-deprived, relieved that I had actually made my way through the entire stack, and nervous about how my students were going to react to my comments and the grade I had selected for them. As the students poured into the class I was surprised that not one asked about the essays they had submitted Friday afternoon. It seemed as though they were not expecting any feedback. The papers already seemed distant memories for them. When they had settled in and I had checked off the attendance, I began my rounds. I handed each student a freshly graded essay. I had shuffled the lowest grades in among the others so as not to draw too much attention to the few "D"s I had given. I had already imagined the reactions of each and every student. With the lower grades I avoided eye contact and felt myself tense up as I delivered the package. With the "A"s I made eye contact, hoping for some type of thanks or recognition for a job well done.

Each delivery was met in the same manner. A nod, a reflex flipping to the last page, a glance at that single circled letter, a facial expression, and then it was over. There were no cries of injustice, no celebratory dances, no tears. All I got was a nod, few flips, and a glance.

When I had wound my way through the entire class, I walked back to the front of the room and turned to face their response. I was certain they were just waiting to respond collectively. Maybe they were wondering how to thank me? I braced myself, running my rehearsed justifications through my mind one last time. I turned slowly. I looked up. I expectantly scanned

the class. Nothing. They were back to business as usual, talking with one another or catching a last few moments of sleep before class officially began.

I asked them to open to the first page of Romeo and Juliet. The usual eager hands were raised to read parts and we moved right into the class. The next forty minutes were filled with some stilted reading and the usual struggles to focus during first period on a Monday, and then the bell rang. They filed out of the class just as they did each Monday on their way to second period. And that was it. I stared out over the empty desks, wondering if I had even returned their essays. Several of "MY" meticulously graded essays lay on the floor. I wandered through the desks retrieving the forgotten pieces and slumped back down in my own chair. One of the discarded essays was an "A" another was a "D" I had agonized over. I felt exhausted, confused, unappreciated, relieved and isolated.

Had I been successful because they did not respond with the indignation I had feared? Had I failed because they had felt unable to respond? Why had the student with the "A" left her essay behind? How could I hand the "D" student his paper a second time? Would the others read my comments at home? Why had I sacrificed my weekend? My mind exploded with questions. Then the door opened and the next class of students filed in. I pulled my way out of the pool of questions and tried to focus on what was about to happen. It was time to introduce tenth graders to Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*.

Twelve years later I sat in an English education classroom with a class of preservice, secondary English teachers learning about teaching writing. Sitting there among the others who had never taught writing to actual high

school students and never had the experience of retrieving their own graded essays from the classroom floor, I envied the opportunity they had to learn about teaching writing before their first year of teaching. I imagined how much easier my first year of teaching writing would have been if I had learned the complexities of written feedback and been taught how to manage student responses to graded writing. I felt guilty recalling how much better I should have taught that first year.

Then I thought of how much I had learned that first year and how the students had challenged so much of what I had believed about teaching writing. I considered how different each class had been and how I had learned that nothing worked all the time and that my failures had been learning moments for both me and for my students. I realized how much of my learning had come from my interaction with the students. I considered the research about the "wash-out" effect that teaching experience has on teacher education (Bullough, 1989), and I wondered how possible it was to learn to teach writing to adolescents without actually teaching writing to adolescents.

Who would challenge these preservice English teachers' beliefs? How would their learning about writing in this English education classroom be different from my learning about teaching writing by teaching writing? What would the English education professor do to make the learning in this teaching of writing class meaningful for these preservice English teachers preparing to enter their first year of teaching? Wondering about the English education professor's dilemma conjured images of my own teaching and how

I had coped with the dilemma of preparing others to perform competently without the benefit of practical experience.

As a soccer coach, I would never ask the players on my team to spend practice sitting on the bench and taking notes while they watched me play. I might demonstrate a drill or take part in a scrimmage to model certain behaviors, but primarily my job is to watch them play and try to understand how I can help them improve. If my coaching were limited to the opening scenario of the team sitting on the bench, then I would not be surprised when it came time to play a game and the girls found themselves unprepared and overwhelmed by the prospect of actually having to play while I watched.

This understanding of my own efforts to cope with the dilemma of preparing others to perform in an unpredictable context with an unknown group of others opened me to the possibility that these preservice English teachers could benefit from learning to teach writing in this decontextualized environment. But it also made me more aware of the anomalous dilemma of learning to teach writing.

The Ethics of Learning to Teach Writing

Students in professional education face a troubling dilemma: they must prepare for doing without actually doing. Law school students engage in mock trials, medical school students practice surgery on cadavers, and teacher education students serve as student teachers; but those simulations are not the equal of putting forth a defense, repairing a living heart or teaching twenty-five twelve year olds how to write a paragraph.

For reasons of prudence, health and ethics, tomorrow's lawyers, doctors and teachers have to learn their professions prior to entering the context of their professions. Law schools help us curtail the number of innocent persons wrongly incarcerated by incompetent legal representation. Medical schools help us curtail the number of healthy persons killed by incompetent medical practice. Schools of education help us curtail the number of young minds stunted by incompetent teaching. However, this ethical concern for the well being of clients, patients, and students places preservice lawyers, doctors and teachers in jeopardy as they struggle to learn outside the real and complicated contexts where they will be expected to perform professionally.

The professional educators, who help preservice professional navigate the dilemma of learning without doing, are also put into jeopardy. They find themselves looking up from the real world of their profession at a classroom full of preservice professionals, and facing the responsibility of helping them learn to be professionals prior to their actually experiencing the complex and varying context of their chosen fields. It is the responsibility of professional educators to ensure that tomorrow's clients, patients and students are not put at risk by having to rely on incompetent novices for their legal representation, health care, and education.

The scenario becomes even more anomalous in the case of teacher educators who engage in the medical school equivalent of operating on their students. Teacher educators teach teachers teaching. Even the sentence that describes the practice is confounding. In the more specific case of English educators teaching the teaching of writing the dilemma is this: teach

preservice English teachers to teach writing to adolescents without actually teaching writing to adolescents.

Constructivist Teacher Education

In the late eighties the education profession reconsidered teacher education in light of Donald Schön's work with reflection and professional education. This led to the call for teachers to learn to be reflective practitioners. English educators joined the conversation about teacher reflection by looking at the relationship between reflective teaching and their particular concerns with teaching writing. Findings from this work suggested that teaching writing was reflective in nature (Hillocks, 1995), which further suggested that writing teachers learn to be reflective practitioners.

Recent efforts to support reflective teaching have led to discussions about constructivist teacher education as a means for helping preservice teachers learn to teach reflectively. Constructivist teacher education has been shown to hold "great promise for deeply emerging preservice and inservice teachers in ideas and issues of importance in teaching" (Griffin, 1999, p. 162). Recently there have been calls for further research that looks at the effects such programs have on the ways teachers teach and on the learning that goes on in their classrooms (Griffin, 1999). Research on constructivist teacher education focuses almost exclusively on changes in how the preservice teachers think about teaching, subject matter, and students' beliefs, knowledge and understandings (Calderhead, 1991; Winitzky & Kauchak,

1992; Zeichner & Gore, 1990). However, there is little discussion about what aspects of constructivist teacher education support those changes in preservice teacher thinking.

What is it about constructivist teacher education in particular that impacts preservice teachers' beliefs, knowledge and understandings? In order for constructivist teacher education practices to be assessed as a practice for professional education, rather than just indicted for falling short of its goals, we need a better understanding how constructivist practices like learning with "others" under conditions of "cognitive dissonance" (Vygotsky, 1986) impact preservice teacher learning. A deeper understanding of the learning to teach processes that preservice teachers experience will help teacher educators assess their own efforts to help preservice teachers cope with the dilemmas that surround learning to teach writing.

In light of the current constructivist teacher education wave of reform, it seems prudent to increase our understanding of the world of the teacher education classroom by looking closely at what happens to preservice teachers when they experience constructivist teacher education. Such a look will provide a more complex understanding of how to cope with the challenges posed by constructivist teacher education. Such awareness will also raise alternative possibilities for constructivist teacher education as a means of coping with the dilemma of learning to teach without teaching.

Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogical Principle

In order to consider the possibilities that constructivist teacher education presents to English educators and preservice English teachers coping with the dilemma of learning to teach writing, I turn to Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogical principle as a lens for framing my view of what happened when these 14 preservice English teachers learned about teaching writing.

Although Bakhtin initially developed the dialogical principle to explore the aesthetics of the novel and reveal the genius of Dostoevsky's poetics (Bakhtin, 1984), he also used the principle as a philosopher to better understand the connection between language and the process of becoming. He explains that "the ideological becoming of a human being . . . is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 341). Bakhtin's work with the dialogic provides insight about coping with the anomalous and complex dilemma of learning to teach writing because it focuses attention on how persons negotiate the polyphony of dissonant discourses. If we look at preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing through the lens of Bakhtin's theory, our attention is drawn to the interactions between the preservice English teachers and others.

Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic suggests that learning is active and derived from the interplay of dissonant discourses. He explains that the act of individual understanding is born out of a continuous interaction between individual consciousness and the consciousness of the others who populate that individual's outer social world. He argues that it is the interaction of

differing voices which is creative, and that any "understanding" that is purely passive, purely receptive, contributes nothing lasting for the individual's consciousness (Bakhtin, 1984). Thus, "true" understanding is interactive and derived from situations characterized by tension between what is known by the self and what knowledge exists outside the self's initial understanding.

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland

This tension between the known and the knowledge outside the self is illustrated in the opening scene of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, when Alice spots the White Rabbit. The sight of the White Rabbit shocks Alice from her known world where she sits along the river and grows bored watching her sister read a book with no pictures or conversations. The White Rabbit puts Alice into dialogic because it presents her with an alternative possibility of a dissonant world where rabbits wear waistcoats and carry pocket watches. The tension between these two conflicting worlds puts Alice into dialogic. Likewise, preservice teachers claim to be bored by their education classes where there are no real students and where they do no actual teaching (Griffin, 1999). This boredom raises the question of what can be done to help students problematize what they know.

Like Alice, preservice teachers speak of being shocked from the world of their prior beliefs about teaching when they begin their student teaching. It is at that point, when they come face to face with students and see the classroom from a teacher's perspective that they claim to begin their real learning about teaching (Bullough, Knowles & Crow, 1992). One look at the

contrast between Alice's riverside experience and her Wonderland adventure and it becomes apparent why she finds the later to be some much more "wonderful." In Wonderland she has the opportunity to interact with all sorts of interesting others who reveal all sorts of interesting things to Alice about herself and all that she previously believed to be true.

Sitting along the river, without opportunities for interaction, Alice learns nothing about herself. One look at the contrast between learning to teach writing and teaching writing and it becomes apparent why preservice English teachers would find teaching writing so much more challenging than learning to teach writing. In secondary classrooms preservice, student English teachers encounter students who reveal all sorts of "interesting" things about what it means to teach writing. Sitting in English education classrooms without opportunities for interaction with students, preservice teachers do not face the same immediate challenges endemic to the classroom environment.

Alice's Wonderland education and her need for "conversations" suggests that for Alice learning happens "best" in the company of others who are as different from her as she can imagine. This way of learning about the self through interaction with "others" illustrates Bakhtin's dialogical principle. If we consider the experience of learning to teach writing from a Bakhtinian perspective, then rather than seeing the preservice English teachers as persons engaged in a prescriptive process of learning how to teach writing, we see that preservice English teachers are engaged in far more complex and infinite processes of becoming writing teachers. This means that each preservice English teacher is both becoming more aware of who she/he is as

an English teacher charged with teaching writing and helping others to become aware of who they are becoming as English teachers with the responsibility of teaching writing. Seen from this perspective, learning to teach writing serves as the catalyst for actualizing a more complete understanding of the self as an English teacher who teaches writing. If we look at these preservice English teachers' learning experiences framed by Bakhtin's theory, then it becomes apparent that the preservice English teachers' writing teacher selves are the true subjects in a learning to teach writing class. Seen within the context of Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, it is these preservice English teachers' interactions and their identities as writing teachers that guide the learning to teach writing curricula.

Such a shift in emphasis for teacher education from a training model, which addresses preservice teachers as persons in need of methods and theories to a more learner-centered model which addresses the preservice teacher as meaning maker is supported by constructivist theories of teacher education. "The cognitive revolution has changed our thinking about teaching and teacher education by focusing on cognitions, beliefs, and the making of meaning as the desired outcomes of interest rather than, or in addition to, prescribed skills and behaviors" (Griffin, 1999, p. 145). Subsequently, constructivist teacher education is being presented as a means to engage preservice teachers more deeply in understanding who they are becoming as both English teachers and writing teachers. Constructivist teacher education models afford preservice teachers the opportunity to interact with "others" and learn actively. To better understand why interactions between the I and others facilitates a deeper understanding of

teaching writing, we can use a Bakhtinian lens to look at preservice English teachers learning to teach writing.

For Bakhtin, all true understanding is dialogic in nature. Preservice teachers struggle to learn teaching in the relative isolation of teacher education classrooms, and find that their learning begins once they enter their real classrooms. If it is the interplay of discourses that produces lasting learning, as Bakhtin claims it does, then closer consideration should be given to understanding how such interplay impacts those learning to teach. Such an increased understanding could then be used to help teacher educators explore the ways dialogic interplay can be implemented in the context of teacher education.

This study considers three questions to better understand the complexity of learning to teach writing: (1) What writing and teaching writing beliefs do these preservice English teachers express while learning to teach writing? (2) Who are the "others" that impact these preservice teachers and what writing and teaching writing discourses do these "others" bring to the experience? (3) What happens when these preservice English teachers find themselves in dialogic with "others" around learning to teach writing?

Responding to Critics

The most common criticism of teacher education is that teaching is learned "best" through experience. Critics question the effectiveness of teacher education in light of findings that teachers' "apprenticeship of observation as students" (Lortie, 1975) leads them to teach the way they were

taught (Goodlad, 1984). First year teachers claim that "they learned little in their college and university courses but came to understand teaching more thoroughly and helpfully during their student teaching and their first years of practice" (Griffin, 1999, p. 13). These findings suggest that preservice teachers should learn to teach by teaching. However, we cannot send unprepared teachers into classrooms to teach students by trial and error any more than the medical profession can send novice doctors into operating rooms to learn surgery by trial and error. The stakes are too high.

In the case of learning to teach writing, preservice English teachers are exposed to a variety of expert knowledge about teaching writing through their readings, and their face to face interactions with others in the classroom. This learning experience also presents the possibility of have the time and space necessary for imagining alternative possibilities regarding who they want to be as English teachers with the responsibility of teaching writing. Subject specific teacher education courses like learning to teach writing can "provide a context for the re-examination of subject matter from a purposefully pedagogical perspective and help prospective teachers develop sound conceptions of what it means to teacher their subject matter to diverse students" (Grossman, 1990, p. 143). However, critics of teacher education argue that "teacher education is, at best, irrelevant and that classroom experience alone can serve as teacher education" (Grossman, 1990, p. 147). Learning to teach writing without actually teaching writing is a necessary dilemma. The question is how to narrow the gap between theories and practices.

Janet Emig's (1971) study of the composing processes of eight twelfth graders explored "the ways that students usually or typically behave as they write" (p. vi). This study caused a shift in the field of teaching writing that moved the emphasis from product to process. Emig's (1971) hope was that the learning and teaching of composition would "someday attain the status of science as well as art" (p. 5). My study of the learning to teach writing experiences of 14 preservice English teachers explores how the preservice English teachers in a combined writing and teaching writing class learned to teach writing. My intent is to focus attention on the learning to teach writing processes of these preservice English teachers, so I can increase awareness of the complexity of coping with the dilemma of learning to teach writing. My hope is that an increased understanding of the learning and teaching of teaching writing will help preservice English teachers enter their first year of teaching writing grounded by dialogic understandings of who they are becoming as English teachers who teach writing.

Larry Cuban's (1964) examination of the history of teaching revealed that traditional teaching practices seem to endure at least in part due to teachers' own beliefs about teaching and learning. The suggestion is that calls for the reconceptualization of the teaching of writing (Nystrand, Greene, & Wiemelt, 1993) are also calls for changing writing teachers' beliefs about teaching writing. Given the research on the problematic nature of changing the beliefs of inservice teachers and the poor track record of such efforts (Cuban, 1984), it seems probable that the "best" place to begin supporting a change in beliefs about teaching writing is in the education of preservice English teachers.

Kennedy's (1998) study of teaching writing recognized that "Despite the fact that the current reform movement has been under way for at least two decades, the teachers participating . . . were far more likely to be concerned about students' compliance with prescriptions than about any other aspect of writing" (p. 169). The study found that preservice English teachers' "ideas about writing increasingly narrowed toward prescriptions as they moved closer and closer to the action of teaching" (p. 169). Formal discussions around the importance of teaching writing strategies and purposes began as far back as 1963 with the publication of *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. It seems troubling that the current wave of preservice English teachers, who were supposedly students of teachers who used more process teaching, would not be more influenced by those experiences. As an explanation for this phenomenon, Kennedy raised the possibility that preservice English teachers' own English teachers might have taught process as prescriptions rather than as strategies for achieving students' purposes. Kennedy (1998) concluded her study with the notion that "there is a sense of fatalism in their [preservice English teachers] acquiescence: a belief that prescriptions are unavoidable, and that prescriptions are onerous, and that teachers should have mastered them" (p. 171).

My study addresses that sense of fatalism by presenting my understanding of the dilemmas inherent the process of these 14 preservice English teachers learning to teach writing before they actually teach writing. Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic claims that meaning is created out of dissonant discourses. Subsequently, this study intends to present the

interplay of the competing and complimentary discourses as I witnessed it among these 14 preservice English teachers interacting around the subject of writing and teaching writing. The dialogic learning of these preservice English teachers is illuminated by the analogy of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, so that readers of the study can both see my account of what happened in a teaching of writing classroom and consider the differences that came from learning dialogically in that environment.

By showing my own account of the learning to teach writing adventures of one class of preservice English teachers this study does not strive to present some prescription for how to learn to teach writing or how to teach the teaching of writing. The study's aim is neither to offer criticism, nor praise of what took place in the classroom. The goal is to present a story, colored by my own beliefs, framed by Bakhtin's dialogical principle and illuminated by *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, of what happened when these 14 preservice English teachers learned about teaching writing while enrolled in a semester long, combined writing and teaching writing, English education class. The purpose of presenting such an account of learning to teach writing is to increase our understanding of the experience of learning to teach writing by using Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic and Alice's experiences in Wonderland to re-frame the dilemmas of learning to teach writing.

I believe that re-framing an account of what happens when preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing will narrow the gap between learning to teach writing in the English education classroom and teaching writing in the English classroom. Narrowing that gap should also increase

the degree to which the learning to teach writing that preservice English teachers do makes a significant difference for them and their students. I believe that a new look at the dilemmas of learning to teach writing will reveal ways English educators can support preservice English teachers efforts to deepen their understandings of who they are becoming as English teachers who teach writing.

Making a Difference

Looking back at my own first year, I am more aware of the many mistakes that I made in my efforts to teach writing and that my students were subjected my own ignorance about teaching writing. Trapped in the classroom with a first year teacher, my students showed me the complexities of teaching writing and problematized my prior beliefs about teaching writing . Together, we learned about learning writing and teaching writing. I wish I had been better prepared to understand and address the writing needs of my students.

I cannot go back to the beginning of that first year or of any year. I hope that I will always be in the process of becoming a better writing teacher, so that I will forever believe that my current students learning is supported by a more competent writing teacher than the one my students learned with in previous years. This study is an effort to explore the alternatives available to English educators working with preservice English teacher learning about teaching writing.

The teaching of writing will continue to evolve and there will always be more to understand about teaching writing as more research is undertaken and the field of composition refines its own knowledge base. Learning to teach writing is not as simple as learning everything there is to know about teaching writing. Preservice English teachers cannot simply read through the teaching writing literature to understand all the different writing trends and acquire the "best" practices. Learning to teach writing is about much more than studying methods and theory. Learning to teach writing means understanding who you are becoming as a writing teacher and embracing the incomplete nature of that understanding.

The composing of a writing teacher identity that the preservice English teachers in this study experienced took place in the light of teacher education, was framed by the trends in teaching writing and colored by the preservice English teachers' beliefs about writing and teaching writing. For preservice English teachers preparing for their first year of teaching writing, learning to teach writing is about understanding who they are starting to become as writing teachers. According research on preservice teacher education, in order for that learning to transfer from the English education classroom to the English classroom, preservice English teachers understandings of who they are becoming as writing teachers needs to withstand the wash out effect of teaching experience.

Consequently, the first section of the next chapter reviews the trends in teaching writing with particular attention given to the role teachers beliefs play in shaping those practices, and considers the ways that teacher education frames preservice English teachers' interactions with the teaching

writing discourses that emerge from those belief-informed practices. The second section discusses what is currently known about the role that beliefs play in learning to teach writing. The third section discusses Bakhtin's dialogical principle and how that theory is used as a lens to understand what took place at the 14 preservice English teachers learned about writing and teaching writing. The fourth section discusses how *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* raises questions about what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers. The fifth section of the chapter discusses the principles that support the study's inquiry and presents the corresponding research questions that frame the analysis of the data presented in chapter four.

II -- A CHAPTER WITHOUT PICTURES OR CONVERSATIONS

Writing as a school subject had been historically understood as a set of prescriptions to be learned and followed, not as a strategy for organizing thought and communicating those thoughts to others. However, as early as the late 80s work around the relationship between writing and thinking found support for a different view of writing. For over two decades it has been argued that the act of writing shapes thinking (Langer & Applebee, 1987). Consequently, many now consider writing to be "at the heart of education" (Hillocks, 1995). Effective writing now involves far more than the presentation of prescriptions. "Effective teaching of writing is reflective, continually reexamining assumptions, theories and their practical implications at every stage from developing knowledge for practice, to planning, interactive teaching and evaluation" (Hillocks, 1995, p. xvii). This recognition of the role that writing plays in learning and calls for a reconceptualization of teaching writing (Nystrand, Greene, & Wiemelt, 1993) present an overwhelming task for those learning to teach writing. "Initial preparation programs cannot be expected to develop all the capabilities teachers will need throughout their careers" Smylie, Bay & Tozer, 1999, p. 31), but such knowledge is of little consolation to preservice English teachers facing their first year of teaching writing.

Given the limits of teacher education and the overwhelming complexity of teaching writing, preservice English teachers and their own teacher face a dilemma: how to "best" prepare to teach writing.

This is an ethical dilemma because having preservice English teachers learn to teach writing through trial and error with real students compromises those students' learning, and having preservice English teachers learn to teach writing without students compromises preservice English teachers' learning. Given the choice between compromising the learning of adults and compromising the learning of adolescents, it seems morally responsible and ethically sound to place the higher burden on the adults. That choice raises the question of what can/should be learned prior to entering actual classrooms. This question challenges English educators and preservice English teachers to think of learning to teach writing as "a critical initial phase of teacher education, the corner stone for what hopefully will become a continuum of professional growth" (Howey & Zimpher, 1999, p. 279). With this thinking a learning to teach writing class becomes a phase that preservice English teachers experience as they move from the world of writing student to the world of writing teacher. Under such an approach attention can be given to what preservice English teachers need to understand for their first year of teaching writing. What learning foundation will "best" support them during that first year?

Palmer (1998) argues that "teaching, like any truly human activity, emerges from one's inwardness, for better or worse" (p. 2). Palmer argues that knowing one's students and knowing one's subject depends heavily on self-knowledge. He shares that "when I do not know myself, I cannot know who my students are. I will see them through a glass darkly, in the shadows of my unexamined life - and when I cannot see them clearly, I cannot teach them well" (p. 3). This interplay between knowledge of the self and teaching

that enables teachers to reach their students suggests that preservice English teachers' initial phase of learning to teach writing be concerned with helping preservice English teachers better understand who they are becoming as writing teachers.

If "good teaching requires self-knowledge" (Palmer, 1998, p. 3), then learning to teach writing should concern itself with preservice English teachers' own beliefs about writing and teaching writing (Smith, 1994). In an attempt to explain the constancy and change in education, Cuban (1993) argues that "teachers' knowledge of subject matter and their professional and personal beliefs about the role of the school in society, about classroom authority, and about children's ethnic and socioeconomic status shapes classroom practices" (p. 19). He further argues that "cultural beliefs about the nature of knowledge, how teaching should occur, and how children learn is so wide spread and deeply rooted that they steer the thinking of policymakers, practitioners, parents, and citizens toward certain forms of instruction" (p. 19). According to Cuban's findings teachers' beliefs determine what takes place in classrooms.

In order to address the complexity of the environment in which preservice English teachers are challenged to develop such understandings of who they are becoming as writing teachers, this chapter opens by considering the larger learning to teach landscape. The chapter is organized into five sections. Section one discusses the role that beliefs play in shaping the teaching of writing practices that preservice English teachers encounter while learning to teach writing. Section two examines the ways that the structure of teacher education frames preservice English teachers' experiences learning to

teach writing. Section three reviews how preservice English teachers' beliefs affect their efforts to learn teaching writing practices in the context of a teacher education environment. Section four considers Bakhtin's dialogical principle as a means of better understanding how to cope with preservice English teachers' beliefs and the impact they have on their initial learning to teach writing experience. Section five provides an analysis of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*, which raises questions aimed at increasing understanding of what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers.

Beliefs about Teaching Writing Practices

Writing teachers "draw on their own beliefs and values to interpret situations they face, to make sense of what happens in their classrooms, and to make decisions about what to do next" (Kennedy, 1998, p. 3). "The conditions under which teachers work with large numbers of students and far too little time to attend to the specific needs of each piece of writing they encounter. These conditions force writing teachers to be a pragmatic group" (North, 1987, p. 40).

Writing teachers rely on one another and the practices that are known in their community. This is not to say that writing teachers are not aware of research or do not produce research. It simply means that the conditions under which writing teachers work and the culture in which they learn their profession keeps them largely dependent on belief driven practices. Research and the work of scholars are often portrayed as distant and unconnected to

the work teachers do in their classrooms (North, 1987). Writing teachers are aware of how the personalities of their students, the cultures of their schools, and the nature of their classes have a profound effect on their practices. Consequently, it makes more sense, and is far more efficient, to talk to the teacher down the hall or share a problem about a particular student with a colleague who knows that student.

What is even more typical, given the traditional egg-crate organization of schools (Darling-Hammond, 1997) and the pressures of time placed on writing teachers with stacks of papers, is that writing teachers work in isolation creating their own practice driven by their own beliefs. Writing teachers have all been taught writing and they all have their own experiences and relationships with writing. Prior experiences as writing students, personal beliefs about writing, and teaching writing experiences are the most readily available resources that writing teachers have. Consequently, they teach based on what they draw on their experiences and beliefs in determining "how to" teach writing. In this way each teacher creates his/her own belief framed teaching of writing practice which is colored by his/her own experiences. That practice is then evaluated and reshaped with each new teaching-writing problem that arises.

Beyond the belief framed practices of individual teachers there is an even greater body of practitioner developed teaching of writing knowledge. Through "ritual, writing, and talk" (North, 1987, p. 29), practitioners have developed a body of teaching writing lore. That lore is lived in and expanded upon by practitioners like a "delightful old manse, wing branching off from

wing, addition tacked to addition, in all sort of materials . . . all seemingly random, yet all connected" (North, 1987, p. 27).

Teaching Writing Lore: Practice Shaped by Beliefs and Experiences

The body of knowledge that practitioners have developed is identified by Stephen North (1987) as "lore: the accumulated body of traditions, practices, and beliefs in terms of which Practitioners understand how writing is done, learned, and taught" (North, 1987, p. 22). North likens this body of knowledge that is driven by pragmatic logic, structured by experience, to which anything can be added and from which nothing can be dropped to a "House of Lore" (North, 1987, p. 27). North explains that this teaching writing House of Lore is huge and sprawling with no provisions for tearing any of it down and to which each generation builds an addition. The result is a body of belief supported practices that are "particularly daunting" (North, 1987, p. 27).

This lore of teaching writing is created out of the very pragmatic need for answers to problems that a practitioner faces. Unlike researchers and scholars who are concerned with the why behind solutions to problems, practitioners need only know what they should do. The practitioner's mode of inquiry is direct and product driven: "identify a problem, search for causes, search for possible solutions, test solutions in practice, validate solution, disseminate newly constructed lore among colleagues. Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* epitomize this method of creating lore. In that work Shaughnessy (1977) searched for a solution to the problem of teaching college

students whose writing was "so stunningly unskilled that I could not begin to define the task nor even sort out the difficulties" (p. vii). The teaching writing lore is also composed of work from writers like Ken Macrorie (1968) who seek to keep writing simple. In *Writing to Be Read*, Macrorie identified the problem that "At times every young child makes memorable statements in writing or speaking. But as he advances in school, his language turns even duller and emptier" (p. 2). In his search for an answer to this problem Macrorie (1968) concludes that bad writing comes from learning to lie, and that "The good writer differs from the bad one in that he constantly tries to shake the habit. He holds himself to the highest standard of truth telling" (p. 6). While these two practitioners reach clear conclusions, much of the chaos of their experience gets lost in the writing of those experiences and the neatness that is often gained from hindsight. More often practitioners who create teaching writing knowledge do so with far more uncertainty about both the problem and the solution. Their work is driven by their beliefs about writing and teaching writing. They are less scientific in their inquiry. Most problems occur unannounced and following on the heels of other problems for which there is simply not enough time and too many students for methodically designed studies and carefully wrought analysis.

In order to develop an appreciation for how deeply the beliefs of writing teachers impact the teaching of writing that takes place in classrooms, we can look to the early days of the field. Traditions of the English grammar schools where writing was taught as a series of prescriptions and where students learned the rules of writing, raised serious doubt in many about the need for a field of teaching writing. Writing was something students learned

by studying the prescriptions of writing. Writing was not seen as an academic discipline so much as a craft or an art. That view of learning to write and the lore of teaching writing that practitioners depended on for navigating their way through their day to day teaching of writing both gave the field of teaching writing a low standing in the larger field of education.

Deep in the Shadow of Science

Today English is one of the `major disciplines addressed in schools across the country and writing is recognized by some educational experts as "the heart of learning" (Hillocks, 1995, p. xvii). However, the attention given to the discipline of English and the value placed on the teaching of writing is relatively new phenomenon in the history of education in this country. In fact, it was not until the 1950s that Composition was even recognized as a discipline. The teaching of writing even struggled to gain credibility among English teachers. It was not until 1949 that The Conference on College Composition and Communication became part of the National Council of Teachers of English. Education in the country has a history of recognizing the practicality of the sciences and relegating the humanities to a lesser status. In 1957 the Sputnik National Defense Education Act did not even make any provisions for English.

Historically, the field of Composition has received a great criticism for its "unscientific" approaches and was largely dismissed as a field "laced with dreams, prejudices, and make shift operations" (North, 1987, p. 16). That history of neglect left teachers of writing to their own devices and has

contributed to forming a culture of belief driven teaching of writing. Efforts have been made to develop a more "scientific" knowledge base for composition. But when it comes to observations what takes place in the classroom there is still strong evidence of a gap between practice supported by the research and practices supported by writing teacher lore (Applebee, 1981; Hillocks, 1995; North, 1987). Recent findings by the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach study (1998) suggest that practitioners continue to produce teaching of writing that is more likely to be concerned with students' compliance with prescriptions than about any other aspect of writing.

Research has demonstrated that direct instruction is less effective than instruction that gives students more control over their writing (Hillocks, 1986) and called for the reflective teaching of writing (Hillocks, 1995). Research has shown the value of placing an emphasis on students' writing processes (Emig, 1971). However, the teaching of writing continues to be driven by concerns for managing student behavior (Graff, 1987), an acquiescence to prescriptions (Kennedy, 1998), and teachers' beliefs that teaching writing is self-evident (Kennedy, 1998).

A question for this study is what might be done in the teaching of teaching writing to narrow the current gap between teaching writing theories and teaching writing practices. In order to understand more about why the teaching of writing continues to be belief driven, we can look to the birth of modern composition which challenged the long-standing belief that teaching writing had not effect on those learning to write.

The birth of modern composition can be traced back to 1962 when the NCTE Executive Council formed a committee on the state of knowledge

about composition. This committee's goal was to review what was known and not known about the teaching and learning of composition, and to examine the conditions under which composition was taught" (North, 1987). In 1964 significant empirical research about the adolescent writing process appears in Anthony Tovatt and Ebert L. Miller's study "The Sound of writing." In this study 30 ninth grade students used tape recorders with audio-active headsets so they could hear themselves electronically as they composed. The study was based on the premise that student writing would improve if the students could hear what they were writing. Although the findings were inconclusive, the study marked an important move in the development of writing instruction as a discipline worth of study. In the same year Rohman and Wiecke broke the writing process into three distinct stages: prewriting, writing, and rewriting. With this study prewriting became crucial component of teaching writing. Both these studies looked at the teaching of writing and its effect on student behavior, not at how student writers behaved as they wrote with minimal direct intervention by investigators. The result was an acknowledgment that the teaching of writing impacts student writing, which challenged long-standing beliefs that writing instruction was unnecessary.

A Shift from Product to Process

While the teaching of writing enjoyed an increase in credibility in the 60s, the emphasis continued to be placed on the belief that final product was what mattered in teaching writing. It was not until the 1970s when, for the

first time, evidence was produced that supported a change in the belief that product should serve as the focus of writing teachers' attention. In 1971, Janet Emig's study of the composing process of eight twelfth graders challenged the traditional focus on the written product by exploring "the ways that students usually or typically behave as they write" (Emig, 1971, p. vi). This shift from a belief in product to new beliefs in the importance of process was done with the hope that the learning and teaching of composition would "someday attain the status of science as well as art" (Emig, 1971, p. 5). In justifying her own study, Emig referred to Kellogg Hunt's 1965 speech that characterized the contemporary knowledge about the language of children as alchemy. Emig expressed her own hope that her study might provide one rung of a ladder up from alchemy, so that the learning and teaching of composition may someday attain the status of science as well as art.

More recent assessments of the state of writing instruction have concluded the following:

Writing instruction has been either more or less careful teacher marking, correcting, and commenting on student writing, or instruction in the formal features of writing: grammar, punctuation, spelling, and the approved structure of paragraphs and essays. (Mayher, 1990, p. 30)

Current findings suggest that writing programs are more likely to be successful if students are given ample opportunities to write (Porter, 1989). However, continued emphasis on product and tendencies toward prescriptive teaching have led students to spend the majority of "writing" time focusing on activities that call for correctness and encourage a purely

mechanical view of writing by responding to “fill in the blank” or “short answer” exercises (Applebee, 1981; Graves, 1979).

Findings by the Bay Area Writing Project have produced a core of concerns that they believe are instrumental in developing successful writing instruction: the composing process, syntax, sequence, small group techniques, and writing assessment (Neill, 1982). In addition to these concerns there are the findings that call for students to play an active role, minimal teacher dominance, and the natural emergence of writing out of other activities (Hillocks, 1983). As of the mid-eighties effective writing programs were believed to need the following characteristics (Graves 1978; Howard 1984):

- Opportunity for students in all grades to write frequently with delayed or “as needed” instruction in grammar
- Teachers writing with students
- Students learning to write for many audiences and in many modes, including those required for subjects other than English
- Non-threatening evaluation of student writing with emphasis on revision rather than correction

In spite of all the evidence that calls for students to play active roles in their own writing development, teachers continue to ignore or overlook students' points of view (Kennedy, 1998) and remained focused on their belief that students must adhere to the prescriptions of writing. Teachers of writing continue to hold to the belief that they are the gatekeepers of correct writing. Research on the teaching of writing has found that students have few opportunities to choose personally meaningful topics to write about or personally meaningful readers to address because the majority of student

writing is done "on teacher demand, on teacher-set topics, in teacher-determined forms, and written almost entirely for the teacher, who functioned as the grader and judge"(Mayher, 1990, p. 30). In one study it was even found that teachers felt confident in how they would deal with particular teaching of writing situations prior to receiving any teacher education. The study explained this finding by recognizing the belief among preservice teachers that teaching writing is self-evident (Kennedy, 1998), and as such requires no expert knowledge or experience.

The Emergence of Dialogic Writing Instruction

Emig's 1971 study challenged the traditional belief that product alone measured the success of writing instruction by examining the phenomenon of process. It is only recently that a discussion has begun around the notion of looking to learning theory as a means of framing thinking about the teaching of writing. Nystrand (1997) challenged educators to look at how people learn when deciding on methods for encouraging learning in the classroom setting. He made the argument that "dialogical instruction established higher expectations for students' learning, engaged students more fully with the material of the curriculum, and coached students in more complex patterns of thought" (p. 15). In connection with this thinking about dialoguing and improving learning, the research on writing workshops, conferences and peer work shows that talk about writing improves writing (Atwell, 1998, Calkins, 1983).

In light of theories about the role of dialogue in learning (Vygotsky, 1986), Brooke (1991) called for a shift from the sequential writing curriculum to writing workshops that allow for a more evolutionary process of developing writers. He presented a theory of writing as part of identity negotiations and complicated earlier mechanical definitions of writing that called for an emphasis on correctness. Brooke wanted teachers to shift from instructors of rhetorical principles to listeners and resource persons who would help writers to discover their own purposes for writing. Brooke (1991) found that students could use small groups to provide for the following essentials: time for writing, ownership over topics and processes, ongoing response to writing, and exposure to the writing of others. In short, student to student work and dialoguing around writing that has been found to be essential in providing effective learning to write experiences (Brook, 1991; Dysthe, 1996; Sperling, 1991).

Further research around teaching writing through dialoguing suggests that techniques like metadiscourse produce higher quality writing that is more accommodating to readers (Xiaoguang, 1996). Xiaoguang found that more explicit talk about structure and tone improved topical progression, and revising. Following in the steps of Emig, Xiaoguang was concerned with process more than product and found that metadiscourse turned student attention away from product and toward a view of writing as communication with a reader audience. The belief that students learn what teachers teach has also been challenged by Macrorie's (1984) use of the verb "help" to capture the essence of this interaction between student writers, and Murray's (1989) suggestion that students themselves become responders. Moffet (1983) goes

so far as to recommend that teachers of writing teach students to be teachers of writing.

The emerging belief that students learn from their peers is supported by both Graves (1979) and Calkins (1982, 1983) who conducted studies and produced evidence that peer response groups produce positive results when teaching writing. Further support for the belief that student talk facilitates learning about writing has been provided by studies that looked at opening a dialogue among students (Nystrand, 1997), classroom talk (Reid, 1983), peer written responses to peer writing (Wauters, 1988), and small groups (Legge, 1980). All these practices of encouraging peer work have been shown to have positive effects on students learning to write in terms of their understanding of audience (Glassner, 1983; Wootten, 1988), and their ability to revise (Kantor, 1984). Other studies (Berkenkotter, 1983; Rijlaarsdam, 1987; & Russell, 1985) have found mixed student reactions to peer work and suggested support for the more traditional beliefs about the limits of peer work in teaching writing.

Beliefs in dialogue as a means of learning are not reserved for peer work. Significant research has also been done on student- teacher conferencing as a means for helping students to develop as writers. Sperling (1990) found that the student-teacher conference provided a context that gives the students an opportunity to join with the teacher in understanding writing. Here again we see support for the belief of the traditional role of teacher as authority being challenged by beliefs in the role of teacher as learning partner with students.

Support for a belief in teacher-student learning partnerships is provided by the explanation that teacher-student conferences students are able to engage in role shifting (Newkirk, 1995), so that students can struggle with their tendency to assume a passive role in the learning process. Conferences have the potential to provide students with a safe place to reconsider the traditional role of the student in the learning process and assume a more proactive role. These changes support the belief that writing instruction should include teaching students how to dialogue with one another around their writing in the context of peer response activities (Wei, 1995).

The current research on the role dialogue plays in learning and the current research on the role of talk in learning to write both mark a shift in teachers' beliefs about the teaching of writing. In the sixties educators began to embrace a belief in the need for teaching writing. In the seventies beliefs about the teaching of writing experienced a shift from attention to the final product in student writing to a belief in the importance of the process students engage in as they move toward the product. The eighties witnessed heated debate about how to define the process with the discussion ranging from Peter Elbow's belief in teacher less classrooms to the more prescribed beliefs regarding the writing process championed by educators like Nancie Atwell (1987) and Lucy Calkins (1983). The nineties gave voice to another critical discussion around beliefs of teaching writing and process by educators like Collins who called for a shift from the writing process to discussions of process writing.

Now the discussion seems to be shifting more towards beliefs in the value of writing across the curriculum and writing to learn. All of this shifting in beliefs about teaching writing has serious implications for expanding the teaching of writing to include the teaching peer interaction around writing. Building on the trend established by Emig's 1971 study work, the research on teaching writing now includes topics like response-centered curriculums (Weir, 1991) writing groups (Cotich, 1994), peer evaluation (Shaughnessy, 1994), peer response groups designed to elicit student talk about writing (Freedman, 1992), conferencing (Sperling, 1991), and co-authoring (Chapman, 1992; Dale, 1997). This shift to the belief that students need to play active roles in their own learning about writing have brought to light that " the learner's capacities to solve problems and to perform intellectual tasks are powerfully influenced by the way the problems are posed and by the learner's interpretation of what the task entails" (Mayher, 1990, p. 76).

Common sense and beliefs about our own experiences as writers tell us that there is a direct correlation between the level of personal investment in a piece of writing and the quality of that piece of writing. Pajares and Johnson (1994) found a direct relationship between students' confidence in their writing, writing abilities and subsequent writing performance. Their investigation into the relationships involving self-confidence about writing, expected outcomes, writing apprehension, general self-confidence, and writing performance revealed that students' self-confidence is largely a result of the feedback that is received from peers and teachers. Current research about feedback supports the belief that quality is more important than

quantity and that the traditional approach of micromanaging students work with a red marking pen may actually turn students away from writing and encourage students to focus on correctness. Such beliefs in focusing on correctness have contributed to the type of white bread writing that has become so common in English classes (Murray, 1989).

Such a paradigm shift might encourage a shift in teachers' core beliefs about teaching writing. For example, Simmons (1990) found that folklore could be used as an "into" for student writers. Simmons's methods begin with personal writing based on memory, experience, or observation and then use the content of modern folklore as a way to capture students' attention. Colette (1990) looked at play as a strategy for developing writing abilities in students. The findings of this study suggested that play should be considered as a way of backing students into the act of writing. Play was found to encourage students to think of writing as a natural means of expression or as a natural extension of what happens when we play with ideas. The idea of using play as an approach to writing also supports Chanrney, Newman, and Palmquist (1995) who looked at how students' understanding of "knowledge" affects their attitude toward writing. They found that a belief in absolutism correlates negatively with students' attitudes toward writing. Students with more evaluative epistemologies were found to have more positive attitudes toward writing. This study suggests that writing teacher beliefs in correctness serve as barriers to producing correct writing.

The belief that placing emphasis on prescriptions and correctness will produce quality student writing has been challenged by studies that look at how students' relationships with writing impact their learning about writing.

Like epistemological concerns that can serve as barriers to learning to write, Murray (1989) discovered that emotions can disrupt concentration on writing and that concentration on writing is influenced by the writing environment both externally and internally. So while Charney, Newman, and Palmquist (1995) pointed out the issues of the students' inner dialogue around the problems associated with perceptions of knowledge; Murray (1989) further complicates the picture by calling attention to the external environment. In both cases the problem is not so much with the writing itself as with the context in which the writing takes place. Murray (1989) found that serious problems with writing became more manageable when students were able to pinpoint the reasons for their distress.

The belief that writing is a gift may also prevent students from imagining themselves as writers. Palmquist and Young (1992) found that higher levels of beliefs in giftedness are correlated with higher levels of writing apprehension. The whole concept of the writing muse might even be explored as a way of talking about how persons came to think of writing as a gift. Such a discussion could disarm those students who use the gift myth as an excuse to avoid any attempt at becoming a writer.

Our current understanding of why students resist writing and what steps can be taken to help them get motivated reveals that many of the problems often associated with writing are actually not so much problems with writing as they are problems with how students understand writing. These findings suggest that writing teachers need to address beliefs about the role of the writing teacher being limited to that of training students in writing prescriptions.

Beliefs in adopting strategies like using the arts to teach writing (Shuman, 1990), publishing students' work (Andrasick, 1993), having students look at the various writing professions (Whitehurst, 1993), using the daily newspaper, using geometry to scaffold poetry writing (Tiger, 1994), breaking writing rules (Nelson, 1994), using social issues to prompt persuasive writing (Light, 1995), using humor (Rothermel, 1995), and encouraging students to choose their own topics (Morris, 1991) may not find support in classrooms where students have developed negative relationships with writing.

Recent beliefs in the need for high-stakes standards that secondary students must meet in order to graduate, the omni-present call by conservative politicians for a return to basics (Bennett, 1992; Hirsch, 1996) and pleas by progressive educators like Lisa Delpit to reconsider the needs of minority students have both led some English educators to give careful reconsideration to beliefs in "the" writing process that has had such a hold on writing instruction since Emig (1971) first drew attention away from product.

Beyond "The" Writing Process

Collins (1998) challenged beliefs in teaching process exclusively with an approach called "strategic writing instruction". Strategic writing instruction is based on the premise that struggling writers benefit from collaborative assistance that helps them to think strategically about writing. In many ways Collins' approach supports the larger call for students to "go meta" (Bruner, 1996) in order to gain a deeper understanding of their own

learning. Collins' goal is to give students control over their writing by helping them to identify and use strategies for coping with writing dilemmas. Collins (1998) defined writing strategies as deliberate thinking procedures that writers use to solve problems they encounter while writing. Some of these strategies are learned intuitively during the process of writing, and other strategies are learned more directly from instruction. Collins (1998) identified key strategies or "default writing strategies" like copying, visualizing, and narrating that students can use when they find themselves stuck in the process of writing. Collins (1998) found that students who cooperated in co-constructing their own writing strategies were able to take greater control over their own writing skills and writing processes.

Unlike the traditional beliefs in teaching skills like punctuation out of context, the strategies approach supports the belief that students need to struggle with problems in the midst of their writing process. This approach to teaching writing calls for "writing teachers to adopt the belief that the writing teacher's role is to assist students in the understanding and use of appropriate strategies by studying the difficulties writers experience and by co-constructing with students ways out of the difficulty" (Collins, 1998, p. ix). Strategic writing allows for the systematic and explicit teaching of options for strategy selection and a gradually scaffolded transfer of responsibility for strategy selection from teachers to students. As with the writing process, the goal is to help students become independent writers. The difference is that the strategy approach sees skills united with process and integrally related to student achievement.

The writing process approach calls for writing teachers to adopt the belief that writing abilities are naturally acquired by everyone in the same fashion that primary language is acquired. The problem with this assumption is that it does not take into consideration the growing number of students, for whom writing must be learned, not acquired. The distinction between learning and acquisition is that acquisition is a “natural” process of attaining abilities through largely intuitive or subconscious means by exposure to models and through a process of trial and error, without formal instruction. Learning, on the other hand, is a process that involves conscious knowledge gained from instruction, explanation, and analysis (Gee, 1993).

This problematizing of “the” writing process has caused a shift toward beliefs in process writing. While some may argue such a shift is simple semantics, the shift has significant implications for writing teachers. “The” writing process is supported by the belief that all writers, in all pieces of writing, go through the same steps. Supporters of process writing do not hold this belief; rather they hold the belief that each writer is unique and as such needs to develop unique processes of writing. Process writing breaks from a belief in the linear and hierarchical structures of “the” writing process and gives more attention to the individual writer and the nature of the piece for cues about how to proceed (Krater, Zeni, & Cason, 1994).

Process writing comes partially as a response to the research done with African American student writers who have been found to benefit from direct instruction (Delpit, 1986, 1988; Landson-Billings, 1994). Krater et al. (1994) found that linear and teacher-led instruction worked well for African American students. They also called for high school students to do the

majority of their writing in the classroom, and they called for teachers to give students credit for the process of writing as well as the final product. The findings of these researchers support the belief that students need direct skill instruction during the process of writing, not after the final draft has been completed.

Considering Revising as Writing

However, those who believe that revision is the key to teaching writing challenge such an emphasis on process. Study after study (Applebee et al., 1986; NAEP, 1977; Sommers, 1982; Yoder, 1993) has found that students think of revision as an indication that they have failed, not as an opportunity to develop and improve a piece of writing. Typically, revision is presented by teachers with the belief that revision is the last stage of “the” writing process rather than as an element of process writing. Students “revise” by editing or proofreading, so that their attention focuses on spelling, punctuation and single word substitutions (Bridwell, 1980). Students do not appear to share Donald Murray’s (1982) belief that writing is rewriting. A change in beliefs toward the teaching of revision is certainly needed in light of what we now understand about the ineffectiveness of revising without purpose (Adams, 1991), the positive effects of direct teacher intervention in the revision process (Hillocks, 1982; Polette, 1995; Pressnall, 1995), and the power of engaging students in collaborative revision with their peers (Dale, 1997; Ryder, 1994; Stoddard & MacArthur, 1993).

Sommers (1982) suggested that writing teachers should act on the belief that students need specific activities designed to give them more sense of purpose when revising. Calkins (1986) suggested challenging the negative stigma of revision by adopting the belief that asking students to focus on positive aspects of their writing in revision can shift students' attitudes toward revision. Simic (1993) also called for a belief in the benefits of acknowledging the positive by arguing that it builds an awareness of the importance of writing. Balajthy (1986) suggested that writing teachers adopt the belief that revision take place in the classroom and that deadlines be made flexible as a way of encouraging students to engage in more complex revision.

Beliefs that technology has the capacity to play an important role in teaching writing have also affected the revision process. It would seem that computers might free students to engage in more significant revisions of their writing because of the ease with which writing can be changed. However, numerous studies (Daiute, 1986; Hawisher, 1986; Kurth, 1986) have found that computers do not improve students' efforts to revise. This suggests that teachers' beliefs technology as a tool for changing the way students think about revision may be short sighted. Computers certainly present the possibility of improved revision, but students must first adopt a new understanding of revision before they can be expected to use computers effectively in the revision process. Several studies that found computers to have a positive influence on students revisions (Flinn, 1984; Owston, et al., 1991; Woomble, 1984) claimed that instructional emphasis on fluency, word choice and mechanics made the difference in how effectively students were

able to use computers to revise their writing. This finding suggests that technology is only as effective when the writing teacher believes that technology should be used to supplement the teaching of writing.

Yagelski (1995) found that teachers' beliefs about teaching writing are powerful indicators for how students revise. Yagelski claimed that teachers' beliefs were drawn from past teaching experiences and institutional contexts in which the teaching took place. Yagelski (1995) found that students' revision strategies grew out of relatively narrow conceptions of revision and narrow conceptions of writing in general. The suggestion is that students' narrow conceptions of revision and writing are the products of the beliefs their writing teachers have formed from their experiences with their own writing teachers. This handing down of beliefs and seeming resistance to challenge traditionally held beliefs suggest the need to examine how beliefs can serve as more than barriers to new learning about writing and teaching writing.

Responding to Student Writing

Li (1996) found that the prevailing belief among writing teachers is that what is good writing is an intuitive judgment that almost defies articulation. This finding suggests that personal beliefs about what constitutes good writing play a crucial role in determining how writing teachers' respond to student writing. Rather than referring to professionally recognized standards for good writing, writing teachers were found to rely primarily on their own tastes and preferences in assessing student writing.

This belief that good writing is an intuitive judgment suggests the need for writing teachers to be explicit about their beliefs of what makes writing good

Newell (1994) called for teachers to provide students with dialogue-like responses to writing. Such a response means that writing teachers believe their role is to serve as genuine readers, who are interested in understanding, as opposed to judging, students' writing. The study found that teacher feedback in the form of directives shifted students' attention away from their own initial interpretations of texts and encouraged students to adopt the teacher's interpretation during revision. Preservice teachers who are invested in encouraging students to use writing as a tool for becoming more independent learners (Ackerman, 1993; Greene, 1993; Nystrand, 1990; Penrose, 1992; Spivey, 1990) may become frustrated if they provide students with traditional teacher directive-feedback in an effort to encourage independent student thinking. Preservice teachers who understand that teacher comments have little effect on the quality of students writing (Grant-Davie & Shapiro, 1987) may be encouraged to ask why, and engage in discussions around how to provide students with meaningful feedback.

A shift from a belief in the teacher-as-examiner to a belief in the teacher-as-facilitator (Grant-Davie & Shapiro, 1987) means exposure to strategies that remove the teacher from the role of the "only" reader (Krest, 1987). This shift in beliefs about the teachers' role also suggests that the teacher look at what happens to a piece of writing as it evolves (Cooper & Odell, 1977) rather just consider the final product. Such attention to the evolution of a piece would also challenge beliefs in the importance of product over process.

Spandel and Stiggins (1997) argued that in order to assess any type of performance the assessor needs to see it from the inside out. This means adopting the perspective of the writer and being familiar with what it feels like to be a writer. This shift in perspective would mean a shift in beliefs about the knowledge required of writing teachers. Traditional beliefs that make expert knowledge about writing prescriptions a priority would have to be emended to allow for equal status of knowledge about adolescent writers and their needs.

Teachers of writers might also reconsider their beliefs about the roles that their own writing plays in their teaching of writing. The belief that a teacher's own writing plays a role in the teaching of writing is supported by Charney and Carlson (1995) who found that providing models seemed to increase the "salience of the topical information" (p. 88) considered by students. Given the research that calls for an emphasis on writing processes (Collins, 1998), this notion of models might be extended beyond product to include processes. In this way the teacher's own writing process could serve as a model for students developing their own processes.

Recent work around assessment has turned attention away from the final product and toward the nature of the assignment as a means of trying to understand why students produce the writing they do. Such attention to the nature of the assignments that teachers compose challenges the belief that the quality of student writing is unrelated to the quality of writing instruction that is received (Young, 1982). Oliver (1995) found that poorly constructed prompts interfered with writer's rhetorical choices, thereby confounding the problem of fair assessment. Nelson (1990) found that students' responses to

writing assignments depended upon what they were actually rewarded for producing. Here we find evidence for the belief that the teacher's decisions about what is valued plays a significant role in what is produced.

In a study of teaching argumentative writing, Yeh (1998) found that knowledge of argument structure sharpened students' judgment regarding the content and organization to need to generate effective arguments. This findings suggests that any fair assessment of argumentative writing will not take place unless teachers believe that awareness of student intent is a crucial element of writing assessment.

Beyond the quality of the assignment there is also the question of writing teacher's beliefs about the role that students' intentions play in producing writing. Wallace (1996) found that students' interpretations of assignments can have a significant effect on their performance. This suggests that student learning is affected by writing teachers' beliefs about the role students' perspectives of an assignment play in the process of assessment.

Without a belief that students' intentions are not always in line with teachers' expectations, teachers may find themselves assessing student work based on objectives that are different from the students' objectives. Fair assessment is a belief in establishing that both students and the teacher are on the same page when it comes to understanding the type of work being produced. It might be that much of the tension around assessment and student writing is rooted in the writing teacher belief that students are writing with intentions that automatically meet teachers' expectations.

So often students are penalized for doing an assignment incorrectly when the truth may be that they have simply done a different assignment

correctly. Without a belief in establishing clear lines of communication to explore mutual intent, students and teachers may be predestined to fail each other.

Like all elements of writing instruction, assessment has been dramatically affected by the shift in writing teacher beliefs from an emphasis on product to one on process (Williamson & Hout, 1992). Specifically, teachers of writing embraced a belief in the portfolio (Baker, 1993; Brown, 1994; Murphy & Smith, 1992) as a means of assessing how students arrive at a final product rather than simply looking at the final product. Here we have an example of how beliefs about writing instruction have dramatically affected what goes on in classrooms. A belief in the effectiveness of portfolios as assessment tools has given teachers a tool that values the process of writing and allows students with the opportunity to be evaluated based on their "best" work.

Emig (1971) challenged the traditional belief about the importance of product by showing the value of looking at the process that students use to create the product. The pendulum swing away from a belief in product to process, like so many reactionary movements in education, raised new questions about writing teachers' beliefs about the value of teaching skills (Delpit, 1995). Now we seem to be at a time where writing teachers are developing beliefs that favor more of a compromise between the extremes of process and product (Collins, 1998).

Reconsidering Teaching Writing

Writing programs are more likely to be successful if writing teachers believe that students need ample opportunities to write (Porter, 1998). Unfortunately, the typical secondary student spends the majority of "writing" time focusing on "fill in the blank" or "short answer" exercises (Applebee, 1985; Graves, 1979) that call for correctness and encourage a mechanical view of writing. The Bay Area Writing Project has produced a core of concerns they believe are instrumental in developing successful writing instruction: the composing process, syntax, sequence, small group techniques, and writing assessment (Neill, 1982).

Other studies of writing programs call for the belief that students should play an active role, minimal teacher dominance, and the natural emergence of writing out of other activities (Hillocks, 1983). As of the mid-eighties effective writing programs were believed to need four characteristics. One, opportunities for students to write frequently with "as needed" instruction in grammar. Two, teachers who write with students. Three, students learning to write for many audiences and in many modes - including those required for subjects other than English. Four, non-threatening evaluation of writing with emphasis on revision rather than correction (Goldberg, 1983; Graves, 1979; Howard 1984).

Current research by Smith (1994) argues that writing teachers who believe in the following behaviors will have more success in teaching writing:

- Ensure that a wide choice of reading material is available relevant to students' interests and the subject of their writing.
- Encourage reading, and demonstrate the type of reading students should do.

- Make everything as comfortable and interesting as possible to enable students to write.
 - Provide necessary materials.
 - Encourage students to write.
 - Demonstrate writing.
 - Help students write.
 - Expose students to people who are writers.
 - Encourage talk in the classroom.
 - Demonstrate discussions and conversations, about interesting events, reading, and writing.
 - Respect writing and students.
 - Look at what students are doing, not what they have done. (p. 230)
- A recurring theme in the teaching writing literature is that teachers'

beliefs about writing and teaching writing play a central role in the development of student writers (Smith, 1994). The current expectations for writing programs and writing teachers' beliefs suggest the need for reflective practitioners with working knowledge of these dilemmas of teaching writing: peer work, conferencing, motivation, composing processes, revision, and assessment and evaluation.

Current research argues that writing teachers who believe in emphasizing on correctness devalue composition by serving as a barrier to what Donald Murray (1989) calls the three most powerful forces that produce clear, thoughtful writing: *difficulty, discovery, and demand*. Murray (1989) further calls for a belief among writing teachers in the value of encouraging students to produce "bad writing," and in the need to "unteach students who have been taught language arts and English until they know too much about the rules and what can't be done and too little about the exciting dangers of language" (p.103). Kennedy (1998), who found "deep connections between teachers' ideas about teaching writing and their own experiences with writing" (p.130), concluded that the brevity of most teacher education programs, the prior beliefs that students have about teaching, and the small number of

programs that present students with a “coherent vision of teaching” combine to create serious doubt as to the effectiveness of most teacher education programs in changing the espoused ideals students hold about writing, learning, and teaching. Kennedy (1998) called for teacher education programs that provide preservice English teachers with the opportunity to “rethink the assumptions they bring with them from their childhood”(p. 183). Kennedy (1998) concluded “teacher educators need to find ways to help teachers temper their initial ideas about the teaching of writing with new ideas about the teaching of writing” (p. 188).

Kennedy (1998) opens her investigation into the effectiveness of learning to teaching writing with the observation that the ancient Greeks believed that writers served as vehicles through which the muses worked. The belief that writing comes naturally to those who are touched by the muse calls into question the need for teachers of writing, which may account for the difficulty the teaching of writing had in being recognized as a needed profession. Historically writing has been viewed as largely prescriptive with little attention being given to writing concepts of writing purposes. Writing instruction was called into question because there was seemingly nothing to teach. Today's research has raised questions about direct instruction of writing coupled with an emphasis on the seemingly more “teachable” prescriptive elements of writing such as grammar. Some experts have made the claim that beliefs in prescriptive teaching of writing reduce composition to “a trivial subject, a matter of etiquette, writing that is traditional, imitative, standard, noncritical, nonthreatening”(Donald Murray, 1989, p. 102). Other

argue that and that direct instruction is less effective than methods that give students control over their writing (Hillocks, 1986).

One way to confront this tendency to retreat to direct instruction is to acknowledge the historical context that has given teachers permission to focus on prescriptive content in the teaching of writing. In the late nineteenth century John Genung argued that students could not be taught how to generate written texts, and that writing instructors should limit their concerns to elements of punctuation, grammar, and language use (Kennedy, 1998, p. 8-9).

This notion of challenging traditional beliefs about writing and the teaching of writing that preservice teachers may have learned during their experience as students is supported by Kennedy (1998) who found “deep connections between teachers’ ideas about teaching writing and their own experiences with writing. Kennedy (1998) concluded that the brevity of most teacher education programs, the prior beliefs that students have about teaching, and the small number of programs that present students with a “coherent vision of teaching” combine to create serious doubt about the effectiveness of most teacher education programs in changing the espoused ideals that students hold about writing, learning, and teaching. Kennedy (1998) called for teacher education programs that provide students with the opportunity to “rethink the assumptions they bring with them from their childhood”(p. 183).

In fleshing out what we know about the effects of teacher education programs in which preservice English teachers learn to teach writing, Kennedy (1998) concluded that “teacher educators need to find ways to help

teachers temper their initial ideas about the teaching of writing with new ideas about the teaching of writing” (p.188). For an overview of how teacher education addresses the challenge of tempering preservice teachers beliefs, the next section reviews the nature of teacher education programs.

Teacher Education: A Frame for Learning to Teach Writing

Over 1200 colleges and universities offer teacher preparation programs (Griffin, 1999), and while there continue to be efforts to come out of the 1986 Holmes Group report *Tomorrow's Teachers* which outline a three tiered hierarchical structure of teacher roles and responsibilities in an effort toward recognizing some standards in the field of teacher education, it could be claimed that there are currently over 1200 different standards for preparing preservice English teachers to teach writing. Preservice English teachers can expect everything from an intensive semester long, four hours a week, seminar dedicated exclusively to writing and the teaching of writing to a cursory, single class session address of teaching writing. Alan Tom (1997) points out that

Most of the arguments among teacher educators are debates about how to configure programs, such as the sequencing of professional courses, the length of student teaching and whether it should be full time, the amount and timing of pre-student teaching field work, whether teacher education ought to be shifted to the graduate level, and so on. (p. 3)

This continuing argument over the structure of programs is compounded by the variety of orientations those programs have toward teaching writing in terms of methods, and purposes.

Kennedy (1998) recognizes three basic institutional structures: University-based programs, field-based programs, and an integrated combination. In the University-based programs students take general education courses followed by courses on teaching and a senior experience where they are placed in schools with an experienced teachers. Some Universities have what is known as a fifth year program in which students who have completed their bachelor degree in the field they plan to teach enroll in a year-long sequence of education classes that culminate some type of student-teaching experience in an actual school setting. Field-based programs also offer general education classes, but the approach tends to be less theoretical and more practical. Courses in these programs also tends to be more abbreviated with the emphasis being placed on the learning to teach in an actual classroom setting. Some of these programs even rely on practicing teachers to facilitate the teaching of the preservice teachers. The integrated programs seek to expose preservice teachers to both classroom and University learning experiences with an effort to create some degree of agreement between the messages that spring from those two contexts.

These three types of programs also differed in their content. Some programs emphasized very practical knowledge over how to manage classroom behavior, while others were more reform oriented and sought to provide preservice teachers with more theoretical strategies for coping with teaching dilemmas in ways consistent with the own teaching beliefs. Those programs concerned with more general management issues tend to focus on issues of organization like lesson planning and develop engaging activities for students. In such programs little attention is given to the specifics of

subjects like teaching writing. Programs more concerned with reform present preservice teachers with the notion that teaching approaches are born from teaching purposes. In these programs preservice English teachers are exposed to research and theories that they might use in making their own decisions about how to teach writing.

In terms of teaching the teaching of writing, these programs break down into two types: those that believe teacher educators should teach aspects of teaching and leave issues of subject matter to the various academic departments of the university, and those that believe teacher educators should teach preservice English teachers to think of writing as consisting of strategies and purposes, not as a set of prescriptions.

In a cross-program analysis of teacher education programs in which Howey and Zimpher (1989) looked in depth at six different types of teacher education programs ranging from small liberal arts programs to major research oriented universities, they found "a lack of clear understanding surrounding the nature and quality of various programs of teacher education" (p. 5). In a review of 220 studies on preservice teacher education programs Koehler (1985) concluded that "there are lots of studies, but they do not add up to anything; they are piecemeal and particularistic" (p. 23).

The Holmes Group's "Tomorrow's Schools of Education" identifies four goals that Teacher Education Programs should work towards. First, preservice teachers should learn to be life long learners by knowing how to use knowledge of their own students that will promote the learning and development of those students. Second, subject matter knowledge must be more thoroughly integrated with learning how to teach it. Third, preservice

teachers must acquire knowledge and skills for organizing instruction and for managing crucial problems that arise. Fourth, preservice teachers must develop a capacity to engage in critical, reflective inquiry and dialogue about their own beliefs and practices, about children's learning and development, and about a range of social, institutional, and political issues bearing on education.

Sykes (1992) further suggested that preservice teachers engage in critical, reflective inquiry on five key topics: promoting understanding among diverse learners, the implementation of teaching strategies and principles derived from research on teaching, students as the basis for responsive teaching, the social and political context schooling from the perspectives of equity, social justice, and humanity, and understanding and reflection on one's own beliefs and assumptions about the first four topics. These suggestions for helping preservice teachers develop a deeper understanding of teaching concur with Shrofel's (1991) study which looked at preservice, secondary English teachers tutoring university-level students who were having difficulty with writing. The tutorial experience revealed that preservice teachers can change their teaching practices, that writing and teaching practices are closely linked, and that confronting oneself as a teacher, learner, writer, and person formed the center of what the preservice teachers experienced. The suggestion from these looks to the future of teacher education and findings of what works to change preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching writing is that coping with the competing discourses around teaching writing is at the heart of learning about teaching writing.

For descriptions of programs of teacher preparation that reflect some of the concerns discussed above, I turn to Bullough and Gitlin (1995) and Schoonmaker (1998). Bullough and Gitlin documented one year in their teacher preparation program at the University of Utah, a program whose design was based on their prior research in the field. Through their examination of student teacher assignments and reflective journals, Bullough and Gitlin chronicled the program's attempts to create a teacher education program that emphasizes not only methods and content acquisition but also an understanding of school contexts and an understanding the self within that context. Bullough and Gitlin's concern was how to develop encounters with teacher education content and theory that would better allow students to achieve perceived goals and needs while simultaneously enabling the university to maintain intellectual and personal integrity. Mainly, they sought to challenge traditional approaches to teacher education, and to develop programs and practices that maximize beginning teachers' control over their own professional development. The program, which uses a cohort organization, attempts to forge an institutional organization and develop instructional approaches that encourage teachers to define personal systems of meaning within the bounds of the particular context of the school and program where they do their student teaching.

Bullough and Gitlin complained that methods courses are disconnected from practice teaching, a theme that resonated through Kagan's findings as well. The researchers found that once their students became "real" teachers they forgot or discarded much that were taught. They wrote, "If teacher education is to be more influential, a different way of working

with students and school faculties must be forged” (p. 12). Through methodologies concerned with constructing biography, promoting reflection, and developing educational community, the authors hope to build a bridge from university methods courses to student teaching experience. The authors reflected on their own experiences using methodologies, educational autobiography, personal teaching metaphors, school histories, classroom studies, curriculum analysis, educative research and personal teaching text. Bullough and Gitlin advise teacher educators to work with practitioners to further their own development and practice in order to challenge school structures that narrowly define education. They also want teacher educators to take time to help students understand school context.

In Schoonmaker’s (1998) description of a portion of her longitudinal case study of Kay, a teacher whom Schoonmaker followed from preservice education through her first five years of teaching, she described the preservice teacher education program at Teachers College. Schoonmaker draws on Kay’s journal entries, her written autobiography, and interviews over the five-year period. Schoonmaker began by mapping out five basic expectations that she had culled from the learning-to-teach literature:

- A novice’s own images and implicit theories about teaching will contribute significantly to his/her development,
- Novices are often unconvinced of the value of educational theory, preferring the “hands-on” learning of field placements,
- Novices are initially consumed with concern regarding classroom control at the expense of attention to teaching and learning,

- Although many teacher preparation programs encourage novices to develop a reflective practice, this is not what is most valued and reinforced in many urban schools,
- Many of the most academically talented novices leave teaching within the first five years.

In describing Kay's learning process in the Teachers College Childhood Education Program and beyond, Schoonmaker explored the program's attempt to foster reflectivity and provide the kind of teacher education that is most likely to retain a teaching candidate as desirable as Kay. Many of the components of the program are congruent with those proposed elsewhere in the literature. For example, there is emphasis on structured opportunities for reflection, as has been widely recommended as essential to teacher development (Schön, 1987). There are also extended intern experiences in PDS placements that are designed to develop the familiarity with pupils that Kagan (1992) found so essential. Furthermore, by having these field placements at a PDS, it is possible that the miseducative aspects of student teaching described by Feinman-Nemser and Buchmann (1987) are minimized, although Schoonmaker does not explicitly address this point. Student teachers are guided through making their initial images and beliefs explicit and then encouraged to question and reconstruct these beliefs based on their experiences in classrooms, as suggested by Calderhead and Robson (1991).

However, a striking difference between Schoonmaker's description of the Teachers College program and the recommendation of writers such as Kagan is the emphasis placed on procedural knowledge. Kagan found this

knowledge was essential for novices, while Schoonmaker agreed with Dewey's (1904) belief that, although the preparation of teachers to be experimental and reflective may initially leave them at a disadvantage because they will have less information about the "how-to's" of teaching, it will ultimately result in teachers who are stronger and more adaptive.

The purpose of my characterization of the variety of teacher education programs is to show how dramatically different preservice English teachers' learning to write experiences may be from one program to the next, and to suggest the need to find ways of ensuring that their learning about teaching writing is not restricted by the structure and orientation of the program they attend. One way to help preservice English teachers have learning to teach writing experiences that measure up to the goals set forth by Sykes is to provide them with learning experiences that allow for specific attention to be given to their beliefs about who they are becoming as writing teachers.

For a closer consideration of how and why preservice English teachers' beliefs about teaching writing affect their learning to teach writing, this next section reviews research on prior beliefs and learning to teach.

Beliefs and Learning to Teach Writing

The possibility of changing teachers' beliefs about teaching writing is supported by findings that teacher education can change preservice teachers' beliefs about both teaching and writing (Kennedy, 1998). However, this optimism is tempered by Nettle's 1996 survey of 20 articles that focused on changes in student teachers' beliefs found both stability and change in

student teachers' beliefs. The significant changes in student teachers' beliefs were associated with methods courses. Nettle concluded that the stability in student teachers' beliefs might be the product of an active process of balancing preexisting beliefs and present reality. This balancing between two worlds that Nettle calls for sounds very much like the type of negotiating of competing discourses that Bakhtin recognizes as what occurs when persons find themselves put into dialogic. For Bakhtin this balancing takes place in what he calls "borderzones" which are places that stand between two opposing discourses. Nettle's work on learning to teach and Kennedy's work on learning to teach writing both suggest that beliefs can be changed. Bakhtin's dialogical principle offers one model of how such changes might be facilitated.

Nespor (1987) found that teacher belief systems were loosely bounded systems prone to variability depending on events, situations, and knowledge systems. This suggests the possibility that teachers' prior beliefs may be just as prone to change as they are to stability. Nespor concluded that beliefs serve teachers in two important ways. First, they define tasks and cognitive strategies. Second, they allow teachers to navigate their way through ill-structured domains. In short, beliefs were deemed important and unfixed determinants of how teachers organize their worlds and define their tasks.

Teachers use beliefs to read situations, to interpret new information, and to decide what is possible or realistic. In order to teach reflectively, "they need time to unearth their beliefs, challenge their thinking, search out the complexities and contradictions, and find ways to value their own voices in the process" (Vinz & Edahl, 1993, p. 254). There is a tension between

remaining comfortable with and responsive to novel demands and prompting challenges to thinking about teaching and learning. This tension must be valued or teachers will stay with proven methods rather than entertain alternatives. Teachers' beliefs can be catalysts for learning and help teachers focus on alternatives when they are used as conceptual frames, but beliefs become barriers when their primary functions are to justify current methods and criticize new methods.

Anderson, Blumenfield, Pintrich, Clark, Marx, & Peterson (1995) identified beliefs as barriers to learning. Anderson found that "preservice teachers enter teacher education programs with views of teaching and learning that are potentially limiting" (p. 150). The conclusion was that "until teachers are provoked into examining and transforming their assumptions about issues like student ability and student intent, they are not likely to learn about new approaches to instruction because they cannot understand their underlying assumptions" (p. 150). Teachers' assumptions frame their understandings of practices, which can prevent them from seeing what is really happening. Rather than creating new meaning from their observations, teachers' assumptions lead them to use what they observe to support beliefs they already hold. Here again we see support for the notion that being put into dialogic challenged preservice teachers to develop more complex understandings. Teachers who have to negotiate between dissonant discourses are challenged to question their own assumptions and acknowledge the complexity of situations. Being put into dialogic increases teachers' awareness to the point where it becomes possible to examine beliefs by imagining alternatives, which help teachers expand upon their beliefs.

Buchmann and Schwille (1983) showed further cause for examining teachers' beliefs by recognizing the teacher norm of over-valuing firsthand experience and common sense as means for learning to teach. Such an approach to learning teaching, it was argued, does not give teachers any cause to pursue alternative modes of teaching or to inquire about the current pedagogical knowledge. Buchmann and Schwille argued that firsthand experience can close avenues to change because of the assumption that teachers learn by doing. Buchmann and Schwille (1983) theorized that "matter-of-fact pretensions of common sense tend to conceal problematic rhetorical and theoretical underpinnings"(p. 32). Buchmann and Schwille noted that people become trapped in behaviors that promise short-term rewards, even in the face of long-term failures, and argued that the type of hands-on experience that helps teachers through their first few years may not improve their teaching. Buchmann and Schwille challenged the tradition of learning by teaching with the argument that learning from experience means learning to adhere to traditional practices and standards. The implication was that teachers should problematize the assumptions inherent in the belief that firsthand practice and common sense prepares teachers best.

Four sets of beliefs have been identified as potential barriers in the process of preparing reflective practitioners: the tendency to think of learner and content as relatively fixed entities, the tendency to equate activity with learning, a distinction between comprehension and application, and a view of curriculum as a fixed agenda with predetermined ends. Each of these beliefs conflicts with current understandings about necessary conditions for learning to write.

Prawat (1992) found "identifying what is problematic about existing beliefs to be the first step in the change process" (p. 361). He identified three criteria necessary for prior beliefs to be problematized: "dissatisfaction with existing beliefs, alternatives intelligible and useful in extending teachers' understanding to new situations, and some discernible means for connecting the new beliefs with earlier conceptions" (p. 361). Problematizing beliefs plays a crucial role helping teachers learn because it frees them from their assumptions and allows them to see a more complete picture of situations, which leads to broader understandings.

Clark (1988) found "teachers' attitudes and beliefs influenced their perception and understanding of classroom events and affected their classroom practice" (p. 53). This impact of beliefs was also recognized by Tillema (1994), who explored the effects of beliefs on perception and found beliefs acting as filters in the knowledge acquisition process. Tillema argued that beliefs "ultimately determine which elements are accepted and integrated in the professional's knowledge base" (Tillema, 1994, p. 601). In order to address how to cope with this problematic aspect of beliefs Tillema researched the conditions under which teachers accepted and eventually utilized new information, and found that "the greater the difference between training content and teacher beliefs, the less learning took place" (p. 613).

In order to move beyond learning teaching practices and look at the effect beliefs have on teachers' views of who they are as professionals, Crow (1987) labeled beliefs about teaching and learning as the "teacher role identity" which simultaneously and counter productively encouraged confidence in teachers and inhibited the adoption of new ways of thinking

about teaching. According to Crow prior beliefs serve as a kind of assessment tool for teachers whose main concern is to find support for what they already believe to be true.

This use of prior beliefs to justify current practices was also recognized by Pajares (1992) who found that beliefs were the best indicators of the decisions that individuals made, and that because they served as personal truths they often remained unchanged regardless of the situation. Pajares argued that because teachers came to teaching as insiders (many have recently finished their carriers as pupils in the classroom), they did not feel the need to redefine their situation in the same way that a student of law or medicine might. As insiders, the notion of redefining their situation was both taxing and potentially threatening because such a paradigm shift also challenged their deeply seeded perception of themselves as successful students in the system. Pajares (1992) concluded that "the filtering affect of beliefs screens, redefines, distorts, or reshapes subsequent thinking and information processing" (p. 317).

Recognizing the limits that beliefs place on teacher learning, McDiamid's (1990) research began with the knowledge that prior beliefs influence teacher learning, and asked how such beliefs could be challenged. The study assumed that although some teachers appear to reconsider their beliefs, such changes might be superficial and not transfer into practice. McDiamid found that teacher education students rarely became aware of the beliefs and the subsequent assumptions that guided so much of their learning. More typically, preservice teachers were found to reconfigure ideas

and information they encountered to fit with their initial beliefs or to reject and ignore what did not fit with their schema.

Powell (1992) also researched approaches for dealing with the powerful influence of prior beliefs among preservice teachers. Powell concluded that programs that acknowledged preservice teachers' prior experiences and the subsequent beliefs they created ultimately helped preservice teachers trust their own intuition for preparing and presenting lessons based on the principles of teaching acquired during their teacher education preparation. Powell (1992) acknowledged that "prior knowledge served as a filter for interpreting new information, and noted that prior pupil-experiences were primary factors that influenced their conceptions of teaching" (p. 225). Maxson supported Powell with the finding that learning was not meaningful unless it was assimilated into a learner's existing cognitive structure.

This work around the impact of teachers' beliefs on their learning about teaching was directed to the narrower subject of learning to teach writing by Florio-Ruane and Lensmire (1990) who focused on teacher candidates' prior knowledge of what writing is and how it is taught. Florio-Ruane and Lensmire found the following: candidates' knowledge was limited to what they learned about writing from the pupil's perspective, candidates' prior learning about teacher thinking and pedagogy was based on informal childhood observations of teachers while participating in lessons, and learning from experience as a pupil typically reflected status quo rather than state-of-the-art practice. It was found that beginning teachers often felt threatened and frustrated in their movement to new perspectives. The

teachers believed it was their job to teach the rules of writing directly to children through explanation and example. This recognition of the frustration that beginning teachers face in their efforts to entertain new teaching discourses is further supported by Joram's findings that pupil-derived beliefs are carefully guarded by preservice teachers. Joram (1998) found that preservice teachers had well-developed beliefs about learning and teaching that formed obstacles to instruction. The suggestion was that targeting preservice teachers' prior beliefs about teaching and learning had a significant impact on those beliefs.

In Kagan's (1992) interpretative review of qualitative research on learning to teach studies conducted between 1987 and 1991, she sought to address the problem of coping with preservice teachers' prior beliefs by providing a synthesis and interpretation the research on prior beliefs. Her goal was to discover if the research revealed any understandable approach to prior beliefs. She reviewed 40 learning-to-teach studies conducted between 1987 and 1991 that examine changes in the behavior, beliefs, or images of preservice teachers. Kagan's explicit purposes in this review was "to examine the studies for coherence as a body of literature, to draw from any underlying themes discerned in the review to pose a model of professional growth for novice teachers, and to infer teacher education practices that might promote such growth" (p. 129).

Kagan (1992) reached the following conclusion:

The studies did cohere to form a body of literature that reflected common themes which suggested directions for preservice teacher education, and that these were consequences of the failure of university courses to provide novices with the kinds of knowledge

they most need, i.e. procedural knowledge of classrooms, knowledge of learners, and a realistic view of teaching. (p. 162)

She suggested the following:

Teacher preparation that emphasizes procedural rather than theoretical knowledge; that offers opportunities for self-reflection, extended interaction with pupils, and opportunities to experience cognitive dissonance (which has been found to promote examination and reconstruction of underlying beliefs); that accepts the novice's obsession with class control; that attends to developmental readiness and is characterized by a concurrent willingness to counsel out of the field novices who do not demonstrate the ability to acknowledge and change dysfunctional aspects of their self definitions as teachers; and that is open to questioning the centrality of the role of theory in teacher preparation. (p. 163)

Bullough's (1989) case study confirmed many of the themes of Kagan's review. Bullough followed a new teacher through her first year and a half of teaching, observing her once a week and interviewing her about that day's teaching after school on the same day. He also interviewed the principal and four randomly selected students from the new teacher's class once each to see if his perceptions of how the teacher was being received were accurate. In describing the stages of development that the teacher passed through, Bullough (1989) noted what Kagan (1992) called the "obsession with control" (p. 163) as a significant factor in the first-year experience. He also documented the novice teacher's inadequate procedural knowledge and her unfamiliarity with pupils. He noted with disappointment that the novice's teacher education program seemed to have influenced her teaching very little.

Bullough (1989) noted that "the novice's self image may have kept her from availing herself of help in solving problems" (p.145). This theme was also developed by Calderhead and Robson (1991), who examined the images of 12 student primary teachers through interviews, two guided video analysis experiences and the writing of a script of an imagined lesson. They found

that all but one of the student teachers had images of themselves as teachers, that these images were fairly rigid, and that they could be useful in describing how the student teachers held or organized their knowledge about teaching. The careful design of the study laid bare not only the images themselves but revealed how these images played out over time and context. The images, which were first revealed in the interviews, were later revealed again by the ways that the student teachers interpreted the videotaped teaching samples. Finally, they played out once more at the end of the study in scripts that the student teachers created of imagined lessons.

Bullough's (1989) case study posited that the stages of development that the first year teacher in his case study experienced were in keeping with earlier theoretical descriptions of the typical stages of development of teachers. In another study of preservice teachers, Lederman and Gess-Newsome (1991) examined the development of preservice science teachers' instructional behaviors, concerns, perceptions about teaching, and decision-making skills to see what changes occurred as the teachers gained in experience. They specifically looked at the transfer of skills and perceptions developed in microteaching to the student teaching experience and any changes or development of skills and concerns throughout the duration of student teaching. The one-year study, which involved an initial survey and follow up interviews with the preservice science teachers, Lederman and Gess-Newsome's analysis of their data yielded a total of 17 categories of concerns which included several concerns for self, including physical appearance, personal expression and confidence, and concerns with subjects such as speech, audio-visual mechanics, lesson planning skills, and clerical

administration skills and the overall work load. Student teachers' concerns for pupils included reactions to and cognizance of pupils, pupil involvement, instructional sequencing, concrete and relevant instruction, use of questioning, classroom management, instructional planning, motivation, rapport with students, depth and breadth of material and time requirements for learning.

Lederman and Gess-Newsome concluded that novice teachers struggle because they lack elaborate cognitive schemata and pedagogical reasoning skills. Prior to microteaching, the student teachers that Lederman and Gess-Newsome studied were more concerned with classroom management than subject-specific pedagogy and methodology. However, the researchers found that the microteaching did cause a shift from concerns with management to pedagogy and methodology, and they hypothesized that the overwhelming presence of "real" pupils within the context of student teaching compelled the preservice teachers to shift concerns from self to students. The researchers concluded that preservice teachers must be provided with a repertoire of skills and encouraged to develop the capacity to engage in reflective decision making, conclusions that sound themes similar to Kagan's contention that teacher education needs to provide novice teachers with procedural knowledge, extended interaction with pupils, and opportunities for self-reflection.

In regard to the recommendation that preservice teachers experience extended interaction with students, Feinman-Nemser and Buchmann (1987) found that teacher education programs can fail to force student teachers to consider pupil learning or to clarify what constitutes a meaningful learning

activity. In reporting on a part of their two-year study of six elementary education student teachers, they described the cases of two student teachers who had been prepared in different programs with different philosophies. They interviewed the students about their learning in their teacher education courses, and grounded these interviews with regular observations of core courses and field experiences. These researchers found that student teaching can be a miseducative experience that often focuses on control and fails to challenge the novice to focus on the examination of student thinking and the promotion of student learning.

Other researchers report more positive findings about teacher education efforts. For example, Nettle (1998) disputed Kagan's conclusion that the literature on teacher education finds that programs fail to influence student teachers' beliefs. Nettle (1998) wrote that Kagan "... missed many studies that did indicate the influences that aspects of teacher education courses had on the beliefs of student teachers" (p.193). Referring to his own 1996 survey of 20 articles focused specifically on the issue of changes in student teacher beliefs, Nettle maintains that student teachers' beliefs are more complex than Kagan indicated. Of the 20 studies, he noted that 18 studies found change in student teachers' beliefs, but that of these 18, 15 also found evidence of stability in the beliefs of student teachers. This claim that teacher education makes a difference in preservice teachers beliefs was also supported by Kennedy's (1998) study of preservice English teachers learning to teach writing.

Nettle reported on his own study, based on questionnaires and follow-up interviews of 79 first-year primary teachers before and after a three-week

period of practice teaching. He claimed that his findings agreed with the body of literature that he cited that found both stability and change in student teachers' beliefs. The significant changes in student teachers' beliefs were associated only with methods courses. Nettle concluded that the stability in student teachers' beliefs about teaching may be seen as a product of an active process of balancing preexisting beliefs and present reality, and that the complexity of the experience of teacher education has not been sufficiently explored. These conclusions may be subject to question, considering the methodological limitations of Nettle's work. The study looked at a three-week period, surely a short time period for the assessment of deeply held beliefs. Moreover, the primary method of data collection was questionnaire, so it is possible that the data is not as rich as those from the more purely qualitative studies reviewed by Kagan.

As the only study reviewed by Kagan that found that the images and beliefs that preservice candidates held could be changed during a teacher education program, Florio-Ruane and Lensmire's work merits close examination. In attempting to prepare a group of novices to teach writing from a process or writing workshop approach, the researchers met initial resistance. It was not until the focus was shifted from suggesting or modeling teaching methods to having the novices conduct research projects with children themselves that the novices opened up to the possibilities of the new ways of teaching writing. After the novices were assigned to interview children to discover their ideas about writing, to read about child language development, to review samples of the writing of young children and learn how to analyze and describe them, to plan and implement instruction within

which children actually wrote, and to document the progress of one child through this instruction, then they were willing to reconsider their original beliefs about the nature of writing, writing instruction, and the role of the teacher in writing instruction.

The shift that Florio-Ruane and Lensmire's study shows in preservice teachers' willingness to reconsider their original beliefs about writing and teaching writing, is further supported by Kennedy's (1998) study which posed the question: Does teacher education make a difference in learning to teach writing? Kennedy found that preservice English teachers arrive to their learning to teach writing experience with a "complex network of thoughts about teaching and about how they themselves will behave as teachers" (p. 174). Kennedy recognized the double-edged nature of these beliefs by explaining that "such ideas can be a tremendous help to an aspiring teacher by providing focus and direction to the work, but they also present a tremendous barrier to reformers who want to promote a different set of ideas about teaching" (p. 174). Kennedy closes her study by raising a new question: How might preservice teachers learn alternative versions of teaching writing? In order to address that question we now turn to a discussion of what coping with beliefs and learning to teach writing in the context of teacher education looks like when framed by Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogical principle.

A Theory of Learning for Coping with Preservice English Teachers' Beliefs

Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic claims that "dialogical interaction with others is necessary for a coherent development of the self capable of engaging

in morally and aesthetically productive tasks" (Gardiner, 1992, p.3). Bakhtin does not specifically discuss learning to teach writing, but if we use his theory of the dialogic to frame the 14 preservice English teachers interactions around learning about writing, then it seems apparent that preservice English teachers benefit from interacting with others because the others allow for the development of a more complete image of who they are as writing teachers. From Bakhtin's perspective individuals are incapable of seeing themselves as they are situated in the world. Much the way a mirror projects an incomplete view of the self by only revealing one side, Bakhtin explains that the self needs others and their different perspective of the self to form a more complete self-image.

Bakhtin's work is largely concerned with understanding Russian literature. Specifically, his work with the dialogic illuminated the genius of Dostoevsky, who created characters with consciences independent from the author and capable of engaging in competing discourses with one another. The same theory of the dialogic that frames Bakhtin's exploration of the relationship between author and characters is applied here to the relationship between teacher and student. Bakhtin's work around consciousness helps to explain the inner dialogue of preservice English teachers who find themselves coping with the dissonance between their student derived beliefs about teaching writing and the theories of teaching writing they are challenged to consider in the context of their teacher education experience. It is both the dissonance and the alignment of these discourses that challenge preservice English teachers' understandings of what it means to teach writing.

As a theory of learning, Bakhtin's dialogical principle is used in this study to frame the social dialoguing that takes place in the context of the teaching of writing classroom and the inner dialoguing experienced by individual preservice English teachers. Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic helps me to understand what happened when these preservice English teachers learned about writing and teaching writing and the ways in which learning in dialogic with others produced deeply rooted understanding capable of withstanding the wash effects of experience.

Others Shape a Passive Self

According to Bakhtin's dialogical principle, a single consciousness cannot generate a sense of itself because an awareness of another consciousness outside the self is needed to produce a complete image of the self. For preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing this need for others to be involved in learning suggests the importance of opportunities to engage in dialogue around aspects of teaching writing. In his essay "Author and Character in Aesthetic Activity" (1920) Bakhtin explains that the other always sees and knows something about the self because the other exists outside the self. He illustrates the limits of the self's perspective by arguing that there are parts of the self's body "that are inaccessible to his own gaze (his head, his face and its expression), the world behind its back" (Bakhtin, 1990, p. 83), but are accessible to the other. Therefore, only the other can "see" the more complete self. The fact that each other "sees" the self from a unique perspective and, therefore, has new

knowledge of the self to offer, suggests that the self is unfinalizable" (Bakhtin, 1990, p. 23) with the capacity for infinite deepening of self awareness so long as a state of interaction with others is maintained. In essence, every interaction with others is an opportunity to increase self-awareness through the interplay of competing and complimentary discourses.

Bakhtin's early writings around this theory of self-awareness actualized by the outsider's consciousness of the self suggest that the self needs to be a passive receptor of the other's teaching about the self. Such a theory of learning supports a deficit model of teaching the teaching of writing. The notion would be that preservice English teachers come to their learning to teach writing experience with needs that can only be satisfied by others. Under this deficit model the preservice English teacher would be called upon to passively receive the gift of knowing how to teach writing from those with more experience. The problem with such an approach is that the preservice English teachers' voices are silenced and there remains little room for the possibility of advancing the understanding of teaching writing beyond that currently known by the expert. While this learning process might facilitate a transference of knowledge about teaching writing, it would not necessarily provide preservice English teachers with the opportunity to weave such knowledge into their belief systems.

Such a superficial exposure to expert knowledge might be one explanation for the limited transference of teacher education lessons to the classroom. In order for new learning to withstand the test of time, that learning needs to become part of a larger belief held by the preservice English teacher. This need for a way to help the learner (the preservice English

teacher) to play a more active role in the learning process is what Bakhtin seems to discover in his later writings when he dismisses his earlier notion of the learner as passive receptor.

An Active Self Interacts with Others

In "Discourse in Life and Discourse in Art" Bakhtin rejects the notion that the self be a passive receptor, and he argues for the self to play a more active role in the evolution of the self. The self is called upon to become an active part of the process and it is here that we see how the self evolves out of interplay with others. If we consider such a Bahktinian view of the learner, then it becomes possible to consider that the preservice English teacher's voice must be heard in both conflict and agreement with the voices of the other, so that new meaning can come from the interaction. His early view of the other giving meaning to the self as a gift is replaced in this work with the idea that meaning is produced by the social interaction of all participants.

Consequently, the self and the other both play active roles in developing self-awareness. Here we see the dialogic process of meaning making and the demands it places on each person involved in the learning process. Under such a model all persons become both givers and receivers. This model also challenges any notion of completing the learning process and promotes the notion of an open learning continuum. For preservice English teachers learning to teach writing such a shift might include considering their teacher education experience as one phase in a learning continuum that began with their first experiences with writing and will continue indefinitely.

Thus, rather than see their learning to teach writing class as a one time shot to learn the prescriptions they will need to teach writing and putting their energy toward synthesizing all they know about teaching writing in an effort to get it "right", Bakhtin's theory raises the alternative approach of using the experience as a time to gather different ideas about teaching writing and play those ideas off of one another as a means of maintaining a state of dissonance among the conflicting discourses around teaching writing. The aim would be to remain open-minded and acknowledge the conflictual nature of understanding the teaching of writing.

In "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language" (Volosinov, 1973) dialogic is first used as a positive opposition to monologic. The result is the principle that "any true understanding is dialogic in nature" (Morris, 1994, p. 12), which means, "the individual consciousness is a socio-ideological fact" (Morris, 1994, p. 12). The idea is that meaning is produced on the "borderzone" (Morris, 1994, p. 11) where the inner experience of the self meets the outer, social world expressed through the other. At this point, Bakhtin suggests that dialogic understanding is active and oppositional. The earlier notion of passive reception by the self is replaced here with the recognition of a need for tension between the self and the others. The interplay is then characterized as more of a competition with both competing and allied discourses. At this point Bakhtin recognizes that discourse itself is dialogic.

This development of an oppositional theory of language and the notion of discourse and consciousness as dialogic, lead to his development of the term polyphony (Morris, 1994), which Bakhtin uses in his 1929 work "The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" in which he recognizes Dostoevsky for his

ability to show the dialogic nature of individual consciousness that is so apparent in the inner dialogue of his heroes. Bakhtin points out that Dostoevsky's literary contribution is his ability to fill his writing with characters who live "tense lives that exist on the borders of someone else's thought, someone else's consciousness" (Bakhtin, 1929, p. 32).

Borderzones as Learning Opportunities

Bakhtin rejects synthesis as an aim for language and embraces the value of dissonance that takes place when views conflict. He uses the term "borderzone" (reader 15) to identify that point at which oppositional discourses encounter one another and raise the opportunity for new meaning to be created. He rejects the traditional notions of closure and of meaning being derived from agreement, and acknowledges alternative aims for language: conflict and open-ended.

Heteroglossia as Learning Catalyst

In "Discourse in the Novel" (1935) Bakhtin identifies the interaction of contradictory and differing voices as creative. In contrast with his early writings, he argues that "understanding that remains purely passive, purely receptive, contributes nothing new to the word" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 281). In this work he presents a new term to describe the dialogic battle: heteroglossia. He argues that there is a centripetal force in discourse that seeks to unify, and that there is another centrifugal force - heteroglossia - that fights against the centralizing process and fragments ideological thought into multiple views of the world. This new term presents language as ideologically saturated and

stratified. He claims that it is heteroglossia that creates the conditions for the possibility of free consciousness. Consequently, Bakhtin presents a new aim for human discourse: the liberation for the hegemony of a single language. He argues that self-consciousness is arrived at dialogically by an inner polemic with the social voices that inevitably first structure our inner being. This takes him to the point where he recognizes laughter and parody as powerful forces for freedom.

If we look at these preservice English teachers in light of Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, then we are presented with the question of what happens around the competing discourses of preservice English teachers student derived beliefs about teaching writing and the teacher derived theories of teaching writing. Preservice English teachers come to their teacher education experience with the expectation of learning about teaching writing. Some hope to learn how to teach writing. Some believe they already know how to teach writing. Some fall in between hoping to learn and believing they already have what they need to be successful in the classroom. All arrive to the experience with a variety of discourse about teaching writing that are largely based on their experiences as students who have been taught about writing.

If we look at these 14 preservice English teachers in the light of Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, we see the possibility that their learning about teaching writing learning springs from their interaction with other varied consciousnesses. It is these interactions that challenge beliefs, give cause for creating new meaning, and lead to dialogic understanding. This Bakhtinian approach to addressing preservice English teachers' beliefs which

puts those beliefs about writing and teaching writing into dialogic may be part of the solution to the problems that educational researchers have recognized with prior beliefs and learning to teach writing.

Given the potential that preservice English teacher's beliefs to either support or undermine their learning to teach writing, and the possibilities for approaching that problem dialogically, the question is raised about the nature of the teaching writing discourses that preservice English teachers encounter. Since Albert Kitzhaber's (1963) scathing condemnation of his peers for not assuming a leadership role in the birth of modern composition, the field of Composition has made great strides in meeting Kitzhaber's challenge to "replace practice as the field's dominant mode of inquiry" (North, 1987, p. 14). The current knowledge base of composition is far less chaotic and "unscientific" than it was in 1962 when *Research in Written Composition* was first published. For preservice English teachers this means that they have a knowledge base to draw from as they learn to teach writing. They have a solid body of research that can be used to put them into dialogic and face the challenge of reconsidering their beliefs about writing and teaching writing.

This consideration of how to "best" cope with beliefs that are put into dialogic by new and competing discourses is illustrated in Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as Alice finds herself struggling to negotiate the dissonant discourses of the two worlds she encounters. Like the beliefs held by preservice teachers, Alice's prior beliefs play two competing roles in her learning process. On the one hand she uses her beliefs to try and make some sense of her Wonderland experiences. For example, her belief that mice and birds do not like cats helps her to control the degree to which she talks

about her cat Dinah in front of the Wonderland creatures. On the other hand, her beliefs also serve as barriers to new learning. For example, her understanding that races have finish lines and one winner leaves her to disregard the caucus race as ridiculous. Alice's learning is filtered by her beliefs, her Wonderland experience puts her into dialogic, and her behavior in Wonderland is belief driven. Consequently, the next section looks at the ways that *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* raises questions about what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers.

Ways that *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* Raises Questions about what Learning to Teach Writing Does to Preservice English Teachers

Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* illustrates of how self-awareness grows out of competing discourses with others. On one level the work is a children's story filled with fantastic creatures and the wonderings of a small child, but on another level the work offers support for Bakhtin's theory of dialogic learning. Consequently, Alice's story can be used to illuminate the learning experiences of preservice English teachers who where put into dialogic with teaching writing discourses from the two worlds of learning to write and teaching writing. In this common condition of the dialogic, preservice English teachers and Alice find themselves grappling with the same fundamental question: Who am I?

Prior to entering Wonderland, Alice sits by her sister along the riverbank, growing very tired of having nothing to do. Her boredom leads her to "peep" into a book her sister is reading, but she is disappointed when

she finds the book has "no pictures or conversations in it" (Carroll, 1992, p. 7). This lack of "pictures or conversations" leaves Alice with nothing to wonder about. She is left alone with her own thoughts and nothing to compete with those thoughts. In order for Alice to escape her boredom, she longs for some competing discourses (Bakhtin, 1984), some "others" whose discourses will allow for some interplay and tension which might challenge her to create new meanings. By opening the novel with Alice in relative isolation, and then casting her into a dream world of her own invention, Carroll throws Alice into dialogic with the others she manifests in her wonderings of Wonderland.

Interestingly, Alice's looking at a book with no pictures or conversations sets her mind to dreaming, and it is through this dreaming that Alice develops her own inner dialogue with the others she imagines. Thus, Alice dreams alone, but her aloneness is populated with the alternative consciousnesses of the others she imagines. Alice seems to learn about herself because she imagines the characters of Wonderland who have the capacity to see the "outsidedness" (Bakhtin, 1977) of Alice. In short, the Wonderland creatures see Alice more completely, and it is through her discussions with those others and her understanding of how they perceive her that she becomes more aware of who she is. Without the opportunity to interact dialogically with the Wonderland creatures and consider her self from their perspective, Alice has no means for examining those aspects of her character about which she is unaware. The interplay between Alice's perspective of herself and the creatures' various perspectives of Alice, allows her to move beyond the limits of her own self understanding and consider more completely who she is in relationship to the world around her. Alice's

dreaming results in her stepping outside of her ego bound perspective and considering her self through the eyes of others, which increases her understanding of who she is becoming.

Each of the following sections presents Alice's experiences as they pertain to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing. These discussions of Alice's experiences show the rationale for the questions this study explores in regard to the 14 preservice English teachers.

What Role does Self-esteem Play in Learning to Teach Writing?

The first sign of growth to come from Alice's negotiating of the two worlds occurs before she even reaches the bottom of the rabbit hole. While falling for what she considers to be a very long way, Alice acknowledges that, "After such a fall as this, I shall think nothing of tumbling down stairs! How brave they'll all think me at home" (Carroll, 1992, p. 8). Here we see Alice being in one world while thinking about another. She is able to make some sense and lend some purpose to her "strange" experience of falling down a rabbit hole by relating it to her more "familiar" experience of falling down stairs. In this instance Alice's prior beliefs about falling serve as a learning lever for her making new meaning out of her Wonderland experience. Such a productive use of prior beliefs illustrates Kennedy's (1998) point that preservice English teachers sometimes use their prior beliefs about teaching writing to give focus and direction to their learning to teach writing. Both of these observations suggest that prior beliefs are not barriers to learning when the learner sees those prior beliefs in such a way that they reinforce a positive

image of the learner. Alice uses her belief about falling down stairs as a means of expressing how brave she has become by falling down the rabbit hole. It seems that how prior beliefs impact learning is dependent on how the degree to which they show the learner in a positive light. The bottom line seems to be learners' needs to feel good about who they are becoming.

The flawed nature of Alice's formal education where she learns in isolation by reciting first appears when she uses language improperly and espouses facts she knows are incorrect. Alice knows that she does not have "the slightest idea what Latitude was, or Longitude either" (Carroll, 1992, p. 8), but she believes they are "nice grand words" (Carroll, 1992, p. 8). As with the thought of her self as brave, the motivation for using these grand words seems to be that they make Alice feel smart. When Alice knowingly uses the word "antipathies" incorrectly she remarks that she is "rather glad there was no one listening" (Carroll, 1992, p. 8). Alice seems primarily concerned with self-image. She seems comfortable with not knowing, so long as others do not see her ignorance. Looking smart seems to be more important to Alice than actually being smart. She even promises herself to not ask questions about the name of the country she has entered because she fears others will think her ignorant. Alice's concern for how she is perceived by others and the ways that concern impacts her approach to learning suggest a close relationship between self esteem and an openness to learning. For Alice learning is about being right and having to ask questions is seen as a weakness.

Given the prior schooling experience of preservice English teachers and the associations that have been drawn for them between knowing and

intelligence, it stands to reason that like Alice they would not be inclined to go public with their own confusion about teaching writing and would want to use new discourses on teaching writing to reinforce what they already believe to be true. Appearing to understand the teaching of writing in front of others may be understandably more appealing to preservice English teachers who come to their teacher education with Alice-like views towards asking questions and appearing ignorant.

Alice experiences her first real lesson when she is "alone." At the bottom of the rabbit hole readers learn that Alice is very "fond of pretending to be two people" (Carroll, 1992, p. 12). At the bottom of the rabbit hole, struggling to make her way into the garden, we see Alice in dialogic with herself. It is at this point in the story that we also see Alice's willingness to learn by trial and error. As Alice goes through the drama of drinking the bottle not marked poison which makes her feel like she is "shutting up like a telescope" (Carroll, 1992, p.11) and holding the rabbit's fan which makes her open up "like the largest telescope that ever was" (Carroll, 1992, p. 13), she appears open to learning and more curious than afraid of her mistakes. This learning by trial and error shows the need for mistakes along the way toward solutions to problems and suggests again that there is a relationship between learning and self-perception.

This willingness to experiment in isolation goes a long way towards explaining the resistance to change and experimentation that has been cited so often in study's that observe teachers (Lortie, 1975; Waller, 1961). Although teachers work in isolation from their colleagues, their teaching is done in the company of students. This constant state of being with others

and the desire to appear competent are both rationale explanations for why teachers would be more inclined to go with proven practices rather than take chances with developing new and untested teaching. For new English teachers this desire to teach writing in ways that will make them appear competent in front of students certainly makes sense, particularly if students are perceived as assessors of teaching writing rather than partners in learning to write. Thus nature of the relationship between teachers and students may have a direct impact on the degree to which preservice English teachers are willing to entertain writing pedagogy that has not been proven to work.

What Does Being an Outsider do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Alice's learning with "others" who are not herself first occurs when she finds herself swimming around the tears she shed when she had first grown so tall from drinking the bottle not marked poison. In this pool of tears, Alice encounters the mouse that helps her learn a lesson in empathy. Here again we see Alice negotiating between her two worlds. Feeling out of control and wanting to for some comfort, Alice tries to speak to the mouse. When she gets no response, she addresses the mouse with the first sentence she learned in French; "Où est ma chatte?" (Carroll, 1992, p. 18). Not surprisingly, the mouse leaps from the pool of tears and appears to quiver with fear. Alice, having realized her mistake, immediately apologizes by explaining that she "quite forgot you didn't like cats" (Carroll, 1992, p. 18). In this instance Alice uses her prior knowledge of the relationship between cats and mice to better

understand how to negotiate the strange and new experience of having a conversation with a mouse.

Whereas Alice's earlier motivation seemed to be derived from her need to appear smart, here she seems to be motivated by a need to escape from her loneliness. Prior to meeting the mouse, Alice's tears had been the result of her feeling "so very tired of being all alone here" (Carroll, 1992, p. 17). Alice's willingness to empathize with the mouse seems driven by her need to establish a connection to someone in her new world. She aims to please as a result of her feeling isolated.

Alice's capacity to empathize with the mouse and her need to feel connected to the others who populate the strange new world she has entered reflect the degree to which belonging requires assimilation. Like Alice, preservice English teachers know they will be working in spaces with others whose language and culture they do not necessarily share. In order to belong in the classroom, teachers assume the perspectives of adolescents in much the way Alice comes to identify with the mouse. This need for teachers to adopt adolescent behaviors and speech has been cited as one of the factors that has contributed to the low status of teaching in the world of professionals (Lortie, 1975). However, as we can see from Alice's experience, empathy is used as a skill to establish a connection. Alice is not a mouse because she identifies with the mouse's fear of cats, as the more knowledgeable she simply adapts her behavior so the mouse will feel comfortable. This chameleon behavior is crucial for teachers whose job it is to help others develop true understanding. It might be argued that empathy is critical for teaching writing. The fact that preservice English teachers have limited opportunities to observe students

learning to write prior to actually teaching explains much of the anxiety that is expressed over keeping control.

Alice needs an opportunity to interact with the mouse before she can establish a connection to him. The fact that she knows mice do not like cats seems insufficient preparation for being with the mouse. Likewise, simply learning what adolescent writers are like might not prepare preservice English teachers to actually teach writing to students. Knowledge of adolescents might have to be applied in actual teaching writing situations just as Alice's knowledge of mice must be applied in the pool of tears before it is actually of any use to her or the mouse.

What Does Belonging to a Learning Community do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

When Alice emerges from her pool of tears with the mouse and the other Wonderland animals she takes part in a Caucus race designed to get everyone dry. The race is organized by the Lory who claims authority over the situation by making the claim that "I'm older than you, and must know better" (Carroll, 1992, p. 21). Given Alice's Victorian upbringing, she accepts the Lory's rationale. Her prior beliefs about what characteristics constitute authority are in line with the Lory's own expressed belief about who should be in charge. Here as with the earlier example of her knowledge of falling down stairs Alice's prior knowledge impacts her efforts to understand her "strange" Wonderland experience. However, in this case Alice's beliefs impair her efforts to understand the nature of the caucus race. Alice's belief

that races are for running toward a finish line to determine a single winner seems to prevent her from understanding or at least from appreciating the purpose of the Caucus race. When the race has been completed (the Lory announced the race was over) and prizes have been awarded (the Lory orders that all participants receive an award) Alice is described as thinking "the whole thing absurd" (Carroll, 1992, p. 23). While Alice refrains from going public with her view of the race because "they all looked so grave" (Carroll, 1992, p. 23), she does not seem to really grasp the Wonderland nature of a Caucus race. The dissonance and of her beliefs about racing and the nature of the Caucus race combined with her feeling like an outsider among the Wonderland creatures seems to keep her from going public about her confusion. She simply plays along rather than draw attention to her confusion. This need to belong and the trouble Alice expresses while negotiating the dissonance of her beliefs and the Wonderland ways suggest a connection between coping with dissonance and feeling like part of a community of others who share similar levels of understanding.

Preservice English teachers are outsiders when it comes to learning to teach writing, but that outsiderness also has the potential to serve as a common ground. Alice's Caucus race experience shows that her desire to fit in with the other Wonderland creatures prevents her from learning openly and suggests that she would be open to confronting her own uncertainties if she were part of a community of others who shared her same concerns. This raises the question of what belonging to a community of others learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing.

What Does Learning to Teach Writing in a Teacher Education Environment do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

When the White Rabbit mistakes Alice for Mary Ann, she is sent off to his house to fetch his white gloves and fan. Alice's growing uncertainty about who she really is prevents her from pointing out the White Rabbit's mistake and she soon finds herself rummaging through the White Rabbit's house. Upon finding the fan, Alice begins to grow until she is so large that she is trapped inside the White Rabbit's house. This feeling of being trapped within Wonderland structures is similar to the way Alice finds herself trapped in the Wonderland rules of playing croquet, the Wonderland ways of having tea, and the Wonderland ways of holding a trial. In each instance Alice feels limited and wants to escape.

The game of croquet causes her no end of frustration. She remarks that she "had never seen such a curious croquet-ground in her life: it was all ridges and furrows: the croquet balls were live hedgehogs, and the mallets were live flamingoes, and the soldiers had to double themselves up and stand on their hands and feet, to make the arches" (Carroll, 1992, p. 66). Alice is unable to play the game just as she finds herself unable to move from the White Rabbit's House.

When Alice sits down to have tea with the Hatter and the March Hare she also finds herself unsure of how to negotiate the strange Wonderland ways. She is offered wine they do not have. She is posed riddles that have no answers. She is the subject of personal remarks she finds offending. Everything that Alice knows about having tea is put into question by the

strange structure imposed on Wonderland tea. Consequently, Alice concludes that it is the "stupidest tea-party I was ever at in my whole life" (Carroll, 1992, p. 61).

Alice's entrapment in the White Rabbit's house, her frustration with the croquet game and her indigence towards the tea-party show how she struggles when she finds herself limited by places, games and experiences. Her response in each situation is to want to escape. Alice's desire to escape from structured environments raises the question of what learning to teach writing within a teacher education learning environment does to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?

What Does Being a Student of Writing do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Throughout Alice's adventure she makes the mistake a making various Wonderland creatures feel threatened with her talk of her cat Dinah. The mouse she meets in the pool of tears is terrified by thoughts of Alice's cat. The birds Alice runs with during the caucus race abandon Alice when she begins talking about Dinah. Alice knows that mice and birds are afraid of cats and she constantly apologizes for talking about Dinah. But she cannot help herself because talking about Dinah helps to put Alice at ease when she surrounded by so much in Wonderland that is strange.

It is not until Alice finds herself face to face with a puppy dog that she experiences what it is like to be afraid of an animal. Alice meets the dog soon after she has eaten the cakes that reduced her size enough so that she could

escape from the White Rabbit's house. Consequently, she is much smaller than the "enormous puppy . . . looking down at her with large round eyes, and feebly stretching out one paw, trying to touch her" (Carroll, 1992, p. 32). During the entire encounter Alice is "terribly frightened . . . at the thought that it might be hungry, in which case it would be very likely to eat her up in spite of all her coaxing" (Carroll, 1992, p. 32). After this role reversal Alice becomes far more compassionate. Later when she learns the Lobster-Quadrille from the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon she is able to actually refrain from talking about experiences having lobsters for dinner. By being in the position of the "other" Alice seems to learn how to apply what she understands about the others whom she encounters.

The education that Alice receives from her experience with the puppy raises a question about preservice English teachers who are learning to teach adolescents about writing. Considering that Alice becomes more effective in interactions with Wonderland creatures after experiencing what it is like to feel endangered by a larger creature, it would be interesting to know what being a student of writing does to preservice English teachers learning to teach students of writing.

What Does Defining the Self for Others do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Alice's main concern throughout her Wonderland experience is discovering who she is. This question of Alice's true identity is posed most directly by the hooka-smoking Caterpillar who asks Alice: "Who are you?"

(Carroll, 1992, p. 35). Alice responds by saying, "I ca'n't explain *myself* . . . because I'm not myself" (Carroll, 1992, p. 35). Alice has become confused by all of the changes she has experienced. She tries to explain that changing so frequently has been quiet confusing. The Caterpillar is not convinced by Alice's argument, so she says that he will understand what she means once has to "turn into a chrysalis . . . and after that into a butterfly" (Carroll, 1992, p. 36).

The same question of identity is posed later to Alice when a pigeon mistakenly calls her a serpent. Alice has just eaten from the Caterpillar's mushroom, which initially causes her neck to stretch her head right up through the tops of the trees. Alice denies being a serpent, but when the pigeon points out that as an egg eater Alice might as well be a serpent, Alice is not as certain that she has not become a serpent. Like the earlier encounter with the Caterpillar, Alice's encounter with the pigeon forces her to be self-reflective and seemingly more aware of herself as someone who is constantly becoming rather than as some fixed self that can be clearly and absolutely defined.

Alice's encounter with others who call upon her to define who she is and her subsequent understanding of her self as evolving raises this question about preservice English teachers learning to teach writing: What does defining the self for others do to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?

What does Encountering the Unfixed Nature of Teaching Writing do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Alice is constantly being confronted with the unfixed nature of things in Wonderland. When Alice first visits with the Duchess she is shocked when the baby she is given to hold turns into a pig. At first Alice is horrified and remarks what a "dreadfully ugly child" (Carroll, 1992, p. 50) the pig makes. But this horror is quickly replaced by her recognition that the pig makes a "rather handsome pig" (Carroll, 1992, p. 50). At this point in her adventure Alice seems to have developed a capacity to recognize and value things for what they are, rather than what she thinks they should be. This ability to see through to the inner nature of things seemed to be the very thing that Alice needed when she was struggling to have tea, play croquet, and run in the caucus race.

The learning that Alice does in response to the unfixed nature of Wonderland raises this question about preservice English teachers learning to teach writing: What does the unfixed nature of teaching writing do to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?

What does Encountering Teaching Writing Language do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Language plays a pivotal role in Alice's adventures. She is constantly asking for clarification from the Wonderland creatures. The confusing nature of Wonderland language is most evident during Alice's time with the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle. In one particular moment the three are having

a discussion around lessons and school. The Mock Turtle is trying to explain to Alice the importance of fish traveling with porpoises. Alice is confused about why fish would need the company of porpoises and she asks the Mock Turtle if he is meaning to say the word "purpose" when he uses the word "porpoise." The Mock Turtle responds by saying, "I mean what I say" (Carroll, 1992, p. 81). The Mock Turtle is offended by Alice's attempt to change his words so that they make more sense to her. Alice is struggling to understand the Mock Turtle because she is trapped in her own ways of knowing.

The ways that Alice's prior knowledge of language distorts the ways she hears what the Mock Turtle says shows the level of miscommunication that can happen when discourses from two different worlds encounter one another. This raises a question about what happens to preservice English teachers when they find themselves confronted with teaching writing language that does not directly translate into their ways of knowing?

What does Learning about the Teaching Writing Stories of Others do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

When Alice frightens the mouse with her talk of her cat Dinah, the mouse responds to Alice's insensitivity by promising to tell her his history, so she'll "understand why it is I hate cats and dogs" (Carroll, 1992, p. 19). The lesson for Alice seems to be that you have to know a person's history in order to really understand how to relate to them. Alice experiences this hearing of

an other's biography again when the Gryphon takes her, to hear the story of the Mock Turtle.

This learning by getting to know the histories of others raises the question of what role the histories of others might play in the education of preservice English teachers. Alice seems to learn about being in Wonderland as she is exposed to the histories of Wonderland creatures. She sees how they have become who they are and this gives her some more understanding of who she might be in Wonderland. The question regarding this learning about the self by knowing the histories of others raises this question: What does learning about the teaching writing histories of others do to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?

What do Competing Teaching Writing Discourses do to Preservice English Teachers Learning to Teach Writing?

Alice's final Wonderland adventure takes place in the courtroom. Initially Alice is excited by the fact that "she new the name of nearly everything there" (Carroll, 1992, p. 86). However, as the trial proceeds Alice grows in both size and in frustration as one rule after another is broken. The rules of the Wonderland courtroom are in direct confrontation with everything that Alice knows about legal proceedings. Finally, when the Queen of Hearts call for "the sentence first - the verdict afterwards" (Carroll, 1992, p. 96) Alice cries out "Stuff and nonsense . . .Who cares for you? . . . You're nothing but a deck of cards! (Carroll, 1992, p. 96). The competing discourses of Alice's own world and the discourses of Wonderland send Alice

into a flurry which causes her to dismiss the entire experience. With Alice's condemnation the cards fly into the air and Alice reawakens in her sister's lap on the bank of the river where Alice had first begun her dreaming.

Alice's inability to cope with the competing discourses of the two worlds she encounters ultimately leads her to erase the new world and return to the world where she is more comfortable. Alice trades her curiosity for certainty. This poses the question of how preservice English teachers react to the competing discourses they encounter as they negotiate between the world they know as students of writing teachers and the world of teaching writing they are exploring. Alice's experience in the courtroom raises this question: What do competing teaching writing discourses do to preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?

Principles for Further Inquiry

The research regarding teachers beliefs and trends in teaching writing, the varied nature of teacher education programs, the affect of prior beliefs on learning teaching, Bakhtin's dialogic principle, and the Alice-derived questions about what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers reveal the following principles of learning to teach writing. These principles serve as guideposts for what is currently understood about learning to teach writing and as potential starting points of departure for further examining the specific question of what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers.

Prior beliefs about teaching writing

filter learning about teaching writing

In terms of forces that influence dialogic learning, we know from the literature on prior beliefs that beliefs act as filters and as such have the capacity to shape the meaning derived from our experiences. In order for a teaching of writing class to make a difference for preservice English teachers, those teachers' beliefs must be impacted in some significant ways. For some preservice English teachers the difference may mean a reinforcement of prior beliefs. For others the difference may mean changes in beliefs. For still others, the difference may be some combination of reinforcement and change. Whatever the case may be, preservice English teachers should walk away from their learning to teach writing experience able to acknowledge some measurable differences in how they think about teaching writing. In order to support the development of such a difference, we need to understand more about how preservice English teachers' student derived beliefs about teaching writing impact their learning about new theories and methods of teaching writing.

*There is a tension in the field of teaching writing between
the need to provide students with authentic writing experiences
and the need to teach students certain writing concepts and prescriptions*

In terms of the field of teaching writing, we know from the literature on teaching writing that the field is filled with competing discourses surrounding theories and methods of teaching writing. At once there seems to be a push for teaching students to develop an understanding of writing purposes so that they will have authentic writing experiences, and a push for students to know certain concepts and prescriptions of writing that can be

used to measure the degree to which they know writing. Preservice English teachers are confronted with having to make some meaning out of those competing teaching writing discourses so they can begin to imagine teaching writing in their own classrooms. We need to understand more about how meaning can be created out of those competing discourses, so that preservice English teachers can develop some strategies for understanding the ways those discourses will impact the efforts to implement their own beliefs about teaching writing.

The orientations to teaching writing taken by teacher education programs and those program's structures influence preservice English teacher learning

In terms of the contexts in which preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing, we know from the research on learning to teach writing that teacher education can change preservice English teachers' beliefs about teaching writing. We also know that the orientation of teacher education programs and the more specific orientations of those teaching in the programs can influence preservice teacher learning. The impact of these factors raise the problem of finding ways for helping preservice English teachers push against those forces so their learning is not limited. What preservice English teachers come to believe through their learning about teaching writing experience should not be largely determined by where they have that experience. It is important to consider the degree to which teaching writing classes nurture preservice English teachers' understanding of teaching writing and the degree to which teaching writing classes shape preservice English teachers' understanding of teaching writing. We need to understand more about how teaching writing class's orientation to teaching

writing impact preservice English teacher learning about teaching writing, so the new meaning preservice English teachers derive from their learning experience reflects their values to the degree that the meaning they create is internalized to withstand the uncertainties they will feel as they confront teaching writing dilemmas during their first year of teaching.

Competing discourses create new meaning

In terms of how preservice English teachers might learn about teaching writing, we know from Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic that maintaining tension between competing discourses produces new meaning. According to Bakhtin's theory, it is reasonable to expect that preservice English teachers experience a centripetal force which encourages them to centralize and unify the various teaching writing discourses they encounter from their peers, their instructor, the literature, and voices of the others who populate their student teaching world. At the same time, preservice English teachers can be expected to experience a competing centrifugal force dispersing those same discourses outward in an ever widening dissonance that disrupts their efforts to identify absolute truths about teaching writing. The dialogic nature of this experience clashes with the assumption expressed by many preservice English teachers that being in a teaching of writing class will provide them with some prescriptions for teaching writing. We need to understand more about preservice English teachers cope with these competing discourses and the heavily contextualized nature of teaching writing which produces such a chaotic array of possible writing pedagogies.

Any true understanding is dialogic in nature

In terms of what it is like to learn dialogically, we know from analyzing Alice's fictionalized experiences in Wonderland that interaction with others develops self-awareness. The dialogic nature of true understanding suggests that preservice English teachers learn through their social interaction with others and their own inner dialogue that extends from those interactions.

Consequently, learning about teaching writing takes on a both/and quality which means that preservice English teachers find themselves coping with the fact that that which theories and methods of teaching writing they implement are largely determined by the interplay between the context in which they find themselves teaching writing and their own teaching writing beliefs. The relative nature of teaching writing then challenges any attempt preservice English teachers might make to arrive at the "best" way to teach writing because the "best" way in one context might not necessarily transfer to be the "best" way in a different context. While preservice English teachers beliefs may remain consistent, the most important of those consistent beliefs may be the belief that context changes everything all the time. In order to better cope with the dilemma of preservice English teachers learning to teach writing before they teach writing, we need to understand more about how the others who populate the world of learning to teach writing classroom impact preservice English teachers' teaching writing beliefs.

Research Questions

While those principles offer points of departure for further inquiry, it is the research questions that determine the direction of the inquiry. This study is guided by three general questions that explore the central question of what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers:

- How do the preservice English teachers' beliefs about writing and teaching writing figure into their learning to teach writing?
- How do the beliefs of others about writing and teaching writing figure into the preservice English teachers learning to teach writing?
- How do the preservice English teachers negotiate the competing, dissonant and complimentary teaching writing discourses expressed by the "others" they encounter while learning to teach writing?

Within the areas outlined by each of these more general questions the study is also guided by an awareness of the questions that *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* pose about preservice English teachers learning to teach writing. With an awareness of the questions that frame this study we turn to the next chapter for a description of the research methodology used to wonder more explicitly about what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers.

The next chapter presents the study's methodology by describing the process of gathering the data, coding of the data, and analysis of the data.

The chapter concludes with a description of the data collection site, a sketch of what happened during each class, and a review of the study's limitations.

III -- METHOD OF INQUIRY

My mother has a garden in the backyard of the house where I grew up on Cape Cod. My father built a split wood fence strung with wire mesh around the plot to keep out the rabbits. Every spring my brother and sister and I rent a rototiller to break up the soil and provide my mother with a more seed-friendly environment. In many ways that space reflects her approach to motherhood.

Over the years, as I have struggled to create my own home away from home, I have reflected about who my parents are and how it was that they helped me to become the person I am. That garden and its fence have come to represent both my mother's and my father's way of being in our family. But it was not until recently that I began to understand my own method of inquiry in light of my mother's method of gardening.

The garden is not one of those Martha Stewart wonders in which everything has a place and things happen by design. My mother's garden is more like an accident. That does not mean that there is anything wrong with her garden. It simply means that the garden happens in response to so many unplanned variables that the outcome is unpredictable and impossible to control or understand. You might say my mother is a qualitative gardener.

Each spring as my father tends to the lawn by implementing his own ritualized methods of seeding, cutting and edging, my mom wanders down into her garden and putters. I have studied her puttering and tried to draw some conclusions about exactly what she is doing, but in the end the only

thing I can say for certain is that she seems to enjoy her time inside the fence my father built.

I share this story of my mother's perplexing and improvisational method of gardening because it is analogous to the method I use to write this study. As a qualitative researcher my approach remained open-ended so my subjects could provide data from their own frames of reference rather than be restrained by the frame of my own perception. While I spent a great deal of time with my subjects, and certainly influenced their learning experiences in some ways, my intent was to limit the impact of my perspective as much as possible. Like my mom, I just spent time in the setting and tried to remain as wide-awake (Greene, 1978) as possible to what was happening around me.

I am not saying that I had no idea what I was doing or that my study has no theoretical frame, but my method was certainly not a linear "a" to "z" process. My study was naturalistic in that the setting from which the majority of the data was drawn was an actual learning-to-teach-writing class. My data was descriptive in that it took the form of words that described my view of what happened. My method of data collection consistently maintained a primary concern for "process" in that the study focused on what happened while the teachers were learning in the class and did not concern itself with the product of that learning as it might have appeared later in practice. My method of analysis was inductive in that the data was not used to prove or disprove some hypothesis I designed before gathering the data. Finally, each element of my methodology was driven by curiosity for what happened when teachers learned to teach writing.

Like the split-wood fence that frames my mother's garden and gives her a manageable space to fill with plants, my decision to use qualitative methods gave me a means for managing my data collection. Although the qualitative approach did not provide a direct path of inquiry, it did keep my mind open and help me to dig beneath my prior beliefs about learning to teach writing. However, I must acknowledge that the study is merely an account of what I perceived to take place, not some absolute account of what did take place.

My Question

In 1961 Willard Waller produced what is now regarded as the first study of the sociology of teaching. In that study he asked this question: What does teaching do to teachers? This study invited readers to explore the "dynamics, tensions, exclusions, and inclusions engendered by the activity of teaching" (Britzman, 1991, p. 1). Nearly fifty years later Deborah Britzman extended Waller's question to the arena of student teaching under the rationale that it is in student teaching that "one first encounters the multiple meanings, constraints, and possibilities of the teacher's identity in the process of constructing one's own" (Britzman, 1991, p. 2). Britzman asked this question: "What does learning to teach do and mean to student teachers and those involved in the practice of learning to teach?" (Britzman, 1991, p. 2). Her study explored how teaching selves are constructed in the context of learning to teach. This study of preservice English teachers extends Britzman's question to the more specific arena of the preservice education classroom and

poses this question: What does learning to teach writing do to preservice English teachers? In an effort to value the preservice teachers and the active role they played in determining the quality of their learning experience, the study's central question was revised to read like this: What happens when preservice English teachers learn to teach writing?

This study takes readers into a teaching of writing class to look closely at what happens as 14 preservice English teachers cope with the dilemma of learning to teach writing prior to their first year of teaching writing. The study draws data from field notes gathered in a teaching of teaching writing classroom, interviews with the preservice English teachers enrolled in that class, and questionnaires distributed to the preservice English teachers at the end of the class.

This qualitative approach to the inquiry is grounded by Mehan's (1979) argument regarding the limitations of the positivist tradition of social science research as it is applied in studies of education. Mehan argued that the paradigm prevented researchers from revealing significant processes that occur in the classroom and cannot be identified in research limited to statistics. Educational research has subsequently embraced more qualitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 1984; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). Consequently, this study uses qualitative methods to gather data, code data, and make empirical assertions based on the data.

I determined that field notes, interviews, and a follow-up questionnaire offered the best means of depicting what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers. The field notes show my perception of the interactions that took place. The interviews reveal the

preservice English teachers reactions to those interactions. The questionnaires present the preservice English teachers' thoughts about what learning to teach writing did for them as persons becoming writing teachers. The combination of data allowed for the juxtaposition of the behavior I observed and recorded as in-class field notes against the more reflective talk that came out of interview dialogue, and the "looking-back" reflections that appeared in the questionnaires. The data was used to frame a portrayal of the interactions between the participants and they ways those interactions influenced their understandings of themselves as emerging English teachers facing the challenge of teaching writing (Bakhtin, 1981, Eisner, 1991).

The study was designed to provide a view of the learning to teach writing experience that would reveal the complexity of that process and provide some deeper understanding of why and how the interplay of the dissonant writing and teaching writing discourses impacted the preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing.

According to Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, meaning actually comes from the type of social interaction that resists synthesis. Bakhtin argues that learning takes place in what he calls "dialogic borderzones," which are places where oppositional discourses have the opportunity to confront one another. Such a confrontation necessitates the development of new meaning. It is precisely this type of running up against alternative discourses that both confuses and educates Lewis Carroll's Alice as she wanders her way through Wonderland. Both Alice and preservice English teachers learning to teach writing are constantly being challenged to reevaluate their prior understanding and make meaning out of their new experiences. Notions of

certainty and completeness are replaced with an awareness of the uncertainty and the incomplete nature of dialogic understanding.

Alice learns that she is not who she was and uncertain of who she is becoming as a result of her Wonderland learning experiences. In short, her response to the Caterpillar's question "Who are you?" must always remain incomplete if she is to continue to grow and learn. This view of the self as "unfinalizable" was also made apparent to these preservice English teachers as they were exposed to dialogic understandings of teaching writing.

Conceptual Frame

This study is framed by Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, so that the study might focus attention on the differences that came from the competing discourses these 14 preservice English teachers used to make new meaning about themselves as writers and writing teachers. By focusing on the dialogic this study moves beyond the conversations that took place during the class and attends more closely to the conditions that produced those interactions. This dialogical view of what happened to the preservice English teachers as they learn to teach writing enables the study to simultaneously consider the polyphony of voices that were heard during the class. The dialogic also allows the study to consider the polyphony of forces that interacted and challenged the preservice English teachers. In short, Bakhtin's dialogic principle allows the study to view the class as a process of becoming, not as some exercise in conformity or assimilation.

In order to understand the dialogic in teacher education the study considers what happens day-to-day in the teacher education classroom and the polyphony of forces that impact that activity. Consequently, this study focuses its attention on what learning to teach writing did for 14 preservice English teachers enrolled in the same English education class.

The observations of the class are guided by the theory that the center of all creative meaning making in this teaching of writing class is the interaction between each preservice English teacher's individual consciousness and the consciousness of the "others" sharing in that experience. It is by presenting my perception of those interactions that the study seeks to make sense of how and why the preservice English teachers became more aware of who they were as writing teachers through their learning to teach writing experience.

To further illuminate those interactions and present some means for identifying what it is like to be involved in such a dialogic learning experience, Lewis Carroll's story of Alice and her Adventure through Wonderland is used as an analog. The preservice English teachers' learning experiences are juxtaposed with the analogous learning experiences of Lewis Carroll's Alice.

The experiences of the preservice English teachers in the teaching of writing class provide the study's subject matter, Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic provides the study's conceptual frame, and the analogous story of Alice illuminates the analysis of the assertions. The result is a study that shows what I witnessed as I observed 14 preservice English teachers who

found themselves on the "borderzone" of learning to teach writing after being students observing the teaching of writing and before being writing teachers.

Acknowledging the Filtering of my Perspective

I decided to do research as a participant observer in the naturalistic, interpretative tradition for three reasons. First, I choose to be a participant observer so I could assume a "native's point of view" (Malinowski, 1922, p. 25). I hoped this perspective would help me examine the class from the inside out, blurring the distinctions between the researcher and the researched by working as a student enrolled in the class.

Second, I chose a naturalistic approach because I recognize the impact of context, and I believe that the actual setting of the classroom provides the most direct resource for data on the students' learning experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). I believed that by becoming a member of what Bruner (1996) called a sub-community of mutual learners I would have greater access to the preservice teachers' understandings of how learning to teach writing affected their understandings of themselves as writers and writing teachers. As a student who was responsible for completing assignments and taking part in class discussions, I hoped it would be easier to identify with the preservice English teachers' perspective and that I might more clearly represent their experiences.

Third, I was persuaded by Lather (1992) that the notion of "disinterested knowledge" and neutral description of objective reality is collapsing, and that alternative practices of educational research must focus

on the central importance of meaning making. My interpretative approach provides my view of how the preservice English teachers created new meaning about themselves as writing teachers since, "...the meaning people give to their experiences and their process of interpretation are essential and constitutive, not accidental or secondary to what the experience is" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 25). The preservice teachers' perspectives of their own experiences in this class are valuable in trying to determine what the experience did to them as persons becoming English teachers facing the challenge of teaching writing.

While my position as an observer did allow me to gather data within the context of the actual class, my limited of knowledge about the individual preservice English teachers forced me to base my data collection on what I saw and heard during the class meetings. As a single researcher I was not able to observe all of the interactions among the preservice English teachers. I was also unable to observe the interactions that took place outside of the class. I observed these preservice English teachers as they presented themselves in the context of the class, consequently, the data only shows who these preservice teachers appeared to be as students of teaching writing.

My collection of the data was filtered through a number of lenses that certainly produced a portrayal of the class that is more a product of what I noticed than some absolute representation of what actually took place. As a student in the class I was aware of Adam's teaching from the perspective of an experienced English teacher, which colored my view of the preservice English teachers' reactions to Adam's teaching. This led me to make

assumptions about which experiences the preservice English teachers should have valued.

As an English educator, I was aware of Adam's teaching as a guide for my own teaching of teachers, which colored my view of the learning as a guide for the teaching of writing. I was constantly distracted by my own interest in Adam as an experienced teacher of teachers.

As an experienced English teacher, I was aware of how the learning about teaching writing compared with my own classroom experiences, which colored my view of the learning the preservice English teachers appeared to recognize as valuable. I made assumptions about how writing is "best" taught based on my own successes and failures in the classroom. This bias about what "good" teaching of writing means, colored by view of who the preservice English teachers were becoming.

My own beliefs about the teaching of writing, my teaching of writing experiences, and my status as a student in the class all colored my perception of what was happening as the preservice English teachers learned about teaching writing. Consequently, this study is an analysis of my perception of what happened when these 14 preservice English teachers learned about teaching writing. The study is not a portrayal of what took place absolutely as these 14 preservice English teachers learned to teach writing. This study is a portrayal of what I saw as an experienced English teacher with deeply rooted beliefs about teaching writing, a novice English educator interested in deepening my own understanding of teaching preservice English teachers, a student in the class trying to deepen my own understanding of teaching

writing, and a researcher interested in producing research that might be used to assess the value of single-subject teacher education.

Gathering the Data

The gathering of the data took place during two distinct phases: the semester during which the class was held, and the semester following the class. During the first phase I observed the class, kept a journal, interviewed the preservice English teachers, and distributed a questionnaire. During the second phase I gathered feedback from the preservice English teachers and the English educator who taught the class.

The primary data site was the teaching of writing classroom where I sat as a student/ researcher composing field notes on what was taking place. The purpose was to develop a thick description of what happened. I recorded both the English educator's interactions with the class, and the preservice English teachers' interactions among themselves and with the "others" whose voices made their way into the class. I attempted to record all interactions that occurred around the subject of learning to teach writing. In addition to noting the interactions, I made reflective notes about my own reactions to what was happening to the preservice English teachers.

The second source of data collection included recorded discussions with the preservice English teachers and the English education professor outside of class time. My status as a student in the class and the relationships I developed with the preservice English teachers made these interviews more like conversations in which we spoke freely about the class and dilemmas of

teaching writing. The purpose of these discussions was to gather descriptive data in the preservice English teachers' own words so that I could develop insights on how they interpreted their learning to write experiences and gain some insight into the students' evolving understanding of themselves as writing teachers.

The open-ended nature of the discussions allowed the students to speak to their own concerns, raise their own questions, and helped me to understand their perspectives. The hope was that I would learn more by considering the type of questions they raised than by simply recording answers to my own questions about their experiences. My goal was to understand what the preservice English teachers believed about teaching writing, what aspects of teaching writing they were drawn to, the nature of their reflections about teaching writing, and what interactions were challenging them to think more deeply about who they were becoming as writing teachers.

The first interviews were scripted with the intent of learning how the students' evaluated the class. I quickly learned that they really had no evaluation of the class because they had no means for comparison. They had been students in classrooms where they learned about writing, but learning about teaching writing was an alien experience that they did not feel qualified to assess.

During the second round of interviews I abandoned my scripted questions and asked the students what they wanted to discuss. Rather than looking for answers to my own questions, I began listening more carefully to the types of questions the students asked. Their questions helped me to

identify where they were in their understanding of themselves as writing teachers and what experiences were having the greatest impact on their learning. The shift from interviewer to listener helped me get at what interacting around learning to teach writing was doing for the preservice English teachers.

The third source of data was a questionnaire distributed to the preservice English teachers on the final day of the class. The questionnaire asked the preservice English teachers to imagine their first year of teaching writing and describe the context in which that teaching would take place and tell a story of one class meeting in which the focus would be on teaching writing. The questionnaire also asked the preservice English teachers two questions: What do you believe about learning, teaching, and writing? What do you need from the teaching of writing class in order to teach your imagined class?

The fourth data source was a journal that I kept throughout the data collection phase of the study. This journal was used to capture my own insights and help me to make better sense of what I was observing. The journal served as a reflective tool.

The fifth data source was artifacts that included the class syllabus, assignment sheets, and other handouts distributed during the class. These artifacts were used to keep track of both how the class was organized and what materials were presented to the preservice English teachers.

The following chart shows the data sources and the time frames for collection.

Table 1. Phases of Data Collection

	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
	September-December	December-March	March-May
Observations	Classes (15)	Reunion Class (1)	
Interviews	Students (14)	Instructor	Student
Feedback			
Questionnaire	Drafted	Distributed	Analyzed
Journal	Composed	Composed	Analyzed
Artifacts	Collected	Analyzed	

Coding the Data

I coded the data from three of my sources: field notes, interviews, and questionnaires. Initially the coding was used to organize the data from each source. I read through the data for patterns and topics, and then I wrote down words and phrases that I could use to represent those topics and phrases. Words like "comfortable," "respected" and "safe" that appeared in the raw data were highlighted and used to "name" those pieces of data. For example, I used the "name" "safe" to code this piece of data from one of

Emily's responses to the questionnaire: "I don't think I would have worked on creating a safe and open environment in the classroom before Adam's class."

This first stage of coding helped me to sort the data and gave me a sense of the type of information I had gathered. These codes became the "names" I gave to the data. For the next stage of the coding I assigned all "named" pieces of data to each of three categories.

During this stage of coding I used the following categories: emerging themes, learning situations, and writing and teaching writing aspects. The emerging themes were used to help me identify the nature of the named data. Each named piece of data was assigned to a theme. For example, Emily's questionnaire response that had been named "safe" was placed under the theme of "community building." This organizing by theme helped me to see how these themes had impacted the preservice English teachers. The learning situations were used to help me identify the type of work the preservice English teachers been doing during their interactions. For example the exercise of sharing names on the first day was coded "name game." Organizing the named data according to particular learning situations allowed me to see how the activities had impacted the preservice English teachers. For example, placing the data named "safe" from Emily's questionnaire helped me to understand how that particular activity had challenged Emily's view of the type of work done by writing teachers. The aspects of writing and teaching writing codes were used to help me understand the subject matter of the interactions. Using this category, I was able to organize the data according the elements of writing and teaching writing that were covered. This helped me to understand what covering

certain aspects of writing and teaching writing did for the preservice English teachers' understandings of the subject of teaching writing. For example, culling the data that dealt with writing prompts under the category "free-writing" helped me to see that the writing exercises were helping the preservice English teachers to empathize with the challenges of learning to write.

Once the data had been "named" and organized into categories, I turned to the field notes to establish a frame, so that all the data could be applied to what had taken place during the classes. I used the field notes as the context for my analysis because the emphasis of the study was on the interactions that took place in the classroom. I wanted to know what learning to teach writing in the context of the English education classroom did to the preservice English teachers. My intent was to use the interviews and questionnaire responses to better understand how what happened influenced the preservice English teachers evolving perceptions of who they were becoming as writing teachers.

Data from the field notes was coded according to emergent themes and what I saw as the pivotal learning moments in each class. The emergent themes were determined by ascertaining the purpose(s) of each class. For example, the first class emerged as a class concerned primarily with building a strong sense of community among the preservice English teachers. Consequently, I labeled that class "Introductions" to show that the primary purpose of the interactions during this class was to help the preservice English teachers to get to know one another. The pivotal learning experiences that supported those purposes were then identified. For example, the

"introductions" were facilitated by a "name game" and a "writer's life map." In this manner I assigned that data to particular classes and specific activities. For example, Emily's "safe" questionnaire response was assigned to the "name game" activity which was organized under the purpose of "introductions." This coding system allowed me to see the sequence of learning that took place by distinguishing the classes from one another and identifying the various learning situations that had occurred in each. This coding also helped me to see how the class evolved from moment to moment and issue to issue.

Each class was organized in this way so that I ultimately had the field notes organized thematically in sequential order with clear distinctions drawn between the learning exercises. This gave me a list of themes and exercises that I could then use as categories for organizing the "named" data from the field notes, interviews and questionnaires.

The transcribed and "named" interviewee dialogue was coded according to the themes that had been identified in the field notes. For example, the "named" data that had been coded "comfortable," "respected" and "safe" was all organized under the broader category of "Community." Each piece of transcript was coded in this manner with some excerpts falling under more than one category. The questionnaires were also organized according to the themes that had been identified in the field notes. For example, Emily's response that free-writes and prompts were "astoundingly effective at getting us writing" was coded "Community." This coding by emerging theme helped me to better understand the variety of ways the preservice English teachers had made sense of these common experiences.

Once the data was organized according to the emerging themes, I coded each piece of data according to one of the "pivotal learning experiences" that had taken place during the classes. For example, Emily's questionnaire response that identified the value she placed on the name game was coded "name game" along with all other questionnaire data that referred to that particular learning experience. This coding enabled me to use the data to better understand what each of the learning experiences had done to the different preservice English teachers.

Finally, the data was coded according to aspects of both writing and teaching writing. I assigned eight codes to writing: revising, quality, personal, creative, academic, purpose, writer identity, and school expectations. I then read through the data and applied these codes accordingly. For example, Emily's questionnaire response about the positive impact of writing prompts was coded "creative." Twenty-three codes were used for identifying data pertaining to aspects of teaching writing. These codes included writing teachers' behaviors and concerns like grading, conferencing, and lesson planning. For example, data like excerpts from Jen's interview regarding her frustrations with assigning a number to student work was coded "grading." This coding helped me to understand what data I had regarding the ways writing and teaching writing impacted the preservice English teachers' interactions around who they were becoming as writing teachers.

This process of searching through the data for regularities, patterns and topics helped me to organize my data. At this point in the analysis of the data I had what amounted to lists of coded data that could then be organized

into outlines broken down by class meeting, theme, pivotal learning experience, and preservice English teacher reaction. These groupings of data allowed me to see the interplay between the themes, activities, and preservice English teacher reactions. These outlines looked like this:

First Class Meeting

A. Theme - Community

1. Pivotal learning experience - Name Game

Preservice English teacher reaction - "I don't think I would have worked on creating a safe and open environment in the classroom before Adam's class" (Emily/Questionnaire)

English educator's reaction - "You've got to know names, it's the number one thing to take care of, it gives you power" (Adam/field note)

B. Theme - Teacher as Writer

1. Pivotal learning experience - writing map

Preservice English teacher response - "The writing history map informed me that multi-media is the way to go. There is no reason that all the "writing" done in class has to look like writing." (Bob/interview)

Preservice English teacher response - "The free-write, maps, prompts, and discussions were astoundingly effective as getting us writing" (Emily/questionnaire)

Preservice English teacher response - Sue's map looks like a book, she explains this is because reading is

important to her as a writer. Her map shows how her school experiences influenced her writing.

These outlines helped me begin the more of making empirical assertions around the themes and based on the data. For example, the outlining of the data around the first class meeting led me to the assertions that familiarity encouraged the sharing of differences among the preservice English teachers and that by understanding themselves as writers the preservice English teachers formed more certain purposes for teaching writing.

Establishing coding categories provided me with an understanding of the types of data I had gathered and helped me to make some empirical assertions. However, it was not until I analyzed that coded data across sources that I began to understand the ways my data shed light on what interacting around learning to teach writing had done for the preservice English teachers.

Analysis of the Data

I used an inductive method of analysis that would enable me to make constant comparisons among my three sources of data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984): the field notes, the interviews, and the questionnaire. By looking across the three types of data for emerging patterns I was able to make empirical assertions in regards to how the interactions around learning to teach writing were affecting the preservice English teachers' understandings of themselves as writers and writing teachers. For example, by looking at the field notes, interviews, and questionnaires, I made this assertion: the preservice English teachers' beliefs about writing influenced their purposes

for teaching writing. This assertion was based on these three bodies of data: interactions which occurred in response to the instructor's request for the characteristics of a writer, interviewee comments which cited the importance of being able to write during the class, and questionnaire responses that recognized the writing prompts during the class.

In order to "flesh-out" the outlined data, I composed multiple drafts of data analysis. I went deeper and expanded my analysis by using the "story" of what happened during the class, drawing comparisons between the preservice English teachers' learning experiences and Alice's learning experience, and applying Bakhtin's dialogical principle. This "thickening" of the analysis allowed me to see the data more completely and present a more complex account of what learning to teach writing had done for the preservice English teachers.

This composing approach to analyzing the data occurred in three stages. During the first stage I organized the coded data under three primary areas: beliefs, interests, and reflections. Each of these three areas was then broken down into three more specific areas. The data regarding beliefs was organized according to the following: beliefs about teaching writing, beliefs about writing, beliefs about student writers. The data regarding interests was organized according to the following: interests in writing prescriptions, interests in writing concepts, interests in writing strategies. The data regarding reflections was organized according to the following: procedural questions, curricular questions, and theoretical questions. The data was then presented in the form of a more developed outline with the added layer of

Alice's experiences. The following is an example of the analysis composed for the data regarding beliefs about teaching writing.

Beliefs about Teaching Writing

Preservice English teachers' beliefs about writing reveal that they understand the value of establishing clear communication with students around their writing. Some speak of this dialogue taking place through comments while others imagine a more personal approach facilitated by conferences or more casual conversations about particular pieces of writing. Just as Alice experiences an initial phase of self pity when she nearly drowns in her own pool of tears, preservice English teacher do begin their thoughts of teaching writing by worrying about how student writing will reflect on their own teaching, but this insecurities seem to take second place when it comes to empathizing with students. Like Alice, who agrees that she "won't talk about cats or dogs either if [the mouse] doesn't like them" (30), preservice English teachers seem to value communication with students and helping students to become comfortable over all other concerns.

When preservice English teachers talk about teaching writing their statements focus on three areas: the burden of assigning grades to student writing, the dilemma of creating appropriate and engaging assignments, and the challenge of offering meaningful feedback. Ryan spoke of the importance of teaching writing when considering the role writing would play in his curriculum. He expressed his belief that

"Teaching writing is the central focus of the classroom . . . Teachers need to create risk-taking learning environments for students to experiment with writing. We need to make students care about writing."

In imagining how teaching of writing might play out in his classroom, Paul recalled a recent observation from the school where he was doing his student teaching. He acknowledged that, "Teaching someone how to write is such a difficult thing to do." He went on to recall that "I was in a school on Tuesday and we had writing coaches come in at the high school where I'm doing my teaching. They have a great writing center. There must have been at least five writing coaches in the class at one time plus myself. Plus the teacher, and there was five different groups of students working on their writing so there was a writing coach for each group of anywhere from three to four, maybe five students, and you know, I mean . . . as I was walking around to the groups to kind of see what was going on you know and like every group there was something different happening. like the coach was sort of taking them in a different direction. You know some coaches were more involved, some coaches were less involved, some coaches were offering suggestions, some coaches were trying to pull suggestions . . . I mean it's so difficult to say you know here's how I'm going to teach you how to write, you know, it's like, I don't know, it's a big dilemma, I mean how can I teach someone how to write?"

Both Ryan and Paul value writing and see it playing a significant role in their classrooms. However, Paul's question of "how

to" teach someone to write echoes the concerns of his colleagues who all worried "how" they would implement their ideals of teaching of writing.

Beliefs about grading.

Aside from more general concerns over class management, grades seem to provide the most anxiety for preservice English teachers. The thought of having to judge student writing runs counter to the overriding desire to join with students and serve as allies in the struggle to understand writing. The consensus among the preservice English teachers was that grading was a schooling practice that only caused disruption in teaching writing. Specifically, they worried over how to justify a grade and what distinguished one letter grade from another.

When asked about grading, Emily spoke about her first experiences grading students' essays in her student teaching. She admitted that "Grading essays on their (students) tests is one of the difficult things . . . you feel like you have to know what each point of the hundred points counts for . . . what is twenty point versus twenty three points . . . it is helping to set up criteria so I know going into it what I am giving points for . . . setting the criteria makes grading easier, but I'm still struggling with numbers . . . the purpose of my comments is to explain the grade so they are not confused by the grade . . . I don't spell it out, but if they were to come to me then I could back it up."

Emily's use of comments to justify her grades suggests that her ability to read student work like a reader is impaired by her belief that students need to understand why they receive a certain grade.

Paul expressed less of a concern for justifying his grades, but he did express frustration over having to serve as judge and jury for student writing. He explained that "The pieces I read from students, you know, I definitely looked at it as a reader first. Because ultimately then I just become a judge and jury . . . well this is good "A" or "B" fix this, what are you doing, but to look at it as a reader you can say well I enjoyed this. Maybe I can become less than that authority, but I can become something else as well. I can become the reader."

Paul seems determined to remain a genuine reader of student work, but he is already expressing the belief that he will be the primary judge of student work and that his judging will be based on his tastes alone. Emily took her beliefs about grading a step further by considering the possibility that students could receive a variety of grades for a variety of reasons. This view of grades as subjective seemed to be a view shared by the preservice English teachers. Many of them found the thought of rubrics to be too controlling and thought of grading as more intuitive. Emily even spoke of the possibility of different types of "A"s. She explained that "A Kid can deserve and "A" even though another kid gets and "A" but is a better writer . . . Look at the students and what they are struggling with if it is second language or something they are struggling with and that makes it even harder because it becomes so personal. When it comes

down to picking a number it becomes so subjective. I feel that if I take or give a point it makes such a difference . . . What is the difference between a ninety-three and a ninety-four? If everyone gets and "A" am I a bad teacher. I think its okay if everyone gets and "A" or a "B" does this look like I am an easy grader."

Here again the emphasis came back to the teacher and how grading might reflect something about the quality of the teaching.

Beliefs about Assignments.

Preservice English teachers want to be demanding and they want to be accepted by students. They seemed to struggle with how rigor and compassion could both be aspects of their work with writing. They took their responsibility for preparing students very seriously and did not want to let students slide by without getting the skills they needed. Lynne spoke to the importance of having students write frequently. She said

"I believe it is essential to encourage students to become good and frequent writers . . . I believe it is important to teach students how to write academically and how to do this well while encouraging and supporting creative writing in the classroom. It is important to give students the time they need in the classroom to write . . . I believe the more students write, the more they will want to write and the better their writing will become."

Emily spoke to the important of exposing students to a variety of assignments so they would be prepared to do more than produce the standard five-paragraph essay. She expressed the belief that

"Students should learn a variety of writing genres, not just the five paragraph essay. Also, students should be given opportunities to produce more than one draft and work off of teacher feedback."

This call for writing multiple drafts and her concern that students have as much time as they needed is consistent with the more general concern the preservice English teachers had over helping students to succeed. There seemed to be an assumption that as new writing teachers they would be working for their students and against the system.

When it comes to teaching the prescriptions of writing like punctuation, spelling and grammar, there seem to be two clearly defined schools of thought among the preservice English teachers. Some show no interest in teaching prescriptions, and see it as a necessary evil. Others are primarily interested in teaching prescriptions because they see teaching the basics as their primary responsibility.

Bob, who defined himself as a writer, spoke of the need to hold off on prescriptions until students saw themselves as writers and became invested enough to learn the details. He shared his story of winning an award for writing and how that got him serious about writing. He said

"I was in college when I won this award for a short story I wrote. That was when I first thought of myself as a writer . . . I started taking writing seriously and was suddenly interested in learning everything I

could about being a better writer . . . but I was in college before I was that interested"

Others, like Samantha, acknowledged Bob's experience and his concerns for placing too much emphasis on correctness before students were ready, but they became frustrated by the notion that you couldn't hold students to high standards. In light of Bob's remarks and the attitude being expressed that prescriptions didn't matter, Samantha said, "I am getting frustrated. I have a problem with ignoring the spelling and the grammar. I don't know how to touch on the bad. What happens when you never say anything bad and all of a sudden you're talking about ignoring corrections on every sentence"?

Emily echoed this concern for correctness when she said "Writing is for others to read, yeah there is personal writing, but it loses its value if it is not correct. You need the skills to write technically. I would have to short-change them a little because I think the technical more important for them at this point." Differences of opinion like this about the role of the writing teacher when it comes to teaching the basics revealed the degree to which preservice teachers' definitions of good writing inform their view of good writing teaching. None of the preservice teachers argued that prescriptions were not important, but their level of interest in prescriptions and their level of comfort with the prescriptions of writing did seem to inform how the teaching of such knowledge would be prioritized.

Beliefs about responding.

Preservice English teachers are very interested in being advocates for students and see responding to student writing as an opportunity to offer helpful advice. Ryan believed that students should be challenged to try new ways of writing and that dialoguing could help to ease students' anxieties. He explained that Students should engage in writing they enjoy, but be pushed/challenged to try new ways of writing. A dialogue either written or spoken between student and teacher and student and student is valuable and necessary to achieve improved writing and an appreciation of the process. As with the other beliefs about teaching writing, Ryan's words here show an interest in working with students in a system that is not necessarily student-friendly. When it comes to teaching writing, preservice teachers believe it is their job to be both rigorous and fair, but they do not seem to believe they know how they will achieve what seems to them to be opposing roles as judge and advocate.

While this stage of the analysis allowed me to better understand how the learning to teach writing experience was impacting the students, the presentation of the data was too decontextualized. In order to present a more complete picture of dialogic learning, I needed to imbed the analysis in the context of the class meetings.

The second stage of the analysis took me back to the original, uncoded field notes. In order to develop a rich context for the data of the first analysis, I used the field notes to compose a story about what happened during the semester. With this storied version of the field notes I could give a more

meaning to the data by discussing the interactions as they unfolded. To produce this storied version of the field notes I triangulated my field notes, my journal entries, and my recollection of what had taken place. The result was a fluid story of what the preservice English teachers had experienced. For example the following field notes

Class Notes

9-2-98

Adam begins class with an explanation of the imbalance in the enrollment between the two classes.

"This number is too big to do the work I want to do"

He asks if some students will volunteer to go to the other section. 5 leave but most stay and he talks more to convince them that the other teacher is just as good, that they do the same stuff, use the same books and work well together. More students leave until the class is down to 16 students. There are only three men in our section and zero in the other.

* this opening sets a tone about the department being a community and Adam shows that he is honest and trusting. There already seems to be a sense of trust that he is looking out for the best interest of the students, and his request shows the importance of working with smaller numbers of students when it comes to teaching writing.

Adam talked about the English program and living in NYC.

This again shows his concern for the whole student and sets a

familiar and caring tone for the class. There is no "business" of learning stuff. This environment is very human and open.

Adam presents a list of what becoming a teacher and the program are all about.

became a "story" that read like this:

September 2

The classroom was located in a building that looked like it had been designed by the imagination of Charles Dickens. In contrast with the more modern buildings in the surrounding area, the brick building that housed the teacher education program looked right out of the early nineteenth century. It always seemed as if thick black smoke should have been billowing from the many chimneys.

While a great deal of the interior of the building was being remodeled, the teaching of writing classroom was in the original condition with peeling paint, and a sagging, acoustic ceiling. The floor was wood and a collection of twenty-five or so single student desks filled the space. The classroom was part of a larger room with an accordion divider acting as one wall. The opposite wall had a chalkboard. The door to the door was large with a small window at the top. Opposite the door were huge nearly floor to ceiling windows that looked across the street to an apartment building. There was a clock that sat above the accordion wall and never really held the right time.

The first class began with Adam's explanation that enrollment in the teaching of writing sections was not balanced. He praised the English

educators who were teaching the other sections, explained how they collaborated, shared his concern that his section was too large to really do the type of work he hoped to do, and asked for volunteers to switch to one of the other sections. After a few moments of silence and passing glances among the twenty-one preservice English teachers, five volunteered to leave and were given directions to help them find the other classrooms.

While this open sharing of a dilemma did not directly have anything to do with the teaching of writing, Adam's decision to share the dilemma with the class and elicit help to introduce the role that dialogue would play in the class. Adam's decision to talk shop with the preservice English teachers seemed to bring him into immediate contact with them and challenge any assumptions that the preservice English teachers would be expected to learn passively or been seen as needing anything in particular. From the start it became apparent that learning in this class would be a group effort. Adam also asked the class about pushing the start of the class up one half-hour so everyone could get home earlier. It was agreed that everyone would make such a change in his or her schedules.

Once the class has settled back down, Adam spoke about the English Education Program at the University by reviewing some of the program's aims. He explained that the program hoped to help students do the following: learn to work well with others by negotiating in teams so their voices were heard and they heard the voices of others; learn processes of describing, analyzing and evaluating the teaching of writing; learn to identify teaching goals. Adam recommended that those steps be taken in sequence to help avoid making assumptions about students or moving to evaluations of

students too quickly. Adam explained that he and his colleagues were there to help the preservice English teachers, but that part of being professional meant managing your own life and work. He explained that he thought of his colleagues as his friends and he shared how closely they worked together. When Adam finished his introduction he asked for questions, but none were asked. Then he introduced the name games that would play such a pivotal role in the evolution of the strong personal relationships the preservice English teachers developed in the class.

The third stage of the analysis was developed more explicitly by Bakhtin's principle of the dialogic and designed to blend together the first and second stages to produce an analysis that was inclusive and maintained the "look" of what had taken place during the semester. I needed some theory to guide my analysis and distinguish my study from other work around learning to teach writing. The aim of this third analysis was two fold: show what learning to teach writing did for these preservice English teachers in the light of Alice's analogous experience; discuss how and why the interplay of dissonant discourses factored into their efforts to learn more about themselves as writing teachers. The result of this third stage of analysis looked the following:

Talk of Professionalism

During the introductory portion of the first class, Adam spoke about the English Education Program at the University by reviewing some of the program's aims. He explained that the program hoped to help students do the following: learn to work well with others by negotiating in teams so their voices were heard and they heard the voices of others; learn processes of

describing, analyzing and evaluating the teaching of writing; learn to identify teaching goals. Adam recommended that those steps be taken in sequence to help avoid making assumptions about students or moving to evaluations of students too quickly. Adam explained that he and his colleagues were there to help the preservice English teachers, but that part of being professional meant managing your own life and work. He explained that he thought of his colleagues as his friends and he shared how closely they worked together.

This talk about his own professional relationship with colleagues segued into a more general discussion of what it meant to be a professional teacher. Adam framed the discussion by identifying three behaviors practiced by professional teachers: working with others, observing, and setting goals. Adam explained that teachers needed to be able to work with others. He identified the value of observing and explained that observing entailed three steps that should be done in order to avoid making assumptions or moving to evaluation too quickly: describe, analyze, and evaluate. In discussing the importance of goals, Adam explained that teachers should write down their goals. He illustrated this point by sharing a story about handing out paper to his students who wrote down their goals for the year, which he then stapled shut and kept until the end of the year when the students got to see what they wrote down. Adam closed his description of professionalism by explaining that part of becoming a professional meant taking responsibility for your own life and work.

To promote some response to the topic of professionalism, the preservice English teachers were asked to address the following questions: What are writing teachers supposed to do? How should class be structured?

What support do writers need? What does class look like? What disciplines do we connect with? What do we need to know to be prepared to teach writing? What have we seen that we want to model or avoid?

Adam framed this exercise with a possible format, but he was careful to explain that he liked control and the teachers should use whatever format they want. Adam went on to say the he often treated his graduate students the same way he treated his middle school students because he is Adam and he can only be the be the type of teacher he is. He can only be himself. Which is not to say that his way is the only way or the best way, it is just his way. This type of openness seemed to make Adam more accessible. It took the edge off of his role as expert because he did not hold himself out as a model to be emulated expect to say that he was true to his self in his teaching. The implication was that each person in the room would have to become a different type of writing teacher. An awareness of the multiple teaching selves that would emerge removed any feeling competition and seemed to increase the degree to which the preservice English teachers had to learn from one another. Late in the semester during a visit to the Middle School where Adam taught, it became clearer to members of the class that much of teaching was about being your self with students.

Samantha was the most outspoken and controversial member of the class. She had taught for two years at a small private school on the East Coast and she came to the class with what seemed at times like a mission to protect students from what she saw as manipulative teaching. Any efforts to direct student learning were met by Samantha with great disdain. She saw her self as an advocate for students' rights to learn for themselves with as little

teacher involvement as possible. Samantha believed that students knew what they needed and that teachers needed to stay out of the way as much as possible. It was not until the visit to Adam's middle school though that Samantha became comfortable with the idea that teachers also had to be themselves and that students also had some role to play in allowing teachers to be self expressive. Her observation of one teacher who as she put it "was really just out there for everyone to see" helped her to reconsider the importance of being herself in front of her students and not being so hesitant about playing an active role in the classroom. What is interesting is that while Adam had introduced this notion of being the self during the first day of class, Samantha had not really given serious consideration to the idea until she had been given the opportunity to see such a lesson play itself out in a classroom.

While some might look at Samantha's experience as evidence that teacher education should take place in the context of schools, it might just as easily be argued that Samantha's learning was the product of variety. The single trip to the school had a jarring effect on several of the preservice English teachers who had come to think about teaching writing within a particular context. Whether that was the real context of their student teaching, some context drawn from the literature like Atwell's classroom in Maine, or some other completely imagined context, what was true for all, except Beth who did her student teaching at the school, was that Adam's school provided a new look at teaching writing. This jarring affect of this new look suggests the strength a variety and the need for preservice English teachers' learning experiences to be characterized by variety.

Further discussion of the characteristics of a professional teacher opened a class discussion about how teachers should behave, and turned attention to the debate over whether to correct everything in a piece of student writing. June worked for a leading fashion magazine prior to entering the program and she associated professionalism with mistake free writing. Her editing experience seem to provide her with an image of writing teacher as editor whose level of professionalism would be largely measured by the product: student writing. While others like Jen, who held fast throughout the class to her conviction that teachers had what amounted to almost an ethical duty to teach students the basic mechanics of writing, stood in agreement with June. There were just as many who shared Bob's disdain for descriptors like professionalism and simply believed that English teachers should help students create writing they found personally meaningful. As a poet and songwriter, Paul saw the whole business of schooling as antithetical to the work he hoped to do in his classroom. He wanted very much to take the school out of the classroom.

What is interesting about the dissonance of these teaching-writing discourses around the topic of professionalism is that they made for good discussions. On the one hand the pockets of students who agreed with one another seemed to band together and find solace in hearing their own beliefs echoed, and on the other hand the eclectic beliefs of the entire class made for a level of tension that kept the discussion moving forward. What seems most important is not what the different groups voiced around the topic of professionalism but that their voices filled the room. Adam's decision to pose questions, frame discussions and then step back seemed productive.

In later interviews dealing with this notion of what professional English teachers do, the need for teachers to play an active role in seeking out students mistakes was expressed by Samantha, who said that teachers need to push kids to be more diligent about adhering to the rules of writing. This call for a proactive approach in micromanaging student writing was countered in part by Paul who, in a post-class interview, shared his belief that writing classes should be safe environments where students feel comfortable making mistakes. Bob added that too many teachers run from the difficult issues like student thinking and just embrace the simple correcting of mistakes. The interplay between Samantha and both Paul and Bob became an ongoing affair during the class. In many ways they almost formed two different camps around topics. They were joined by their dissonance and seemed to almost anticipate disagreement. In many ways the presence of the other seemed to increase the level of thought given to their utterances. By the end of the semester it seemed clear that statements about free expression and the importance of bad writing were presented with others like Samantha and Jen in mind. The fact that this anticipation of dissonance never seemed to develop any animosity between those in disagreement suggests that the differences were valued precisely because they were dissonant.

The discussions around professionalism seemed to be suggesting the need for a balance that meant professionals both challenged student writers to learn the conventions of writing and nurtured students so they felt safe taking chances. But such an agreement about balance was never reached. There did not seem to be any agenda to find agreement. Such a balancing became problematic for the preservice English teachers like Samantha and

Emily who focused on teaching prescriptions like punctuation, grammar and usage.

Samantha and Emily, who defended teaching writing prescriptively, struggled with the idea of not correcting everything. They were concerned that uncorrected mistakes would promote poor habits among students. Concerns for correct spelling and proper use of punctuation came up again and again. There seemed to be an association between professional teaching and student writing that was mistake free. The notion of learning to write as a recursive continuum was difficult for Emily to accept because she believed that the basic had to be mastered first. She saw it as her responsibility to help students learn the rules and write correctly. Incorrect student writing was seen as a sign of unprofessional teaching.

This composing of the data allowed me to present my analysis of the data without losing the story of what took place. The first stage revealed common themes and helped me to develop the empirical assertions identified in the "outlining" of the coded data. The second stage helped me create a more contextualized presentation that located those assertions in the context of the class. The third stage of analysis produced a three layered account of what learning to teach writing had done to the 14 preservice English teachers. The first layer told a story with discussions of how the interactions helped the preservice teachers create new meaning out of their learning to teach writing experience. The second layer presented the story of the class and supported analogies to Alice's learning experiences that helped illuminate the nature of the preservice English teachers' dialogic interactions around learning to teach writing. The third layer presented Bakhtinian discussions that explored why

and how those interactions had proved meaningful for the preservice English teachers.

The Data Collection Site

Bakhtin explains that "every utterance has two aspect: that which comes from language and is reiterative, on the one hand, and that which comes from the context of enunciation, which is unique, on the other" (Todorov, 1984, p. 49). He also argues that the road which links the internal experience to its external objectification lies entirely in social territory (Voloshinov, 1973). In order to help readers understand the context in which the interplay between the preservice English teachers and the "others" to place, the closing section of this chapter describes the following: an outline of the English program's philosophy, a physical description of the classroom, an imagined account of the typical journey the preservice English teachers made to the classroom, and a class-by-class synopsis of what took place during the semester.

The Place

Picture the United States. Now picture the East Coast. Now picture New York City: yellow cabs, the neon lights of Time Square, the softball diamonds of Central Park, the winding tunnels of the subway, people crammed together like cattle during rush hour, a constant hum of human activity. Now picture the Upper West Side: the community gardens of Riverside Park, restaurants, newspaper stands, hot dog carts, book stores,

open air cafés, Harlem. Now picture Columbia University, Teachers College: nineteenth century architecture, a labyrinth of high-ceiling hallways, bulletin boards crowded with flyers and course offerings, a twisting stairway, the fifth floor.

Now picture a classroom: a water-stained acoustic ceiling, the hum of neon-tube lighting, a thickly stained wood floor, an accordion dividing wall, floor to ceiling windows that look across to the wrought iron fire escapes of a brick apartment building, a collection of sixteen single student desks, and a white marking board. This is where the preservice English teachers learned, but before seeing what happened during the class meetings, consider the philosophy of the English education program.

The Program.

The English Education Program at Teachers College has a reputation for valuing communication and fosters a strong sense of family among its students and faculty. The program is student-centered and committed to the professional development of individuals in their scholarly, teaching and research life. The program values the variety of needs and backgrounds of students, and strives to provide a range of opportunities that build upon past experiences while challenging students to examine their assumption and beliefs about teaching and learning (Brisbane & Hamilton, 1997, p. 6). The Program's mission states that a good teacher has the following qualities: "flexibility, resilience, openness to students' needs, confidence, and a desire to be an active participant in the community" (p. 6). The program's goal is to

"assist student teachers in maximizing their potential to become reflective and self-directed teachers" (p. 6). The yearly retreat to a resort in Connecticut where students spend several days writing in community with one another sets the tone for much of the work that happens throughout the year.

The closeness of the English education faculty also sets a standard for caring and collaboration that is particular to the program. The English Program's handbook describes the program as student-centered and committed to the professional development of individuals in their scholarly, teaching and research life. The program values the variety of needs and backgrounds of students, and strives to provide a range of opportunities that build upon past experiences while challenging students to examine their assumption and beliefs about teaching and learning. The program hopes that its professors believe that a good teacher has the following qualities: flexibility, resilience, openness to students' needs, confidence, and a desire to be an active participant in the community. The teacher and the text are valued, but they are not seen as the center of the class. The program's goal is to assist student teachers in maximizing their potential to become reflective and self-directed teachers. Now consider the nature of the weekly journey to class for the preservice English teachers who enrolled in that program.

Getting to Class

It's seven a.m. and you are an education school graduate student in a major city. Today is the first day of the semester. The subway station swells with suits and high heels - you juggle coffee and a bagel. Crammed onto the

subway, your mind floods with images of the classroom that will be yours someday. You picture yourself at the front of the room filled with eager students raising their hands and distracting students with raising voices.

Back up on the street you check nervously between your directions and your watch, cursing yourself for not taking some time over the weekend to locate the school where you have been assigned to complete your student teaching hours. Ahead you spot lines of students with baggy clothes, backpacks and walkmans. You will be on time.

You worm your way through the crowd, flash security your student identification card, sign the visitor form, and strain to hear the guard's directions to class. You blend in with the students - too much you worry - you should have dressed nicer. Inside the doorway of the classroom you pause, check the room number twice against your crumpled directions, and scan for the teacher. The desk at the front of the room is vacant. You walk to the bulletin board at the back of the room. The teacher turns and smiles. You relax for the first time since you left your apartment.

Morning classes fly by. You feel invisible. Mostly you sit in the back of the room watching and wondering what to do. Bells ring, desks and chairs shift, some students raise their hands, some students raise their voices. During second period the teacher takes two boys down to the office, leaving you in charge. Those are the longest five minutes of your life. Third period is filled with laughter and amazing student projects. You dream of your own class and how you will help students love learning.

The bell rings for lunch. You agree to meet with your cooperating teacher tomorrow at 6:30 am. Minutes later you are back on the street, trying to choose between lunch and getting to the library.

Compromising, you buy lunch from a cart at the north end of the park and walk across town to the college. Twenty-five minutes later you are stuck at the library turnstile. The librarian instructs you to get your identification card verified. Two hours and five offices later you slip back through the same turnstile, verified personal identification in hand. Class begins in less than two hours and you haven't started the reading.

You find a spot on the fourth floor and open the book. Library fumes work your brain. Your head grows heavy as you turn page after page, reading how Nancie Atwell (1998) teaches writing to middle school students in Maine. How did she get so good? Are middle school students different from high school students? What if you don't teach in Maine? Are you supposed to be able to do *all of this stuff the first year*? You head buzzes.

Five-o'clock. The sky darkens. Your stomach rumbles. You forgot to deal with dinner. Class is four hours long. It starts in ten minutes. You hope there will be a break. Tired, hungry, and reeling with questions, you close the book and head to class.

Climbing the stairs, you remember your 6:30 a.m. meeting with your cooperating teacher. Your legs burn as you reach the third floor. Your bag is heavy. You promise to pack less tomorrow. The door to room 325 is open and most students have already taken their places. You drop into an empty desk in the front row. Next time you will be early. You pull out a notebook and find a pen in the bottom of your bag. The professor walks into the room.

The sky is dark. Four more hours and you start your forty-five minute commute home. Now you are really hungry. It's too late - class begins.

The Classes

The following accounts of the classes are presented in the order in which they took place, so readers can get a feel for the flow of the class. The purpose of these thumbnail descriptions is to provide an outline of what I saw take place without going into any detail about what was said or how the preservice English teachers reacted. More interpretive accounts of the interactions that took place are reserved for the data analysis that is the subject of the next chapter. Each class is labeled according to an emergent theme and a pivotal learning situation, so that readers might more easily distinguish one class from another and get a sense of the major issues that emerged during the semester.

Personal Introductions - The Name Game and Writing Maps

The first class began with Adam's explanation that enrollment in the teaching of writing sections was not balanced. He praised the English educators who were teaching the other sections, explained how they collaborated, shared his concern that his section was too large to really do the type of work he hoped to do, and asked for volunteers to switch to one of the other sections. After a few moments of silence and passing glances among the twenty-one preservice English teachers, five volunteered to leave and were given directions to help them find the other classrooms.

Once the class has settled back down, Adam spoke about the English Education Program at the University by reviewing some of the program's aims, and explaining that he and his colleagues were there to help the preservice English teachers. Then he explained the importance of knowing students' names and asked the preservice English teachers to think of an adjective that both described something about their character and began with the same first letter as their first name. The class was arranged in a circle, and once everyone had selected an adjective and shared it with the class, each preservice English teacher was asked to recall the name and adjective of each person in the circle. The second phase of the game followed the same naming of each person in the circle, but this time the naming was attempted after everyone had changed seats.

This name game was followed by an exercise in which each person was asked to create a memory map that showed his or her life as a writer. Adam gave the class large pieces of paper and baskets of colored markers to complete the project. To illustrate what he meant by life map, Adam went to the board and drew an example of how his own map might look. The class spread out on the floor and into the hallway for the next half-hour. Adam worked alongside the preservice English teachers in creating his own map.

When the maps had been created, Adam asked for groups of four to be made, and then he asked that the members of the groups use their maps to identify common experiences, transitions, turning points, periods of growth, types of writing, and "others" reflected in the maps. He asked the groups to create lists of these elements so they could identify patterns and share their findings with the entire class.

Adam ended the first class with a request for two pieces of writing. He asked that the preservice English teachers write about two clusters of questions: *The first dealing with writing and the second dealing with teaching writing.* He asked that the responses be presented by describing actual experiences. Adam closed by expressing his hope that the class would provide everyone with the opportunity to evolve as a writer and as a teacher of writing.

Being a Writer - Reviewing Goals and Defining What Writers Do

In keeping with the emphasis that was placed on the preservice English teachers own writing lives, Adam opened the second class by giving the class a writing prompt and asking them to write for half an hour. This writing session was followed by Adam introducing the notion of journal writing, which was followed by small group discussions in which the preservice English teachers read and shared the writing they had completed during the first half-hour.

Those discussions were followed by Adam asking the preservice English teachers to share what they had written about their writing goals for the semester. One of the class requirements was to complete two "finished" pieces. The topics ranged from revisiting a play written in college and revising the first chapters of an unfinished novel to a journal of the student teaching experience and reflections on what it means to grow up as a Korean-American. Adam then turned attention to what the preservice English teachers had written about their notions of what it means to be a writer.

After a break in the four-hour class, Adam reviewed the syllabus with the class and talked about the need for active listening and struggling to be present in the moment of the class. He explained his rationale for not laying out precisely what would happen in the syllabus. He liked to have the class unfold and be allowed to remain more improvisational. This review of the syllabus was followed by a writing prompt. Adam began a story and asked the preservice teachers to complete the story. This writing time was followed by small group discussions in which the stories were shared. The class ended with Adam asking for feedback from the class about the first two classes.

Getting Personal - Sharing Special Places and Imagining Teaching Writing

During the third class meeting the class was asked to develop maps of favorite places. This exercise was done as part of the larger process of gathering things to write about. The class was instructed to put as much detail as possible into the maps of their favorite places. As with the first maps of their writing lives, the preservice English teachers spread out on the floor and use the markers Adam had provided. When the maps had been completed, Adam asks the class what was being learned through the exercise.

After the break the class came back together and Adam asked the class to come up with questions about teaching writing. All of this discussion around questions of how to teach writing led Adam to tell some of his own stories about teaching middle school students.

Defining Good Writing - Discussing the Multiple Possibilities

The next class began with Adam putting a "To Do" list on the board as an outline for how the class time would be used. He listed the following: meet in small groups to discuss how the journaling about the New Yorker and New York Times reading was proceeding, reading the New York Times and the New Yorker were ongoing assignments; discuss definitions of good writing; discuss rules for responding to student writing; sharing writing in designated groups of three (writer support groups of three were assigned to facilitate writing workshops around the two "finished pieces" expected from the preservice English teachers; hold a large group discussion about the writing; talk about how to continue with the fictional pieces being written; fishbowl a piece of student writing that Adam would share with the class; not review the reading, but focus attention on developing the preservice English teachers' own writing as a way of learning about how to teach writing.

Adam polled the class to see how many felt like they had done enough gathering for composing their two "finished" pieces. He explained that he hoped for the class to become a community of writers, and that our journals would become places where the preservice English teachers could keep a record of what they wanted write about. He then asked for the preservice English teachers to form groups of four and discuss reactions to the reading of the New Yorker and the New YorkTimes.

The next phase of the class concerned a two pronged discussion about what qualities where associated with a good piece of writing and some rules

for guiding teacher's responses to student writing. Adam's one stipulation for the discussion was that the preservice English teachers think of themselves as persons working on writing, not as teachers. These small group sessions were followed by a full class discussion.

Adam closed the class by referring back to the original list and explaining that they had not had the opportunity to get to the piece of student writing that he had brought for the fish-bowling exercise. He set a goal for doing the fish bowl during the next class. He also said that he would read through the drafts of the work that had been completed and put examples of the strongest writing on an overhead for discussion.

Responding to Writing - Fish Bowling a Student-teacher Conference

Adam opened the next class by asking about the reading assignments. The preservice English teachers explained that they were overwhelmed by the reading and confused by how many different things Atwell was covering in her book. Several of the preservice English teachers who were also involved in the first experiences students teaching admitted that they had been unable to complete the reading. Adam advised the class to simply think of the Atwell text as a reference and to post-it sections that might prove helpful.

Next Adam asked about the writing. The responses about the writing were much more varied. Overall, the amount of writing they were being asked to complete had come as a pleasant surprise and a break from the work that they were being asked to do in their other classes.

Adam changed the direction of the discussion by introducing the piece of student writing he had hoped to use in the previous class meeting. He asked each of the preservice English teachers to read over the piece of student writing and make a decision about how to respond. About fifteen minutes was given to reading the piece and considering means of responding. For the next step of the exercise Adam asked three of the preservice English teachers to form a group in the center of the larger circle of the preservice English teachers. Those three were then asked to talk about how they had responded to the piece. The other preservice English teachers were given instructions to simply watch the work of the three in the center of the "fish-bowl."

He asked that each person to consider what type of advice the student would be receiving from each person in the central group of three and what each person method of responding revealed about their beliefs about writing.

During the next phase of the exercise I volunteered to play the role of a teacher in a fishbowl with Adam who would play the role ninth grade student. Together we would attempt to model a student-teacher writing conference. Adam left the room to give the preservice English teachers an opportunity to read the next student piece. When he returned the two of us sat across from one another and began our dialogue. At the end of the conference Adam asked for reactions from the preservice English teachers.

Experiencing Each Other's Teaching - Presenting Mini-lessons

The next class began with a discussion about the weekend retreat. The preservice English teachers enrolled in the program spent two days and an

evening on a retreat at a convent. The majority of the preservice English teachers from the class attended the retreat and seemed to take their personal relationships to a new level. Adam asked the class to write down five words that they would use to describe the experience.

Once again Adam put the agenda on the board. It read as follows: review reading of Writers on Writing, lesson planning and mapping a writing class, Atwell and Romano reading, mini-lesson assignment, developmental lesson planning, work in writing groups, review of deadlines for major assignments.

The first exercise began with Adam giving cards to each of the preservice English teachers. These cards had a preservice teacher's name on one side and the name of an author to review on the other side. The preservice English teachers then organized themselves into groups of three. Each group was given fifteen minutes to develop a presentation of what they knew about the author that they had been assigned read.

The presentations were followed by a writing prompt in which Adam asked the class to make a list of personal goals that they each wanted to achieve over their life time. Then he asked the preservice English teachers to pick one of those goals and develop a set of objectives for meeting that goal. This exercise was used to frame the next exercise of designing a lesson.

Adam handed out examples of actual lesson plans and a sample template for creating a lesson plan. He asked the class to look at the examples with a critical eye to determine whether they would work. The class ended with Adam suggesting that the preservice English teachers look at Bloom's taxonomy and give particular attention to the verbs.

School Visit - Observing the Teaching of Writing

The next class took place at a Center School where Adam had worked as a teacher for the last few years. The Center School is a public middle school located in a large city and has a progressive reputation. The class assembled in a teacher room. The room was filled with a large table that everyone squeezed around. Adam assigned the preservice English teachers to particular classrooms where they were to go for their observations.

After the individual class observations Adam's class gathered together in another classroom to discuss the experience and have an opportunity to speak with some of the teachers whose classrooms were observed. To begin the discussion Adam asked each of the classroom teachers to explain how they fit into the bigger picture and to highlight some tips or principles for teaching writing.

After the classroom teachers left the room, the preservice English teachers shared what they had learned from observing the various writing classes. Then Adam shifted the discussion to deal with the lesson plans that the preservice English teachers had been developing as an assignment for the teaching of writing class.

Visiting with Experienced Teachers - Talking with Experts

The next class was used as an opportunity for the preservice English teachers to have some follow-up questions regarding the visit to Center

School that took place the previous week, Adam invited the teachers from Center School to come and talk with the class.

While waiting for the Center School teachers, a class discussion grew out of concerns that Center School offered too much of an ideal to really apply to many of the classroom settings where the preservice English teachers imagined they would be teaching during the next school year.

The first teacher from Center School to speak was Shirley. She was a graduate of the English education program at the university where the teaching of writing class was being taught and she seemed to share in the progressive theories of the program while at the same time having some very specific ideas about how student creativity needed to be structured.

Megan was the second teacher from Center School. She was an older teacher and her time in the class was used to present more of a lecture in which she went over the step by step procedures she used in her classroom. She taught a creative non-fiction class. She presented what happened during her activities. She explained how she used pictures and drawings as writing prompts. During her presentation the preservice English teachers took what looked be very detailed notes on the step-by-step activities. There was a sense in the room that Megan was giving the preservice English teachers they type of information they wanted to have in regards to what actually happened during an activity. There was no discussion about why Megan did what she did. It seemed like Shirley's talk had been largely theoretical while Megan's was much more practical.

Identifying Teaching Purposes - Framing a Rubric

The next class began with Adam sharing his experience teaching a weekend workshop that involved sketching and writing. He used this story to introduce the writing assignment for the class. The preservice English teachers were asked to take their notebooks to a museum in the school's Humanities Department. The museum was filled with the painting and collages of grade school students. Each preservice English teacher is directed to select one piece of art for inspiration and to sit and write for 30 to 40 minutes before returning to the classroom.

The museum was a one-room gallery with works displayed on the walls and a few larger pieces set up in the middle of the room. The pieces were part sculpture and part painting. Adam explained that the pieces had been put together by grade school students during the weekend.

This writing exercise was followed by the class generating a list of mini-lesson topics. This list was placed on the board: Form/structure, Audience, Voice, Tone, Getting started, Drafting, Talking out a frame, Transitions, Word refining, Presentation, Peer work to edit, Perspective of writer, What's missing, Feedback can vary, Listening with purpose, Grammar. Adam put checks by the topics that seemed to repeat, so the class could identify common concerns. The final list of common concerns included the following: Audience, Transitions, Short story, Narrative voice, Setting, Revision/editing, Conflict, Workshop organization, Chronology, Intentional gaps, Title, Word choice.

Once the mini-lessons had been listed, Adam handed out lesson plans and asked each of the preservice English teachers to read a lesson plan and pass it to another preservice English teacher, having identified the purpose of each lesson. The class is then broken into groups and each group is asked to decide on the purpose of the lesson.

This exercise is followed by Adam's explanation that he wants to involve the preservice English teachers in the process of assessing their work during the semester. He asks the class to divide into groups and come to some agreement about the purpose of each assignment that has been complete during the semester. Adam distributed a rubric from the New York Regents test and an article that discussed portfolios and rubrics. After the groups had spent time discussing the assignments they had been given, the class came together for a time to share the findings of each group.

Adam closed this class by explaining that the homework was to keep the lesson plans and revise them, to develop a new lesson plan, to respond to partner's writing, and to draft a second piece.

Measuring Quality - Composing a Rubric

The next class began with Adam placing a list of topics to be covered for the evening. The list included the following: a copy change writing prompt of a piece called "White Angel," a quiz on our reading of *Inside Out*, revisiting the rubric for Adam's grading of the class, writer group discussions around the second "finished" piece, and reviewing the lesson plans that were to be revised. Once the list was on the board, Adam asked the class to decide

how to proceed. The class agreed to return to the previous discussion around designing the rubric that Adam would use to grade the class.

There was a great deal of confusion in the class over both the process of developing a rubric and the purpose. The task was to identify purposes for each portion of the portfolio and then to arrive at some agreement over how each element would weigh in determining the final grade. In light of the array of questions about the process and some of the complaints about why we were even bothering with such a task. Many of the preservice English teachers expressed the belief that assessment was Adam's responsibility. They did not necessarily feel comfortable or qualified to assess their own work. The greatest sticking point seemed to be the problem of trying to decide what Adam expected out of each assignment.

Adam shifted the discussion to the exercise he wanted the class to work around. He asked the class to organize themselves back into the groups they had formed in the earlier class. Once again the preservice English teachers grouped themselves according to the different sections of the portfolio that would be completed. This time the instructions were for each group to take a large piece of paper and write down the elements that should be included in each section. Then based on that criteria there would be a determination of three levels of grades: high, medium, and low. Once the posters were completed they were placed on the board for presentation to the class.

As the discussion wound down, Adam introduced the next exercise, the copy change. He explained that a copy change meant changing the words in a piece but not changing the tone or style of the piece. The class ended by

getting into writing groups and discussion progress on the second "finished" piece.

Writing Celebration - Reading the "Finished" Pieces

The final class was held as a writing celebration. Adam lit the room with candles and the preservice English teachers gathered in a circle to read excerpts from one of their "finished" pieces. Many of the readings were deeply personal. One reader was brought to tears during her reading and had to ask one of the members of her writing group to complete the reading. The class ended with an agreement to hold some form of reunion class during the next semester, so that the members of the class would not lose touch completely. A reunion class was held during the next semester. Seven of the preservice English teachers were able to attend. During that meeting they shared student teaching stories and asked questions around issues like grading student writing and designing engaging assignments.

Limitations

Qualitative data provides a "real life" view by focusing on naturally occurring events in a natural setting with thick descriptions, context embedded analysis, and a sustained period of study. However, these same strengths can be weaknesses. The naturally occurring events and setting do not allow for a controlled environment in which behaviors might be isolated. The uniqueness of thick descriptions limits the degree to which data can be applied to "others." The attention to context creates the problem of relativism

and problematizes attempts to transfer findings. The sustained periods of time may cause the researcher to become too subjective as relationships are established with subjects.

The first limit of the study is the role I assumed as a student/ researcher in the class. As a student I definitely got the sense that the other teachers were relating to me as a peer, not as a researcher and that helped me to become involved in conversations that I might never have had as a designated researcher. However, there were times when my own curiosity got the best of me and I slipped so deeply into the role of student that I was unable to observe what was happening around me.

The second limit is the method of using a small number self-selected key subjects. While I believe that my method of self-selection accomplished my aim of getting meaningful and authentic data, it would have been helpful to hear from a wider variety of voices. It might also be argued that the self-selected teachers shared a higher interest in learning to teach writing than the average teacher did. Each subject's uniqueness certainly prevents him or her from synecdotal representation, but that does not mean that he or she cannot stand as a "representative" of teachers learning to teach writing.

The third limit is the decision to just work with one class. This meant that I had nothing to contrast this class experience against. The study took place in a vacuum, so that I could witness the contextualized experiences of the teachers. It would certainly have been helpful to look at a variety of classes and a variety of teacher populations.

The fourth limit is the fact that the study focused primarily on the learning to teach experience, with no attention to the application of that

learning. I wanted to turn attention away from the traditional emphasis on the transfer from learning to teaching and just look at what happened for teachers as they learned about the teaching of writing. Certainly an important follow-up study would be to look at the outcomes of that learning.

As an interpretive study, the main limit is obviously the filter through which the data was poured. While I did go to some lengths to keep my own beliefs about the teaching of writing from coloring the data, there can be no doubt that the same data would have yielded different results in the hands of a different researcher. Add to this my own limited experience as a researcher and you have a study that is, at best, my biased and belief laden interpretation of what learning to teach writing did for these preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing.

IV -- THE OTHERS

The literature on preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching writing suggests that "teachers enter their professional education already trapped in their own relations with the subject" (Kennedy, 1998, p. 14), and that subsequently their learning is filtered by their prior beliefs. The major concern is that these filters impair preservice English teachers' capacities to change their beliefs about teaching writing. Consequently, their learning to teach writing experience makes little difference for them in preparing to teach (Cuban, 1984). This notion that preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching contribute to the stability of teaching practices has received large attention from education reformers, and there is a body of literature aimed at helping teacher educators cope with the "dilemmas" posed by these beliefs.

Recently, delving into preservice teacher's biographies has been presented as a means of helping preservice teachers to go deeper into themselves and problematize those beliefs. Although such efforts to remove the filtering effects of prior beliefs have been practiced by a number of teacher educators for nearly a decade, to date, the lasting impact of teacher education remains largely unchanged. Preservice teachers continue to arrive at and graduate from teacher education program with unchanged ideas about teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Griffin, 1999; Howey & Zimpher, 1999; Smylie, Bay & Tozer, 1999;) thus calling into the question the purpose of even having teacher education programs.

In the more specific field of English-teacher education, preservice English teachers have been found to show a tendency to become increasingly more concerned about students' compliance with prescriptions as they move closer and closer to actually teaching writing (Kennedy, 1998). This gravitation towards prescriptions is problematic in light of research that demonstrates that direct teaching of writing is less effective than pedagogies like teaching writing strategies and writing processes that give students more control over their writing (Hillocks, 1986).

One thing seems clear: preservice teachers' prior beliefs are powerful and deeply rooted. Preservice English teachers come to their learning to teach writing experience with images of teaching that are derived from their personal experiences, images of teachers in popular culture, image of teachers in literature, images others around us have of teachers, and images teachers hold of teachers (Vinz, 1996). The socially constructed nature of these beliefs make the beliefs part of preservice English teachers' perceptions of who they hope to be become as English teachers teaching writing. Attempts to neutralize such deeply rooted beliefs about teaching writing seem misdirected and dismissive of the rich body of experience-based knowledge that preservice English teachers bring to their learning to teach writing experiences. Rather than work to remove or replace preservice English teachers' prior beliefs, it might be that prior beliefs can serve as a foundation for further learning about teaching writing.

Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic, when applied to the field of teacher education provides education reformers with a means for shifting away from preoccupations with teacher education outcomes, so that we might develop a

deeper understanding of the preservice teacher learning processes. Bakhtin's notion that meaning is created from dissonant discourses (in this case preservice English teachers' student derived beliefs about teaching writing and those they encounter in the teaching writing classroom) can be used to direct teacher educators' attention to what learning to teach writing does to preservice English teachers during their learning to teach writing experiences. In the same ways that Emig's (1971) study shifted attention toward students' writing process to better understand how students compose texts, Bakhtin's dialogical principle can be applied to the dilemmas of English education and teaching the teaching of writing in such a manner as to shift attention to preservice English teacher learning to teach writing processes. Such a perspective of the process of learning to teach writing sheds new light on what happens as preservice English teachers compose writing pedagogies.

Bakhtin argues that the presence of others' discourses is necessary for individuals to develop new understandings. When viewed as a theory of learning, Bakhtin's dialogical principle can be used to consider the possibility that preservice teachers' prior beliefs might act as levers that reveal more complete views of the self. Bakhtin's theory suggests the possibility of a shift away from self-learning in isolation and toward a view of the self-learning in community with other's. For Bakhtin it is the "others" outside the self who are capable of revealing a more complete view of the self. He calls for learners to look outside the self for a deepening understanding of the self. Therefore, while teacher biography may be part of the answer for coping with the dilemma of learning to teach, if Bakhtin's theory is used to frame the dilemma of how to cope with preservice English teachers' prior beliefs, then

we have cause to wonder if it might not be the teacher biography of the "others" that enables an educating of the self.

The value of engaging in such a dialogic learning process is further illustrated by Lewis Carroll's protagonist, Alice, who makes new meaning through her various interactions with the "other" creatures who inhabit Wonderland. In his stories of Alice, Carroll gives value to Alice's voice and shows how she plays an active role in her own education (Auerbach, 1973), but it is also clear that her learning comes from the interplay of her beliefs and the beliefs of the "others" she encounters. Even if Alice's experience is understood to be a dream, it is the "other" voices she creates within her own consciousness and their view of her self that reveals Alice more completely to Alice. So too it seemed with these preservice English teachers that their own efforts to see a more complete writing teacher self was aided by the perspective of "others" outside that self. While working with biography has been seen to play a pivotal role in helping teacher education make a difference for preservice teachers, it may be an awareness of the biography of "others" that reveals a more complete understanding of the evolving self as writing teacher.

This chapter presents my interpretation of the interactions between the preservice English teachers' writing and teaching writing discourses and the various writing and teaching writing discourses they encountered during the class. Each section looks at a particular class and the dialogic interplay that I observed during that class. Through analysis of my perception of those interactions these sections present my account of what learning to teach writing did for these preservice English teachers. The purpose of presenting

such an account is to arouse reader's interests in those interactions and to examine the processes by which these preservice English teachers attributed meaning to their learning to teach writing experience. The hope is to awaken concern over aspects of learning to teach writing processes that seem to have received less attention than learning to teach writing outcomes.

Bakhtin (1974) argues that the human sciences can be distinguished from the natural sciences in that the human sciences concern themselves with depth of insight rather than with accuracy. He explains that the object of the human sciences is the expressive and speaking being who never coincides with itself, and who is, therefore, inexhaustible in its meaning and signification. This nature of the human sciences means that "accuracy consists in overcoming the other's strangeness without assimilating it wholly to oneself" (Bakhtin, 1974, p. 371). Bakhtin calls for the self to preserve what he calls an exotopic position that enables the self to learn with the other without fusing with the other. Exotopy is the term he uses to describe the process of an individual studying the self through the perspective of another in order to see the self more completely. During this process there is a tension maintained so that the self does not simply adopt the other's view of the self, but rather that the self incorporates that other's perspective with the self's perspective to develop a more complete view of the self. This recognition of the depth the other's perspective adds to an understanding of the self and reveals the impossibility of completely knowing the self.

For Bakhtin "exotopy is the most powerful lever of understanding" (Bakhtin, 1970, p. 334) because it is only through the eyes of the "other" that the self is revealed. The self then is not seen as being able to learn in isolation.

There must be "others" for the self to be revealed and more deeply understood. Lewis Carroll shows how "others" reveal the self in his story of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland when Alice becomes more aware of her self through her interaction with the "others" she encounters in Wonderland. For example, Alice's interactions with the Caterpillar increase her awareness of how much she has changed. The Caterpillar's "Who are you?" (Carroll, 1992, p. 35) inquiry places Alice outside of herself to consider just who she plays in her new role as Alice in Wonderland.

This does not mean that Alice is given an identity by Wonderland creatures like the Caterpillar. Alice enters Wonderland with beliefs and it is the interplay between the discourses that have shaped those beliefs and the varied discourses she encounters in Wonderland that reveal more of Alice's self. It is this condition of exotopy or being in a condition of flux with "others" like the Caterpillar that gives Alice the leverage that she needs to deepen her understanding of Alice.

This variety of complimentary and dissonant discourses gives way to new meaning for Alice because she finds her beliefs both challenged and supported in the company of others. Arguably the richness of her experiences is derived from the problematizing of her prior view of learning as a centrifugal effort aimed toward the synthesis of discourses. In Wonderland, Alice makes a more centripetal effort and acknowledges the complexity of the discourses that do not allow themselves to be reduced to common truths or principles. She learns to think differently about things that she previously thought of with certainty like the having of tea, playing croquet, and the possibility of ugly babies becoming handsome pigs. Variety

and discord take on value as Alice acknowledges the possibility of multiple perspectives and the multiple truths those perspectives reveal about single objects. Alice realizes that even the simplest of acts like the having of tea or the playing of croquet do not necessarily always call for the same type of behavior. Through her efforts to negotiate the dissonant worlds Alice begins to understand the variability of context and to see herself in new and different ways.

Likewise, preservice English teachers who enter a learning to teach writing classroom where the teaching of writing is not represented as prescriptive pedagogy face the challenge of learning principles that will transcend variations in context and attend to the unpredictable nature of teaching writing. The reality that "teaching depends on growth and development, and it is practiced in dynamic situations that are never the same twice" (Ayers, 1993, p. 127) may explain why so many preservice teachers claim frustration over not having learned how to teach. Like Alice, preservice English teachers learning to teach writing find themselves coping with the largely unpredictable impact of context and the unfixed nature of teaching writing. Rather than simply learn how to teach writing, preservice English teacher find themselves engaged in the far more complex process of coming to understand who they are becoming as teachers of writing.

When Alice arrives in Wonderland with prior beliefs supported by a variety of discourses that are challenged by the discourses of the "other" Wonderland creatures, she finds herself confused about exactly how to behave. Alice comes from a world of protocol where proper behavior is known. Wonderland is a world of improvisation where proper behavior

varies. The Caterpillar makes the suggestion that Alice's primary concern should be "who" Alice thinks she is becoming. Alice responds to the Caterpillar's inquiry by acknowledging uncertainty of her identity in Wonderland. Alice's education has been largely prescriptive with little attention given to what that learning does to her emerging self. Consequently, Alice seems to know a great deal without understanding much of anything. It is only once she enters Wonderland that Alice is able to move beyond the passive reception of knowledge that has been her education and develop true understanding by being placed in dialogic with the "other" Wonderland creatures. In Wonderland, learning is about becoming who you are.

The preservice English teachers in this study arrived at the door of the teaching of writing class with a variety of beliefs about teaching writing that were supported by a variety of teaching writing discourses, which then found themselves competing and allying with the beliefs and supporting discourses of "others." Consequently, the learning for the preservice English teachers became a constant interplay of those discourses as each tried to negotiate their way toward some deeper understanding of who they were becoming as writing teachers. Learning to teach writing challenged these preservice English teachers to negotiate the dissonant discourses and look beyond prescriptive understandings of teaching writing and embrace more dialogic understandings of teaching writing that revealed who they were becoming as writing teachers.

Alice's "fall" into Wonderland and her subsequent struggles to fit through the door and into the garden frame her learning experience in

Wonderland. Prior to entering the garden, Alice reflects about "what was going to happen next" (Carroll, 1992, p. 8), shows off her knowledge of things like the number of miles to the center of the earth (four thousand), and realizes the limits of truths she had learned like "if you drink much from a bottle marked 'poison,' it is almost certain to disagree with you"(p. 11). In short, Alice enters the garden feeling unsure of both who she is and what she can expect in her new surroundings.

Likewise, the preservice English teachers arrived at this teaching of writing class feeling unsure of what they could expect from their new surroundings. When asked to assess the teaching writing class, the preservice English teachers claimed that because they had ever taken such a class they felt unqualified to assess their experiences. The preservice English teachers did not express any specific expectations of the teaching of writing class.

As an inquiry aimed at revealing the complexity of learning to teach writing, the presentation and analysis of the data gathered around the teaching of writing class is prefaced by a depiction of the variety of "falls" the preservice English teachers experienced prior to entering the teaching of writing classroom. Each member of the class arrived to the class from a different world populated by different writing and teaching writing discourses. Some came from classrooms where they were already teaching writing. Some came from student teaching assignments where they felt caught somewhere between student and teacher. Some came from dorm rooms where they imagined future classrooms in which they would teach writing. Some came from offices where they dreamed of finding professional fulfillment by teaching writing.

Multiple Paths to One Class

4:00 PM

Paul sits listening to music in his dorm room. His room is just large enough to fit a single bed and a desk. Unpacked boxes are still stacked against the walls and as he listens to the music battle with the constant buzz of the city his mind struggles with the lyrics of a new song he is composing. He wonders how he is going to survive the four-hour teaching of writing class he is taking.

Emily sits in front of her computer screen thinking about the twenty-six phone messages she will try and fail to return before the end of the day. She scrolls through a draft of a letter to a hopeful author. The letter explains why the office does not accept unsolicited manuscripts. Emily scans the copy making sure the right name and title has been cut and pasted into the sample letter she has mailed to what seems like hundreds of writers over the past year. She wonders what time she will finally get home after the four-hour writing class she will be taking every Wednesday after work for the next three months.

Helen sits at her desk reading paragraphs her eighth graders wrote about why they think that To Kill A Mocking Bird is a good book. Reading through and making marks on the papers, Helen is excited about being a student again and not having to do the teaching. She is looking forward to doing her own writing and letting someone else do the grading. The whole idea seems so relaxing. She glances toward the clock and wonders how many other students in the teaching of writing class will have teaching experience.

Sitting at his desk in the English Education Office, Adam listens to classical music and jots down some last minute notes. He has never taught this class before, but he is excited about getting the students to really look at who they are as writers and to challenge them to broaden their understanding of the different types of writing that can take place in an English class. He imagines the students wanting to talk about the readings he has selected and thinks back to the way he has been teaching writing to middle school students. He wonders what it will be like to have a four-hour class and how the work around writing and the work around teaching writing will inform one another.

Natalie is exhausted. When she had signed up for student teaching, she had not expected to actually be the teacher. She had never wondered about what to do when different students come to class each day. She had never thought about students who would just stare into space the entire class. She had never expected everything to be so complicated. Sitting on the subway, she just wants to go home and go to sleep. She is so tired. Then there is that part of her that is hoping the four-hour teaching of writing class will help her. Maybe she can learn how to get her students to do some interesting writing. Maybe she can find a way to give her students feedback without completely shutting them down.

4:30 PM

Paul shuts off the stereo, grabs his bag and locks the door behind him. A few other students also enter the dorm hall to make their way to class. Standing in the tiny elevator, Paul thinks of the summer, his band, the lyrics tumbling around in his head.

Emily shuts down her computer and pushes back from her desk. As she makes her way toward the front door of the office someone wishes her luck. She says thanks and steps out into the noise of the city. She wants to check the bookstore to see if the books for the class have arrived, but she also wants to eat.

Helen steps off the subway and makes her way up the stairs. The sidewalk is not as busy this far up town, but the sun is still hot and her bag is heavy with unmarked papers. As she walks the three blocks to the school she passes two hot dog carts. She only has enough money to buy a diet coke.

Adam grabs a basket of magic markers and a pad of large poster paper. The halls are already filling with students who have come early to meet with professors and make last minute changes with their advisors. There are too many students in his section and Adam is worried about what will happen when he explains that he need a few students to volunteer to switch into another section.

Natalie stands in the lobby looking at the posted classes and their respective room numbers. She spots the combined class: A&HL 4151 - Teaching of Writing/ A&AH 4156 - Writer's Workshop. She jots down the room: 511A Thompson. Then she looks at her map and moves toward the stairs.

4:50 PM

Paul sits on a bench down the hall from the class. He is making his way through a bag of chips and does not look up when Adam walks by with the poster paper and basket full of magic markers.

Adam is the first to get to the room. He puts his supplies onto a table at the front of the class and moves the desks around to form more of a circle. He opens one of the windows and sits down to review his notes.

Helen and Emily stand next to each other in front of the bulletin board where Natalie had just jotted down the same information they are searching for. Helen finds the class first and moves toward the stairs. She spots the elevator, but decides not to wait. Emily finds the listing second, but she walks down the hall hoping to find some food.

Natalie wanders down what looks to her like the same hall she walked down just a few minutes earlier. She checks the map again. Everything seems the same. She wonders how many of the other students she sees are looking for the same class.

4:55 PM

Paul walks into the classroom and recognizes Adam from earlier. They exchange a nod as Paul finds his way toward the back of the room near the window where Natalie is already seated. Emily walks in just ahead of Helen. Emily has a candy wrapper in her hand. Helen drops her bag next to the first desk near the door. The room swells with students. Some seem to know each other, most just find a place to sit and make themselves busy with arranging their space.

5:00 PM

Adam gets up from the table at the front of the room. The class quiets as he pulls a desk toward the circle and sits back down. He looks around the class for a few seconds smiling and nodding at what seems like some familiar faces. Paul glances out the window. Emily swallows the last bit of chocolate.

Helen clicks open her pen. Natalie looks at the clock. Adam leans forward and rests his elbows on the single desk. "Hi, I'm Adam". Class begins . . .

Considering the Interplay of Discourses

Much has been written about the impact that biography has on learning to teach (Vinz, 1996), the significant role that prior beliefs play in filtering the learning to teach experience, and the trends that have evolved in the teaching of writing, what has not been explored deeply is the impact that interplay of those biographies and beliefs has on learning of teaching writing. This interplay of discourses among others is what Bakhtin identifies as the chief matter of understanding. He suggests that learning evolve out of the tension of the exotopy and the nonfusion of the "I" with the other that takes place in such an interaction. Paul, Emily, Helen, Adam, and Natalie clearly arrived at the same teaching of writing class from very different places, which impact how they experience what takes place in that common classroom.

What seems apparent as the class unfolds is that the state of being different, not necessarily their particular differences, was what created the type of tension in the class that demanded new meanings be made beyond those already-made. The students in the class like Paul, Emily, Helen, Natalie did not come to the class as individuals in need of completion by some others, but rather they arrived as capable participants who played a role in their own learning and in the learning of the other participants. Their learning was socially constructed through their interaction and the complimentary and

competing discourses they shared around the common subjects of writing and teaching writing.

Research that considers teacher biography (Clandinin, 1993) provides some insight into teacher thinking and moves understanding beyond the old paradigm of studying teacher behaviors. However, a consideration of the complex interactions between the self and others moves learning to teach beyond biography and locates much of the learning about the teaching self outside that self. Bakhtin's criticized the Freudian emphasis on the id as the core of the self and suggested the other as the core of the self. Recent emphasis on teacher biography and the impact of prior beliefs largely ignores that impact of others, and if Bakhtin is correct in his assertion that "any true understanding is dialogic in nature" (Volosinov, 1973, p. 102). This suggests that much of the teacher education experience is washed out because there is an over-emphasis on the self, with too little attention to how others reveal the self.

It seems clear from looking at this one class that much of what Paul, Adam, Helen, and Natalie learned about themselves as writing teachers was determined by Helen's presence and visa-versa. This is not to say that it necessarily mattered who was in class. Alice's learning of her self is not better or worse because she interacts with the mouse instead of some other Wonderland creature when she first copes with the dilemma of managing her own self pity, but it does matter that she interacts with the mouse. Likewise what seemed to matter in the teaching of writing class was that the participants' differences, their otherness, was allowed to come forth and reveal for each other some more complete understanding of the self as

writing teacher. Alice learns about Alice when she sees herself through the mouse and hears her won longings for her cat Dinah through the ears of another that fears cats. The mouse shows Alice her indifference towards others and helps her to develop a more complete vision of herself, which in turn gives her the knowledge that she needs to change. Emily's concern for making learning to write a serious and largely academic experience helped Paul to see his own belief in the power of hands-on learning from a new perspective. Without the dissonance of Emily's teaching writing discourse Paul would not have had the opportunity to see his teaching writing self in that way. This does not mean necessarily mean that Paul had a better experience or would have learned less if Emily had not been present, but what it does seem to suggest is that Emily's presence made a difference in Paul's learning to teach writing.

Having drawn attention to the differences among the participants in the class and argued that it is the dialogic that reveals a more complete understanding of the self as writing teacher, I turn to the description and analysis of what happened during one semester-long teaching of writing class. The aim of which is to reveal the complexities of learning to teach writing and consider principles that guide that work, so that preservice English teachers' learning to teach writing better withstand the tendency to be washed-out by their teaching writing experience. The extended hope is that the new meaning created during the teacher education experience might be deeply rooted enough to be part of another interplay with others in the actual teaching setting. In this way the learning to teach writing discourses might

travel with preservice English teachers beyond the teacher education classroom.

Now we move on to consider the actual "scenarios" in which the preservice English teachers participated. These "scenarios" as, the term is used by Bakhtin, consider the interplay of the "I" the Other and the object of their utterances. For the purposes of this study "scenarios" are comprised of the interplay among the preservice English teachers, the English Education Professor and the subjects of writing and teaching of writing. The following sections are organized along the time-line of the actual class and each "scenario" is analyzed by considering the interactions that took place between the participants. The empirical assertions derived from the analysis of those interactions are further analyzed by drawing from data gathered from interviews and responses to questionnaires. Scenes from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* are used intermittently to illuminate the analysis of the preservice English teachers' experiences.

The Class as Other

The classroom was located in a building that looked like it had been designed by the imagination of Charles Dickens. In contrast with the more modern buildings in the surrounding area, the brick building that housed the teacher education program looked right out of the early nineteenth century. It always seemed as if thick black smoke should have been billowing from the roof top.

While a great deal of the interior of the building was being remodeled, the teaching of writing classroom was in the original condition with peeling paint, and a sagging acoustic ceiling. The floor was wood and a collection of twenty-five or so single student desks filled the space. The classroom was part of a larger room with an accordion divider acting as one wall. The opposite wall had a chalkboard. The door to the room was large with a small window at the top. Opposite the door were huge nearly floor to ceiling windows that looked across the street to an apartment building. There was a clock that sat above the accordion wall, but it never showed the correct time.

The rather squalor conditions of the teacher education building and their contrast with the obviously state of the art condition of both the law school and the school of business reinforced the us versus them feeling among the preservice English teachers. Before the class even started there was a shared sense of belonging to a marginalized group. Couple this with the caretaker nature of those attracted to teaching and you already had the makings for a strong community. The class was ripe for valuing one another in what seemed to be a world where their work was neither understood nor valued. Sure they knew that others thought of teaching as a noble profession, but there was also an awareness that it was a profession into which you basically volunteered and for which your success would be rewarded in the form of good will, not money or material comforts.

This palpable need to know and care for the others that was present in the classroom led me to frame the study with Bakhtin's dialogical principle. Bakhtin's theory recognizes the role that interactions between the self and others play in the process of developing self awareness. Consequently, his

theory helped me to focus on the dialoguing and reaching out to others that the preservice English teachers did in an effort to better understand who they were becoming as teachers of writing and to explore means for coping with the dilemmas inherent to teaching writing.

While teachers have traditionally worked in isolation (Lortie, 1975), their choice of teaching as a profession suggests that they are by their very nature curious and social creatures. Teachers like to be around others, which may predispose them to be open to learning from others. This openness to developing an understanding about the self from others outside the self suggests that Bakhtin's theory is well suited as a theory for framing inquiries aimed at understanding the learning experiences of preservice teachers, who seem open to the role that others can play in revealing more complete views of individuals. The first step in creating a space where such learning from and by others can take place is to introduce the others to one another. Thus it was with informally structured introductions and the learning of names that Adam began his class.

Talk of Professionalism

During the introductory portion of the first class, Adam spoke about the English Education Program at the University by reviewing some of the program's aims. He explained that the program hoped to help students do the following: learn to work well with others by dialoguing; learn processes of describing, analyzing and evaluating the teaching of writing; learn to identify teaching goals. Adam recommended that those steps be taken in

sequence to help avoid making assumptions about students or moving to evaluations of students too quickly. Adam explained that he and his colleagues were there to help the preservice English teachers, but that part of being professional meant managing your own life and work. He explained that he thought of his colleagues as his friends and he shared how closely they worked together.

This talk about his own professional relationship with colleagues segued into a more general discussion of what it meant to be a professional teacher. Adam framed the discussion by identifying three behaviors practiced by professional teachers: working with others, observing, and setting goals. Adam explained that teachers needed to be able to work with others. He identified the value of observing and explained that observing entailed three steps that should be done in order to avoid making assumptions or moving to evaluation too quickly: describe, analyze, and evaluate.

In discussing the importance of goals, Adam explained that teachers should write down their goals. He illustrated this point by sharing a story about handing out paper to his students who wrote down their goals for the year, which he then stapled shut and kept until the end of the year when the students got to see what they wrote down. Adam closed his description of professionalism by explaining that part of becoming a professional meant taking responsibility for your own life and work.

To promote some response to the topic of professionalism, the preservice English teachers were asked to address the following questions: What are writing teachers supposed to do? How should class be structured? What support do writers need? What does class look like? What disciplines

do we connect with? What do we need to know to be prepared to teach writing? What have we seen that we want to model or avoid?

Adam framed this exercise with a possible format, but he was careful to explain that he liked control and the teachers should use whatever format they want. Adam went on to say the he often treated his graduate students the same way he treated his middle school students because he is Adam and he can only be the be the type of teacher he is. He can only be himself. Which is not to say that his way is the only way or the best way, it is just his way. This type of openness seemed to make Adam more accessible. It took the edge off of his role as expert because he did not hold himself out as a model to be emulated accept to say that he was true to his self in his teaching. The implication was that each person in the room would become a different type of writing teacher. An awareness of the multiple teaching selves that would emerge seemed to remove any feelings of competition and seemed to increase the degree to which the preservice English teachers were aware of the possibility that they would learn just as much from one another as they would from Adam. Late in the semester during a visit to the Middle School where Adam taught, it became clearer to members of the class that much of teaching was about being your self with students.

Samantha was the most outspoken and controversial member of the class. She had taught for two years at a small private school in Vermont and she came to the class with what seemed at times like a mission to protect students from what she saw as manipulative teaching. Any efforts to direct student learning were met by Samantha with great disdain. She saw herself as an advocate for students' rights to learn for themselves with as little

teacher interference as possible. Samantha believed that students knew what they needed and that teachers needed to stay out of the way as much as possible. It was not until the visit to Adam's middle school that Samantha became comfortable with the idea that teachers had to be themselves and that students had some role to play in allowing teachers to be self-expressive. Her observation of one teacher who as she put it "was really just out there for everyone to see" helped her to reconsider the importance of being herself in front of her students and not being so hesitant about playing an active role in the classroom. It is interesting that while Adam had introduced this notion of being the self during the first day of class, Samantha did not seem to give serious consideration to the idea until she saw another teacher being himself, genuinely interacting with students in a classroom.

While some might look at Samantha's experience as evidence that teacher education should take place in the context of schools, it might just as easily be argued that Samantha's learning was the product of a variety of opportunities to wonder about her own beliefs about teaching writing. Adam's words presented a challenge to Samantha's understanding of a teacher's role, and the trip to the middle school classroom showed some evidence of Adam's view that teachers be genuinely involved in the learning process.

The single trip to the school had a jarring effect on several of the preservice English teachers who had come to think about teaching writing within a particular context. Whether that was the real context of their student teaching, some context drawn from the literature like Atwell's classroom in Maine, or some other completely imagined context, what seemed true for all,

except Beth who did her student teaching at the school, was that Adam's school provided a new look at teaching writing. The jarring affect of this new look suggests the strength of variety and the value of having preservice English teachers' learning experiences characterized by interacting with a variety of others.

Further discussion of the characteristics of a professional teacher opened a class discussion about how teachers should behave, and turned attention to the debate over whether to correct everything in a piece of student writing. June worked for a leading fashion magazine prior to entering the program, and she associated professionalism with mistake free writing. Her editing experience seem to provide her with an image of writing teacher as editor whose level of professionalism would be largely measured by the product: student writing. While others like Jen, who held fast throughout the class to her conviction that teachers had what amounted to almost an ethical duty to teach students the basic mechanics of writing, stood in agreement with June. There were just as many in the class who shared Bob's disdain for descriptors like professionalism and expressed their belief that English teachers should help students create writing they found personally meaningful. As a poet and songwriter, Paul saw the whole business of schooling as antithetical to the work he hoped to do in his classroom. He wanted very much to take the school out of the classroom.

What is interesting about the dissonance of these teaching-writing discourses around the topic of professionalism is that they made for good discussions. On the one hand, the pockets of students who agreed with one another seemed to band together and find solace in hearing their own beliefs

echoed, and on the other hand the eclectic beliefs of the entire class made for a level of tension that kept the discussions from settling into agreement. What seems most important is not what the different groups voiced around the topic of professionalism but that their voices filled the room. Adam's decision to pose questions, frame discussions and then step back was productive in generating discussions.

In later interviews dealing with this notion of what professional English teachers do, the need for teachers to play an active role in seeking out students mistakes was expressed by Samantha, who said that teachers need to push kids to be more diligent about adhering to the rules of writing. This call for a proactive approach in micromanaging student writing was countered in part by Paul who, in a post-class interview, shared his belief that writing classes should be safe environments where students feel comfortable making mistakes. Bob added that too many teachers run from the difficult issues like student thinking and embrace the practice of correcting mistakes. The interplay between Samantha and both Paul and Bob became an ongoing affair during the class. In many ways they almost formed two different camps around topics. They were joined by their dissonance and seemed to thrive on disagreement. In many ways the presence of the other seemed to increase the level of thought given to their utterances. By the end of the semester it seemed clear that statements about free expression and the importance of bad writing were presented with others like Samantha and Jen in mind. The fact that this anticipation of dissonance never seemed to develop any animosity between those in disagreement suggests that the differences were valued.

The discussions around professionalism seemed to be suggesting the need for a balance that meant professionals both challenged student writers to learn the conventions of writing and nurtured students so they felt safe taking chances. But such an agreement about balance was never reached. There did not seem to be any agenda to find agreement. Such a balancing became problematic for the preservice English teachers like Samantha and Emily who focused on teaching prescriptions like punctuation, grammar and usage.

Samantha and Emily, who defended teaching writing prescriptively, struggled with the idea of not correcting everything. They were concerned that uncorrected mistakes would promote poor habits among students. Concerns for correct spelling and proper use of punctuation came up again and again. There seemed to be an association between professional teaching and student writing that was mistake free. The notion of learning to write as a recursive continuum was difficult for Emily to accept because she believed that the basic had to be mastered first. She saw it as her responsibility to help students learn the rules and write correctly. Incorrect student writing was seen as a sign of unprofessional teaching.

Learning the Names of the Others

As a preservice English teacher, Emily was a recent college graduate from a top rated college in the East Coast, who was working for the university's major publication while enrolled in the class. Emily was on the fence about whether or not teaching was the right profession for her.

Throughout the semester Emily wavered back and forth. Her own experiences as a student at a prestigious college preparatory school in New England and her time as a college student both shaped her professorial view of teaching. Emily was concerned with subject matter and resisted the notion that teaching writing would be more about coping with adolescents than surveying literature and producing scholarly writing. Along with this belief in a rigorous and fairly traditional curriculum, Emily was very resistant to the notion that teachers needed to structure student learning. Emily saw such structuring of learning as manipulative and disrespectful to students. However, both of these beliefs seemed to be challenged in the open environment that Adam created for the class starting with the first meeting and the effort he put into making sure the students in the class knew each other's names.

In response to the questionnaire that asked about class work that challenged or reinforced prior beliefs about teaching writing, Emily wrote that "the free-writes, maps, and discussions - as well as the bonding within the class were astoundingly effective in getting us writing." She also cited her own surprise at the effects of Adam's efforts to bring the class together as a learning community. She said, "I don't think I would have worked on creating a safe and open environment in the classroom before Adam's class, but I will now. The closeness between the students made all the difference." During an interview near the end of the semester Emily shared that she valued the students most of all and the professor for creating an environment in which the students could value each other.

As a middle school teacher working in a progressive school where the teachers believed students need to care about what they were writing, Adam had come to value the role of community in helping students to take chances and push beyond their current understandings. He expressed the belief that the students had to feel the classroom was a safe place before they would take risks with their own writing or with any thoughts they had about teaching writing.

Adam set a comfortable tone in the class by presenting himself as a partner in the learning process. The first thing he shared with the class was a dilemma that he felt they could help him address. His friendly introduction of "Hi, I'm Adam" was followed by a simple plea for some help in coping with the dilemma that too many students were in his section. He praised his fellow English educators who were teaching the other sections, explained how they collaborated, shared his concern that his section was too large to really do the type of work he hoped to do, and asked for volunteers to switch to one of the other sections. After a few moments of silence and passing glances among the twenty-one preservice English teachers, five volunteered to leave and were given directions to help them find the other classrooms.

While this open sharing of a dilemma did not directly have anything to do with the teaching of writing, Adam's decision to share the dilemma with the class and elicit help, introduced the role that dialogue would play in the class. Adam's decision to work with the preservice English teachers seemed to bring him into immediate contact with them and challenge any assumptions that the preservice English teachers would be expected to learn passively or been seen as needing anything in particular. From the start it

became apparent that learning in this class would be a group effort. Adam also asked the class about pushing the start of the class up one half-hour so everyone could get home earlier. It was agreed that they would make such a change to their schedules.

Adam's decision to reveal his need for others gave the preservice English teachers the role of active participants in the class. This challenge to any assumptions that the preservice English teachers were there to passively receive an understanding of teaching writing seemed to bring Adam closer to the class and create an environment where learning in isolation would not be the norm. The amount of work that was done in small groups during the rest of the semester built off of this early request for assistance and established Adam's role as facilitator and presenter of frames for student interaction around aspects of writing and teaching writing.

Bakhtin's discussion of the other points out that the self can be viewed more completely through the perspective of the other. This role of the self suggests that the self and the other need to know one another. Adam introduced this notion of knowing the other by explaining the importance of knowing students' names. Adam shared his belief that the teacher should know the students' names by the second day of school. He even made the claim that you could not really teach persons unless you knew their names. In order to act on this belief, he asked the preservice English teachers to think of an adjective that both described something about their character and began with the same first letter as their first name. The class was arranged in a circle, and once everyone had selected an adjective and shared it with the class, each preservice English teacher was asked to recall the name and

adjective of each person in the circle. The second phase of the game followed the same naming of each person in the circle, but this time the naming was attempted after everyone had changed seats.

The exercise ended with Adam announcing that there would be a name quiz at the start of the next class to ensure that everyone took the knowing of names seriously. This first interaction among the students in the class opened the door for a level of communication and a taking of risks that would shape class discussions. Beth would later remark in an interview that she "felt very comfortable with the other students." She said that she believed "a lot of it had to do with the name game on the very first day. That mattered a lot, especially in the intensity of the discussions and the writing workshops." Beth spoke frequently during class discussions and developed the confidence to take risks during some of the class presentations. Initially she had been reserved and felt content to just be in the class, but the relationships that she developed during the class seemed to help her break out of the more passive role.

The positive responses to Adam's efforts to create an open class and give the students an opportunity to get to know one another suggest that participants in the class came to value one another and think of the others in the class as both students and teachers. This opening of the dialog among the students suggests that Adam's most important contribution to the class, as suggested by Emily's response in the questionnaire, was to bring the students together in dialogue around different issues. In my own field notes, I often cited how the energy in the room seemed to be at its highest when Adam was

not involved in the discussion. The class seemed to run best when fueled by the voices of the students and framed by the instructor.

It might be that most of Adam's work took place in the planning of the class and in observing the preservice teachers' interactions with one another. During an interview, Adam explained that he had learned a great deal about his own teaching by discussing the class with his colleagues who had taught the class in the past. During a follow-up interview in the semester following the class, Adam explained that he borrowed much of the curriculum from a colleague who had been teaching the class for several years. He recalled how he had used the assignment that she had found helpful in the past. Thus, Adam's own understanding of himself as a teacher of teachers was revealed through his interaction with colleagues and the students in the class. He did not develop the class in isolation, nor were his teaching decisions during the class made in isolation.

During the class Adam's voice seemed most needed when it came to framing the next discussion, pushing the discussion on to the next topic, or presenting the guidelines for some activity that would call the students into action among themselves. Time seemed to drag the most when Adam's voice was the only one in the room. This slowing of time suggests that in addition to the need for the voice of another outside the self to reveal the self more completely, the number of others interacting might also have an impact on the learning that takes place.

It is certainly the case with Alice that the quality of her learning time takes on a feverish pace when there are multiple others involved. Her experience learning about the caucus race that calls into questions so much of

what she knows about competition and rewards, seems all the richer because so many different creatures are trying to show Alice her own efforts to understand the race as they see them. It seems to be the dissonance of the caucus discourses held by the Lory, the Mouse, the Duck, the Dodo and the Others that reduce Alice to silence and open her to accepting the Dodo's solemn offering of the thimble as a prize for her having been in the caucus race. Alice still finds "the whole thing very absurd" (Carroll, 1992, p. 34), but the overwhelming involvement and solemnity of the others leaves her open to participating in the affair.

This type of openness without a call necessarily for acceptance of any one particular point of view about the object under address may be the type of understanding beyond the self that Bakhtin sees as the product of interacting utterances. It might be that the nature of the object whether it be teaching writing or caucus racing and the degree of freedom given to the voices of the participants plays a more significant role in facilitating understanding than the espousing of truths about a subject by any one expert. In this teaching of writing class it certainly seemed like the most impressionable lessons came out of those scenarios in which the learners acted as full participants both speaking and listening. Such certainly appeared to be the case with the exercise that followed the name game and helped to push the students to get to know one another on a more personal level around the common topic of writing.

Meeting the Others as Writers

Early during her adventure, Alice finds herself confronted by a talking Caterpillar who demands the response to one question: Who are you? Alice's immediate response is " I can't explain *myself*, I'm afraid sir . . . because I'm not myself, you see"(Carroll, 1992, p. 47). Here we see Alice thrown into dialogic with the Caterpillar around the topic of identity. The Caterpillar responds to Alice by saying that he "can't see" (p. 47) why Alice will not explain herself. The truth of the matter is that the Caterpillar actually does see Alice, and he sees her in ways that she cannot possibly see herself. Alice is quite correct in admitting that she cannot explain herself. Only the Caterpillar can explain Alice to Alice, and in doing so provide her with a more complete view of her self. The two keep returning to the same question: Who are you? If viewed from the perspective of Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic such inability to move beyond this question could be due to the fact that the question is misdirected. Based on Bakhtin's explanation of the nature of interactions between the self and others, it should be Alice who should be asking the question about her self to the Caterpillar.

In order to get the preservice English teachers to reveal more about who they were, Adam asked each member of the class to create a memory map that showed their life as a writer. Adam gave the class large pieces of paper and baskets of colored markers to complete the project. To illustrate what he meant by life map, Adam went to the board and drew an example of how his own map might look. The class spread out on the floor and into the hallway for the next half-hour. Adam worked alongside the preservice

English teachers in creating his own map. What was interesting about this project was how much the preservice English teachers spoke of how their own drawing and writing increased their own self-awareness. By presenting themselves for others, they had actually come to recall aspects of their own selves they had not considered for a long time. Like Alice, it was the interaction with the others that seemed to increase an awareness of the self.

When the maps had been created, Adam asked for groups of four to be made, and then he asked that the members of the groups use their maps to identify common experiences, transitions, turning points, periods of growth, types of writing, and "others" reflected in the maps. He asked the groups to create lists of these elements so they could identify patterns and share their findings with the entire class.

From this experience it became clear that there was no common sequence of events or primary influence that was shared by all the preservice English teachers. Their writing lives emerged as being as varied and individual as their lived lives. Paul's writing life was shaped outside of school with the poetry and song writing that he did. Sue, a recent college graduate who was frustrated by the lack of value others in the class gave to correctness, spoke of how her father, a writer, had influenced her writing life. She also spoke of one horrible high school teacher who had brought her writing down and one good high school teacher who had really pushed her writing to a new level in an advanced placement course.

Cheryl, whose writing focused on her family and her experience of being an Asian/ American, shared the story of her Russian Literature Class at Wellsley and how that professor had helped her break through to a new level

as a writer by giving her a "D" and challenging her to move beyond the very formulaic writing she had done in high school. She remembered high school English as a joke and saw herself during that time as more of a math and science student.

During the class discussion that took place on the second day of the class around the preservice English teachers' own writing, June explained that she writes the way she talks while Cheryl's writing is much more formal. June went so far as to describe Cheryl's writing as "nicer" than her own. Cheryl responded by acknowledging that June's writing was funny. Adam drew attention to the issues of voice and audience. Helen made the point that classroom writing is different than writing done outside of school. Gale, who seemed unsure of the role her own life would play in her teaching of writing and who did not self identify as a writer, wondered how personal teachers should allow students to become. She acknowledged that she censored her own writing in school. Natalie pointed out that each person in her group seemed to get personal right away in their writing. Adam explained the importance of learning to read the different comfort levels of students.

The majority of the preservice English teachers in the class identified themselves as sometime journal/ diary writers, but most also admitted to not being able to keep up with their journal writing. They talked of wanting to find ways to write each day and hoped they could help their students discover the value of writing as a means for thinking about their lives and keeping some record of their thoughts. Hayden believed that, "Writing should be used as a tool or a vehicle. Writing can be used to work out one's

thoughts and feelings. It can also serve as a passport into relating your ideas to another."

This personal use of writing was shared by the other preservice teachers, but there was also a shared sense that such writing would not be valued in schools as much as more academic writing like analytical essays.

The types of experiences that had shaped the preservice English teacher's views of writing varied from professional experiences working in publishing to more personal experiences like the trip Tricia took to London and the journal she kept during that experience. The timing of the experiences also varied. Wendy recalled the prize she won in seventh grade for a poem she entered in a contest. Paul told the story of a prize he was awarded for a short story he wrote during his senior year in college and how that recognition caused him to first see himself as a writer. Lauren went as far back in her childhood as the days when she memorized nursery rhymes and wrote her own rhymes. Beth shared how she had used journal writing as an opportunity to reflect on her day to day life.

The mapping and the discussions that followed revealed the collage of experiences and persons who had shaped the writing lives of the preservice English teachers in the classroom and showed that the turning points varied widely in terms of both when they happened and where they happened. What seemed to emerge was that there was no straight line of development and no particular type of learning that you could expect from any one experience. For every good teacher that opened a new view of writing there was an equally bad teacher who shut down much of writing. There was not even any predictable correlation in terms of the outcome from positive and

negative experiences. Some negative experiences like Cheryl's "D" in Russian literature had lasting positive effects.

Adam ended the first class with a request for two pieces of writing. He explained that he needed to get to know each person in the class. He asked that the preservice English teachers write about two clusters of questions: The first dealing with writing and the second dealing with teaching writing. He asked that the responses be presented by describing actual experiences. Adam closed by expressing his hope that the class would provide everyone with the opportunity to evolve as a writer and as a teacher of writing.

Adam would later remark in an interview held during the semester after the class that while he wanted the class to come together as a community of writers and to learn from one another, he had wished there had been more of an edge to the class. He reflected about one exercise in which he took excerpts of writing from the first finished pieces and presented them to the class via an overhead projector. The preservice English teachers were asked to respond to the pieces anonymously by writing a comment on a slip of paper. Those slips were then given to the author at the end of the presentation. Adam had selected what he believed to be good examples of writing from the class. During the post-class interview he wondered if he should have selected poor writing samples to give more of an edge to the discussions about the writing and to present the preservice English teachers with a more challenging experience.

What seemed to come out of that first class meeting more than anything else for those who were asked to look back on the class at the end of the semester was the creation of a community. As the semester moved

forward the members of the class would come to identify themselves as being in Adam's writing class. During the program retreat this sense of belonging to the class became evident as the class traveled in what was almost a pack. They sat together during full program presentations; they ate together, and could be seen hanging out in the same groups of twos and threes that made up their writing workshop groups. What also became apparent during that first class was that the members of the class were very different. There were those like Jen who saw themselves as the gatekeepers of good writing. There were the social activists like Samantha who saw themselves on a mission to keep students free of manipulating teachers. There were the poets and the songwriters like Paul and Bob who wanted to know how to keep schooling out of their classrooms. There was Adam who wanted the class to come together as writers. There was Emily who wanted the curriculum to be rigorous. There was Helen who wanted to learn new ways to reach her kids. The class was rich with differences.

Writer as Other

In keeping with the emphasis that was placed on the preservice English teachers own writing lives, Adam opened the second class by giving the class a writing prompt and asking them to write for half an hour. This writing session was followed by Adam introducing the notion of journal writing. He reviewed the dilemma of privacy and explained how important it is for the teacher to consider the privacy of students. He also touched on the phenomenon of journal burnout and suggested a need to be aware of

what types of work the students' other teachers demanded of them. This presentation was followed by small group discussions in which the preservice English teachers read and shared the writing they had completed during the first half-hour.

In response to a questionnaire that asked the preservice English teachers to identify what experiences changed their beliefs about teaching writing, Emily explained that "the journal and process of working on our own finished pieces really opened my eyes to the importance of writing as a teacher of writing." Emily acknowledged that she "was persuaded that this (writing) is crucial to understanding where students are with their own work." Emily's most amazing discovery during the class was the she might be a writer.

Empathy as Learning Lever

Paul echoed the value that Emily found in using her own writing experiences to identify with students. During an interview, Paul said:

As a general rule, the frequent writing assignments and writing prompts in the class made me realize how important it is for teachers of writing to approach the subject not just as teachers but as writers themselves. It made me much more conscious of issues that student writers will continually grapple with.

During a follow-up interview in which Adam was asked to reflect on the changes he would make in restructuring the class for the next year, Adam commented that he planned to spend more time studying adolescents and their needs as writers. Adam believed that it was important to understand what was unique to adolescents learning to write. In light of the type of

responses made by Emily and Paul, it might be that identifying as writers enables preservice teachers to identify with students in a more personal way than *studying adolescents*. Rather than coming to see students as adolescents, this writing experience led the preservice teachers to acknowledge dilemmas they had in common with their future students. This acknowledgment of having to cope with the same struggles seemed to make the preservice teachers feel like they could empathize with their students. Bakhtin sees empathy as the first of two stages in every creative act. He explains the creative activity by saying:

The first moment of aesthetic activity is identification: I must experience, i.e., see and know, what he experiences, put myself in his place, in a way coincide with him. But aesthetic activity begins properly only when one returns within oneself at one's place, outside the one suffering, and when one gives form and completion to the material of identification. (Bakhtin, 1977, p. 24)

If Bakhtin's theory is considered in terms of the interaction between teacher and students rather than as an aesthetic interaction between reader and novelist, Bakhtin's theory suggests the importance of the teacher being able to empathize with the student learning experience prior to seeing that student as an other existing outside the self of the teacher. The reactions of Emily and Paul suggest that their experience as writers created a condition of empathy that made them more aware of the value of addressing issues of adolescence as they impact learning to write. Without this first stage of empathy it is possible that learning about adolescents might have driven a wedge of differences between teacher and student rather than providing a bridge over which those differences should be negotiated. As Bakhtin suggests, accuracy

in understanding others lies in "overcoming the other's strangeness without assimilating it wholly to oneself" (Bakhtin, 1974, p. 371).

As we see in Alice's own adventure, it is her awareness that she is not a Wonderland creature that enables her to see a more complete view of Alice through the eyes of the others she encounters. She does not become like the others, she simply learns to see her own behaviors through their very different eyes. When Alice finds herself in danger of drowning in her own pools of tears, it is the mouse's deep seeded fear of cats, which Alice does not share, that helps her to surface from her feelings of self pity and feel empathy for the mouse. So too the preservice English teachers who often expressed concerns over whether or not they would be prepared to teach writing seemed at risk to not identify with the fears and insecurities of the students they would be teaching. Being reminded of the difficulties of learning to write, seemed to distract the preservice English teachers from their own concerns and help them to see themselves through the eyes of the students and in doing so see themselves as guides for those students.

When Alice turns to caretaker of the mouse, her self pity is replaced with a confidence that comes from seeing herself from the perspective of another located outside her self. The empathy for students that is born out of the experience of being a writing student allows preservice English teachers to imagine themselves as students and see themselves from the perspective of that other. This "other" student perspective of the preservice English teachers reveals an image of the preservice English teachers as more than novice, it reveals an image of the preservice teachers as experienced learners of writing and valued guides for students learning to write. It seems that only the

empathy that comes from being a writing student could provide preservice English teachers with the opportunity to imagine themselves through the eyes of students because of the common ground they share as learners of writing.

Studies of students as adolescents might certainly benefit preservice English teachers in their efforts to know student writers more completely, but it would not necessarily allow them to develop the type of knowledge of their own teacher of writing self that would be deeply understood to the point where it might resist the "washout" effect of the schooling norms that have remained so resistant to reform efforts (Cuban, 1993).

Schooling Norms as Others

Adam moved the discussion to the issues of time and wondered how time constraints impacted writing. Beth explained that she needed time to finish once she began writing. She said that she did not like to go back over her own writing and that she preferred simply to push through to the end. Paul raised the issue of in school writing versus out of school writing and wondered how the two were related. Wendy said that she had kept a journal periodically, but that she had never thought of the journal as a place to tap into her own imagination. Adam responded to this insight by explaining that the journal can be used as a tool to the point where students actually depend on journal writing as a means for being imaginative. Lauren questioned the degree to which students were free to write from their imaginations in school. Beth added that she believed there was need for students to have more to

gain from class than a grade and she saw the journals as places where students might do some writing they found to be personally meaningful. Adam suggested the need to structure freedom for students through the use of things like writing prompts.

This theme of student individuality in conflict with schooling norms that called for conformity came out in Paul's questions. He asked: Why are students stripped of a voice in the school setting? When did this stripping of voice happen for schooling? How can we maintain standards and nurture individual nature? This final question reinforced the polarization of teaching prescriptions of writing or teaching concepts of writing. The development of new high stakes standards seemed to pull more of the preservice English teachers toward Samantha and Emily's view that as English teachers they had what amounted to an ethical obligations to make sure that students knew the rules of writing upon which they would be judged in standardized tests. There was agreement that it would be nice to have the more carefree teaching called for by Paul and Bob, but that such teaching just wouldn't be fair for the students facing high stakes testing.

This polarization of teaching and schooling was made more explicit by Samantha who posed these questions:

To what degree is the student writing experience a product of the school environment? Do we really learn anything about who students are as writers or do we just learn about how they write as students?

These questions reflected the shift in the class discussions from issues of learning to write and toward the more particular issues of learning to write in school. This tendency to fall into schooling discussions did not occur when the teachers were engaged in discussions about their own writing, but the

moment school was mentioned there seemed to be a drawing up of sides. It was as though the teachers were predisposed to think of school as the place where the rules of writing were the bottom line.

Many of the other preservice English teachers agreed with Paul who claimed that he did not learn how to write in school and that the type of writing typically done in school was not real writing. He believed himself to be a writer because he used writing on a daily basis to express himself and to make sense of his experiences.

In these discussions of context schooling played the role of the other in forcing the preservice teachers to examine their beliefs in light of the teaching writing in schools scenario. Bakhtin explains how learning takes place along dialogic borderzones where he sees new disciplines originate out of opposition. The demonizing of schools that took place in throughout the semester and the subsequent polarizing of in school writing and out of school writing constantly challenged the preservice English teachers to reconsider their ideals for teaching writing in light of the boundaries found in schools. The problems of schooling like time limits, quantitative assessment demands, and the politics of being both teacher and evaluator served as “others” in revealing a more complete view of who the preservice English teachers’ were becoming as writing teachers.

The Writer Within as Other

Adam then turned attention to what the preservice English teachers had written about their notions of what it means to be a writer. The majority

of the preservice English teachers shared Natalie's hesitancy to call herself a writer. Most associated serious writing with being published and thought of writers as *persona who earned their living by writing*. Personal writing was seen as something that came out in breaks from life, and there seemed to be agreement around the idea that writers were born, not made. Adam responded to the notion of writers being born by sharing his dilemma of having to tell all his students that anyone can write.

After a break in the four-hour class, Adam reviewed the syllabus with the class and talked about the need for active listening and struggling to be present in the moment of the class. He explained his rationale for not laying out precisely what would happen in the syllabus. He liked to have the class unfold and be allowed to remain more improvisational. Another writing prompt followed this review of the syllabus.

Adam began a story and asked the preservice teachers to complete the story. This writing time was followed by *small group discussions* in which the stories were shared. The class ended with Adam asking for feedback from the class about the first two classes. The consensus seemed to be that while the preservice English teachers struggled at times to share their writing with one another, they liked the experience. The preservice English teachers walked out of the second class *talking about their different writing projects* and expressing a general enthusiasm over the opportunity to actually have time to work on their own writing. To this point the class seemed more like a writing class than a class about teaching writing.

In a post class questionnaire that asked the preservice English teachers about their most pivotal learning experiences, Beth found that the discussions that helped her most were:

The discussions we had about our own writing helped me to view teaching writing differently. I very rarely write outside of class, so writing on my own coinciding with discussions about teaching writing made me see how important it is to practice what you preach. I think teachers should definitely write along with their students.

She went on to say:

We all did what we were being taught. One can sit and discuss and read about teaching writing, but to have the writing workshops throughout the semester really helped me to see what can happen in a writing workshop, both the good and the bad. It was very insightful.

When Adam asked the teachers to step back from the teaching of writing and consider their own understanding of what it means to be a writer, Samantha hesitated to call herself a writer because she believed that in order to be a writer you had to be a professional whose work was consistently evaluated and designed to meet certain standards. She did not believe that personal writing like journaling made a person a writer.

This lack of agreement around the characteristics of a writer suggested that there might also be a variety of writing teachers who did not necessarily believe in one purpose for writing or one approach to teaching writing. All this allowance for difference seemed to remove the pressures to find the "right" way to teach writing and to introduce a new pressure to find a way to teach writing that was consistent with the teacher's beliefs about writing and teaching writing. This identification of beliefs as the determining factor in whether or not a particular theory or method was "right" forced the preservice teachers to examine their beliefs as both writers and as teachers of

writing. Their beliefs became the foundation on which all other learning took place, yet these were beliefs that were themselves in the process of shifting. The result was a type of relativism that left some preservice English teachers wondering if there were any answers to their questions about teaching writing.

Like Alice, who becomes frustrated by the court proceedings she witness near the end of her adventure, there were times when some of the preservice English teachers wanted to throw up their own hands and dismiss the entire learning experience. Seeing beyond their prior assumption that there were certain things one could learn about teaching writing, and confronting the unfixed nature of teaching writing revealed the preservice teachers as participants in their own learning. Adam could not give them what they needed as writing teachers because what they needed was so deeply embedded in what they believed about writing and teaching writing. They could use Adam and others as opportunities for examining their own learning and exposing the unexamined portions of their teaching selves, but they could not just become like others.

This frustration clearly came through in the mixed reactions to reading about Nancie Atwell's successes with writing workshops. In response to discussions around the classes reading of Nancie Atwell's theory of teaching writing Paul said this:

Well the theory that Atwell . . . I don't mean theory . . . I mean philosophy, looking at her philosophy as a writing teacher or as a teacher in general doesn't really say anything about how I am going to teach or even how I might teach. I'm not Nancie Atwell . . . I won't be teaching in Maine . . . Like Romano and his whole thing with the multi-genre writing and the grammar B. I read that and I was like yeah that's really interesting, but you know what am I going to do with

that when I'm teaching in Harlem and they don't know Standard English?

Emily found Atwell's organization was too extreme, but believed that reading about how she ran writing workshops had helped her to think more about how she might organize her own workshops. The difference in those who found Atwell instructive and those who dismissed her work seemed to be grounded in their understanding of the role they would play in developing themselves.

The notion of finding a model writing teacher to emulate meant finding an "other" with the same beliefs and being able to teach in the same context. This "finding a match approach" was very different from those like Emily who believed that understanding themselves as writing teachers would mean taking bits and pieces from others. This use of other more experienced teachers as opportunities to examine the self, rather than as potential models, also seemed to serve the preservice teachers in coping with their cooperating teachers during their student teaching experience. Preservice teachers with "good" cooperating teachers, who modeled the type of writing teacher the preservice teachers hoped to become, were envied by those who found themselves stuck with "bad" cooperating teachers.

This view of cooperating teachers as "good" and "bad" seems irrelevant in light of Bakhtin's theory that the self cannot be given understanding by the other. The notion that the preservice teacher could passively receive an understanding of teaching writing as though it were some gift they had paid for, some thing which they were entitled to receive for having enrolled in the program was widely displayed by those in the class who were unhappy with

their student teaching placement or found the class reading largely irrelevant. According to Bakhtin's theory, the self is in a perpetual state of flux and is capable of being constantly revealed more completely by resisting the tendency toward a desire for synthesis. For Bakhtin the self is revealed through the other based on the uniqueness of that other from the self. In light of this theory of self-development, the more different the other, the more the self can learn about the self by interacting with the other. It might even be argued that those with the "worst" placement received the "best" placement because of the dialogic they had to navigate.

The outcome of this class that focused on looking at the teachers as writer brought the preservice teachers into dialogic with themselves. That is to say that like Alice they developed a double-voice. The preservice English teachers became both writer and teacher of writing. By considering the writing self as an other existing outside the writing teacher self, the preservice English teachers were introduced to an internal dissonance. Like Alice whose imagination thrives in the Wonderland context, they could rely on their imagination to materialize dissonant others within their own consciousness: they could be their own teachers. In short, the context of the teacher education classroom gave the preservice English teachers an opportunity to consider that the writer in the teacher could teacher the teacher to teach writing by revealing a more complete view of the self as a writing teacher.

Teaching Writing as Other

During the third class meeting the class was asked to develop maps of favorite places. This exercise was done as part of the larger process of gathering things to write about. The class was instructed to put as much detail as possible into the maps of their favorite places. As with the first maps of their writing lives, the preservice English teachers spread out on the floor and used the markers Adam has provided. It's was raining and the windows were open, creating a comfortable atmosphere. During the mapping exercise there were several comments made about how the exercise was getting the preservice English teachers to think about things they would not have remembered otherwise.

Adam asked the class what was being learned through the exercise. Beth was amazed by how much she remembered and commeneds that it was the writing about the map that was allowing her to return to her past. Cheryl also commented on how the writing about this place was taking her back in her own life. Adam then asked the type of stories that were evolving out of the maps. Both Paul and Lauren found themselves writing about places where they spent time with their grandparents. As the preservice English teachers shared their places and stories there was the opportunity for them to get to know one another on a more personal level.

As with the earlier looks at who the preservice English teachers were as writers, this exercise suggested the possibility of the writer within the preservice English teacher serving as an other with the potential to reveal more about the preservice English teacher's writing teacher self. This

autobiographical work seemed to awaken the preservice English teachers to the power writing has to facilitate an inner dialogue. This sparking of the imagination by the act of writing sent the preservice English teachers on an inner journey of the type Alice experiences when she decides to chase the white rabbit into Wonderland.

While the earlier writing exercises helped the preservice English teacher's to empathize with the student experience of learning to write, this mapping seemed to help the preservice English teachers identify more with their peers. Each exercise that revealed more of the preservice English teachers to one another seemed to be followed with an increase in the preservice teacher's willingness to speak in disagreement with one another. Familiarity seemed to create a space where the preservice English teachers were comfortable speaking their minds. Although Adam worried that the class did not have enough of an edge, it might have been the very lack of such an edge that brought the preservice English teachers together around their differences. The differences became bridges that the preservice English teachers used to traverse topics about which there was dissonance.

Both Beth and Emily acknowledged in the post-class questionnaire that they had felt comfortable in the class and were not afraid to share their beliefs in front of the others. It may very well have been this level of self-confidence and feeling of safety which allowed for so much sharing of dissonant discourses. Efforts to create more tension in the classroom might very well have caused some to remain silent for fear of being judged.

Acknowledging the Incompleteness of Others

After the break, the class came back together and Adam asked the class to come up with questions about teaching writing. Natalie asked how teachers could take students from the traditional setting into a free environment without giving the students the structure. June asked about how to deal with the students who did not like to write. Sally also wanted to know how to deal with the students who did not learn to play the game of school. Natalie asked how teachers could take Nancie Atwell's from *In the Middle* and apply it to an urban setting. June also recognized a problem with transferring Atwell's work into the urban classroom, but acknowledged that she liked the mini-lessons because they included grammar so the students could keep the real world in mind. Emily found Atwell's writing extremely helpful in challenging her resistance to create a highly organized writing class, but she believed that Atwell went overboard on the organization. Natalie expressed her concern over how it easy it was to revert to what was safe in the classroom. Several of the preservice English teachers wanted to know how to grade writing and still keep learning to write a positive experience.

This din of questions asked by the preservice English teachers made it clear that everyone was unsure about something. It became obvious that no one felt complete as a writing teacher. An awareness of the incompleteness of others and of the diversity of needs expressed the impossibility of covering everything. This state of incompleteness and acknowledging the impossibility of closure are addressed by Bakhtin's argument against

dialectical forms of thinking that aim for high levels of synthesis. Bakhtin favors a dialogic open-endedness and the impossibility of closure. Such an embrace of the incompleteness of the self relieves pressure to fully know the self and celebrates the acknowledgement of an ever evolving self with an insatiable need for others whose utterances shed new light on the self. This may explain why the class was not paralyzed by the variety of questions and why the preservice English teachers seemed so willing to absorb the questions of the others in the class.

All of this discussion around questions of how to teach writing raised a variety of thematic concerns such as *How to transfer what you learn about teaching writing into your own classroom? How to keep the teaching personal without going too deep into your own life? How to keep students on task and have those tasks remain meaningful?* Adam addressed these questions by telling his own stories of how he used workshops in his own middle school classes. While these comments did bring the various questions together, as with other times that Adam took over the conversation and provided some synthesis of the preservice English teacher's teaching writing discourses, the energy seemed to leave the room and the preservice English teachers' attention seemed to wander. This change in the level of student engagement suggests that confusion and disagreement keep learning active by calling attention to the need for discussion.

The class felt most alive and focused during discussions in which the preservice English teachers struggled to have their different voices heard. The class ended with the preservice English teachers voicing their frustrations with the Atwell reading as idealized and disconnected from the urban

classrooms where they will be doing their teaching. There seems to be a desire to read about the failures that English teachers endured while becoming good at teaching writing. Reading about the finished product just seemed to increase the preservice English teachers' feelings of being unprepared.

This desire to hear about the failures and complications was an interesting phenomenon that I had witnessed in other classes. The need for seeing the struggle and the disdain for being exposed to the idealized final product suggests the preservice English teachers were open to learning from the oppositional struggles that Bakhtin argues are at the heart of true understanding.

Teaching Writing Dilemmas as Others

When the preservice English teachers talked about teaching writing, their concerns spanned many aspects of teaching writing such as, but not limited to the burden of assigning grades to student writing, the dilemma of creating appropriate and engaging assignments, and the challenge of offering meaningful feedback.

Ryan spoke of the importance of teaching writing when considering the role writing would play in his curriculum. He expressed his belief that:

Teaching writing is the central focus of the classroom. . Teachers need to create risk-taking learning environments for students to experiment with writing. We need to make students care about writing.

In imagining how teaching of writing might play out in his classroom, Paul recalled a recent observation from the school where he was doing his student

teaching. He acknowledged that, "Teaching someone how to write is such a difficult thing to do." He went on to recall that:

I was in a school on Tuesday and we had writing coaches come in at the high school where I'm doing my teaching. They have a great writing center. There must have been at least five writing coaches in the class at one time plus myself. Plus the teacher, and there was five different groups of students working on their writing so there was a writing coach for each group of anywhere from three to four, maybe five students, and you know, I mean . . . as I was walking around to the groups to kind of see what was going on you know and like every group there was something different happening. like the coach was sort of taking them in a different direction. You know some coaches were more involved, some coaches were less involved, some coaches were offering suggestions, some coaches were trying to pull suggestions . . . I mean it's so difficult to say you know here's how I'm gong to teach you how to write, you know, it's like, I don't know, it's a big dilemma, I mean how can I teach someone how to write?

Both Ryan and Paul valued the personal benefits of a writing life, consequently, they saw writing playing a significant role in their classrooms. However, Paul's question of "how to" teach someone to write echoed the concerns of his colleagues, who all worried "how" they would implement their ideals of teaching of writing and fight against what they had heard would be a significant pull to revert to teaching writing in the ways they had been taught.

Many of the preservice teachers shared their horror stories of having to write five paragraph essays in school. They spoke of the mechanical nature of the writing and how it had become more of a game or a formula that you just followed. Ryan recalled how he struggled at first with such writing, but became so adept at the five paragraph essay that he found it to be more of a fill in the blanks exercise:

Once I understood the outlining method and that you just had to write five paragraphs about the same idea, the whole thing became pretty rote and you could write a paper without really thinking. I want to

help make writing easier for students, but I don't want them to just get into routine and not have to think when they write.

Emily saw writing as more of a skill that students needed to know for college. She saw herself as being responsible for preparing students to write correctly. She believed that, "knowing the basics, such as spelling, punctuation and grammar, are essential to not only communicating well, but also being taken seriously." Emily was afraid that if the students didn't learn the basics first, then they wouldn't become writers. She hoped her students' writing would be taken seriously by others and believed that academic writing would be the type of writing that students would have to use to prove themselves.

When it came to teaching elements of style in academic writing, June expressed the belief that style and content should not be presented separately. She recalled her experience in a high school history class:

I just wanted my writing to sound nice and was only concerned with style until I had a high school teacher in American history who made me get the facts right and give attention to the content. In my senior thesis I finally merged my style with content or academic writing . . . Later in my writing for a fashion magazine my writing went back to more style.

Wanting to become creative teachers of writing seemed to be a hope shared by the preservice English teachers. They each had teachers whom they wanted to be like and teachers whom they did not want to be like. Cheryl spoke of the college English professor who taught her to see how style and content informed one another. She recalled how in high school she had just worried about style and never really given any attention to the ideas in her writing. She hoped that she could teach like her college professor and help her students see that what you write and how you write are intertwined.

Ryan spoke of his eight grade English teacher who taught grammar. He recalled failing the final exam several times before being passed along to the next grade. He questioned the role of learning grammar and believed that writing should be primarily creative. He wanted his students to have fun with writing and be taken seriously at the same time.

In discussing creative writing, Paul told the story of working with writing and students during an outdoor education experience. He described how he would present a certain scenario with a beginning and an ending and then let the student write about the middle:

So I let them go with it but still gave them a point to start and a point to end then they just filled in the middle. I also had a picture of me jumping off a cliff and asked the students to write about what goes on in your mind as you fall off that cliff. I give them the framework . . . There are ways in academic writing to let kids be creative. Writing is an art anyway so it's creative by nature. If I assign a term paper, to me it seems that I have to give them choice about what to write about and ask for specific aspects of their writing. Like give me specific quotations but also some anecdotes. I don't think the two are necessarily separate. Even in creative writing there is something students pull from themselves.

This ability to frame writing experiences that would get students interested and excited by writing was something that the preservice English teachers wanted to know how to do. They wanted to teach in ways that would get students writing on their own, so that students would begin to see themselves as writers or at least to not dread having to write.

Respecting student freedom and creativity was a constant theme throughout the class. There seemed to be a desire to provide freedom, and a concern that freedom needed to be tempered. Samantha voiced her concerns that hands off approach might encourage students to not take the details of their writing seriously. She wanted students to respect the importance of

prescriptions. Like Emily, she was very concerned with the possibility of students leaving her class and not knowing what were often referred to as "the rules" of writing.

Paul, who often spoke of his own frustrations as a student having to perform in school writing he found meaningless while living what amounted to a secret writing life outside of school, questioned such concerns for micromanaging student writing and expressed his concern about student writing becoming too formulaic. He asked these questions: "How do we keep writing from becoming formulaic? How do I see through students who are using the formulas to play the game of school? Is formula bad? It helped me as a writer." There seemed to be some tacit assumption that form will inhibit student freedom or that students are not capable of being free within teacher-design constraints. The reflection that structure helped this teacher as a student suggests the need for his questions to be answered with specific students in mind.

When Alice finds herself in the courtroom she is curious about the procedure and listens carefully as the witnesses are presented in the trial over the stolen tarts. However, she is shocked when the rabbit calls her to the stand. She of course has "nothing whatever" (Carroll, 1992, p. 109) to add to the proceedings and is taken back when the jury misinterprets the rabbit's correction of the King's pronouncement and write down the word "important" in their note books. The preservice English teachers also paid careful attention when it came to listening to other English teachers who visited the class. They wanted to hear about teaching writing from those who were actually doing it, and like Alice, they seemed to think that they really

had nothing to add to discussions around what should take place. Among themselves they had very animated discussions about what they might do, but when the experienced teachers came to the class there was a tone of acceptance.

The preservice English teachers' wondering over "how to" teach writing raised questions of "what to" teach. This is the place where they drew most heavily from their own experience of students learning to write. Unlike the "how to" questions which were usually answered by Adam or one of the students in the class with actual teaching experience, these questions of "what" were often answered by other preservice English teachers, who told stories about what they had done in English classes as students.

Interestingly, most of these stories were about things they would not do. The majority of the preservice English teachers seemed to see themselves as coming to the rescue of students. Ryan spoke time and again of not subjecting students to the same type of "grammar hell" that he suffered through in eighth grade. He said:

I still don't know those rules, but I write well. I can always look up the rules when they I get stuck or can't remember if I need to use a comma or where the semi-colon goes. I'm not going to make students do grammar exercises. It's just a waste of time and a sure way to get them to hate writing.

This commitment to not teach as he was taught was common among the other preservice English teachers. There were, of course, the stories of the great English teachers and the great assignments that they hoped to model, but for the most part they seemed to imagine what they would teach by identifying what they would not do.

The first question concerned how much writing would take place in the class. Some of the preservice English teachers wondered about what types of writing would supplement the literature being studied. Samantha, who often referred to her frustration of not being challenged in high school, wondered how to keep the writing serious and critical. She said:

I do not want the students to hate writing, but I also don't want them just writing about their feelings. I want their writing to be serious and to look at the literature so they are ready for college . . . I'll do journals and creative writing, but that writing is not my real priority . . . where else will they have to do critical writing if not in my class?

This concern that the writing be serious and connected to the literature points to the problem of time. Emily took this problem of limited time a step further when she said:

You have all these things you are going to do when you get into the classroom and you have all this time, but then there isn't time. I don't know what happens . . . I don't know where the time goes. I would like to have them doing multiple drafts and journal writing and writing poetry, but you have to make choices. I don't know . . . it's just hard with fitting everything in. There are just so many other things besides writing that you have to do in class . . . I feel like my writing in the class is not a strong element, it's there but it is equal to the literature and the discussion. Don't have them do a lot of writing in class, they are capable of doing the work on their own. I don't feel like writing is a strong element in my class. I don't feel like I have the time to do much writing they have so much work.

Emily's frustrations with not having the time to do lots of writing in class conflicts with the lesson plan concerns over filling the time. It seems like reflections around "what to teach" make preservice teachers anxious over "how to" determine the types of writing they will emphasize.

The preservice teachers' questions about the types of writing that should be taught revealed a perceived tension between what schools want from student writers and what students need as writers. School writing was

associated with the five-paragraph essay assignment that many of the preservice teachers questioned. They expressed concerns that such writing reduced students to parrots who just took information they were given, put it into a formula and handed it back to the teacher. Many of the preservice teacher's echoed Cheryl's high school experience of getting easy "A"s once they had learned the five paragraphs format. Around this type of experience there were mixed feelings.

Ryan wondered a great deal about what he could do to help students be successful in the system. In response to Cheryl's "easy 'A'" story he said:

The five-paragraph essay formula might be a good thing to teach so the students can do well in their other classes and give their other teachers what they are looking for. I wouldn't want to stop with the five-paragraph essay, but if it helps some students to do well, then I think it is important to teach.

Ryan's reaction draws attention to several themes: teacher versus school, new teacher versus old teachers, teacher as student ally. There seems to be a dual concern for helping students learn the game of writing in school and exposing students to more meaningful types of writing.

In addition to concerns for the particular genres that would be stressed, there was the issue of what type of strategies to teach students. Overwhelmingly, the preservice English teachers spoke about teaching writing as a process. In support of process writing, Paul shared his thoughts about process writing:

I would like to see other people's process because when we go into the classroom we could have all of these more or less tricks . . . like how about you draw a picture about this or make a list . . . To a certain extent those are things that I as a writer do and so I can draw on that and my own experience. One of the reasons I know that I do that is because I have thought a lot about my own process, but I would like to see what other people's processes are. See what they do. In order to . .

. How do you get started? When you are stuck, what do you do, do you leave it, do you come back. We have had that conversation a little bit, but we haven't had that conversation directly . . . As far as teaching and teaching a process of writing I would try and leave it as open as possible, but I would also try to give some models or even, not even giving models . . . but having a conversation with the class, so okay we have a poem due on Friday. How are you going to start doing that? Maybe generating lists or something. What are some ways you can get started doing this?

Paul's questions are consistent with the pattern of preservice English teachers wanting to know where to begin.

The seemingly endless dilemmas surrounding teaching writing provided the preservice English teachers with an endless array of others they could use to reconsider their own teaching writing beliefs. Each time they encountered another dilemma they were challenged to revisit their beliefs about the particular aspect whether it be grading student work or developing assignments. These reconsideration's were made even more problematic, and arguably richer, because of the dissonance of the teaching writing discourses held by those like Jen who saw themselves as gate keepers of quality writing, those like Paul who saw themselves as education reformers, and those like Bob who hoped to show students how to bring writing into their lives.

Their varied views around the many dilemmas challenged them to see the incompleteness of their writing teacher selves and the incompleteness of learning to teach writing, and while such revelations could be frustrating, they also led to further dialogue and reconsideration that gave way to the need for new meaning to be created. Just as the story of Alice is presented to readers as a tale to be kept in memories mystic band, the interactions around these teaching writing dilemmas became lessons the preservice English teachers added to their understanding of teaching writing. That is not to say

that each learned the same lessons, simply that the lessons took on a complexity and richness because of the multiple voices that were heard around each dilemma. It seemed that the preservice English teachers were able to both find support for some of their beliefs through the voices of others who were like them, and to create new beliefs through the voices of those who were not like them. Once again it seemed as though the edge or tension that challenged prior beliefs and gave way to new understanding was made possible because of the open and trusting environment that was developed in the classroom.

This close environment did not evolve out of a likeness of thought or some common methods for teaching writing; the relationships were more personal in nature. They listened to each other out of interest and respect. There was not widely held agreement about the teaching of writing and there were certainly cliches that evolved around those who shared the same beliefs, but those even those smaller groups seemed to grow stronger over time based more on aspects of their personalities and biographies than on their agreements about how to teach writing. Their writing really brought them together because it opened their lives to one another as they took chances and learned to trust each other. This trust them seemed to facilitate a willingness to listen to the others, and it was through that listening that the preservice English teachers had an opportunity to see themselves and their beliefs as writing teachers in a new light.

"Good" Writing as Other

This class began with Adam putting a "To Do" list on the board as an outline for how the class time would be used. He listed the following: meet in small groups to discuss how the journaling about the *New Yorker* and *New York Times* reading was proceeding (reading the *New York Times* and the *New Yorker* were ongoing assignments); discuss definitions of good writing; discuss rules for responding to student writing; discuss sharing writing in designated groups of three (writer support groups of three were assigned to facilitate writing workshops around the two "finished pieces" expected from the preservice English teachers; hold a large group discussion about the writing; talk about how to continue with the fictional pieces being written; fishbowl a piece of student writing that Adam would share with the class; not review the reading, but focus attention on developing the preservice English teachers' own writing as a way of learning about how to teach writing.

Adam polled the class to see how many felt like they had done enough gathering for composing their two "finished" pieces. He explained that he hoped for the class to become a community of writers, and that the preservice English teacher's journals would become places where they could keep a record of what they wanted to write about. He then asked the class to form groups of four and discuss reactions to the reading of the *New Yorker* and the *Times*.

Everyone seemed overwhelmed with reading the *Times* because there was so much information to absorb. This response to information overload

seemed to be a trend throughout the semester as each class seemed to reveal yet another layer of teaching writing that the preservice English teachers discovered through their work with one another. The variety of strategies and methods for teaching writing, which ranged from Atwell's scripted work shops and mini-lessons to the more free ranging writing prompts of Romano, were overwhelming. The variety of teaching writing purposes that ranged from the prescriptive concerns voiced by those in the class like Emily and Jen to the concerns for making writing a personal experience that were voiced by Bob and Paul made it unclear which purposes were best.

Things were not coming together to form some clearly defined set of principles for teaching writing. In fact, the learning seemed to be expanding outward in an ever-increasing web of discourses. The sense of being overwhelmed by the reading seemed to echo the general sense of information overload being experienced. The frustration with Adam's instructions to skim the paper daily to identify articles worthy of more attention seemed to mirror the frustration of not knowing how to organize the new teaching of writing information they were skimming through each day in their readings and class discussions.

They expressed more positive responses in reading the New Yorker. Lauren enjoyed reading the New Yorker because of the high quality of the writing that she felt was having a positive impact on her own prose. June commented that she had been reading the New Yorker for a long time, but had never had the opportunity to discuss her reading. She liked bringing the reading into the classroom. With this assignment the immediate connection to issues of what made for quality writing seemed clearer. The New Yorker

provided a model of "good" writing that gave some reassurance that there was such a thing as a standard for good writing that the preservice English teachers could turn to in defense of their own beliefs about what constituted good writing. The New Yorker seemed to be an ally in the greater cause of recognizing quality writing.

The next phase of the class concerned a two pronged discussion about what qualities were associated with a good piece of writing and some rules for guiding teacher's responses to student writing. Adam's one stipulation for the discussion was that the preservice English teachers think of themselves as persons working on writing, not as teachers. He wanted the responders to be readers.

The discussions about good writing began with the preservice English teachers simply listing qualities. The Preservice English teachers held very definite ideas about writing and expressed biases when it came to the type of writing they valued most. While there seemed to be agreement around the type of writing schools value (formal analytical prose), there was not agreement about what type of writing held the most intrinsic value. There were those who saw value in writing for the sake of writing, and there were those who believed writing had to be done in certain ways for certain reasons.

Some of the preservice English teachers were like the Wonderland creatures who find caucus racing perfectly natural and have no problem with the notion of multiple purposes and awards for all, and then there were those who took a more Alice like approach. Alice, based on her prior understanding of racing, believes the purpose of a race is to win. When the

Dodo arbitrarily announces the end of the caucus race and call for all the participants to receive prizes, Alice dismisses the event as absurd. The preservice English teachers who saw themselves as gate keepers of quality writing believed writing to be an absurd and purposeless activity unless there was a clearly defined goal and adherence to some identified standard.

June, whose recent experience with publishing a fashion magazine had drawn her attention to the importance of writing styles, believed that good writing expressed a distinct voice and helped you learn something. Helen, who valued high academic standards and attention to detail, said that “good writing” needed to be clear. Natalie, who saw writing as a means for giving students a voice, said she liked writing that made her work at the meaning and allowed the reader to make contributions. Samantha, who stressed the importance of giving students the freedom do to their own learning, liked writing that told a story and took her on some kind of journey. Gale, who expressed concerns about getting too personal with students and becoming part of the school rumor mill, claimed the need for writing to have some type of conflict or tension. Helen, who saw herself primarily as a caregiver, who could learn from her students, favored writing that made you want to read it again. Jen, who expressed an interest in working with more advanced students who already knew the rules of writing also expressed an interest in writing with multiple layers that invited re-reading.

Ryan spoke to the value of writing like many of his colleagues who viewed it as a life-affirming tool. He said:

I believe that writing is an important tool for both self-awareness and communication. It is a craft that takes time and patience. It is a process that starts with a creative idea and continues through editing

and revisions. Writing helps students mature as thinkers and individuals.

This notion that writing has the capacity to improve the quality of students' lives was echoed throughout the study. Although there was no one agreed upon reason given for writing having this impact, there seemed to be full agreement that learning about writing would enhance students' lives. For some that enhancement would come in the form of new confidence about the rules of writing, for others the benefits would be reaped in discovering writing as an outlet for thoughts and feelings.

There was a great deal of division around the dilemma of determining the role that a teacher's writing should play in teaching students. Some like Beth were cautiously optimistic about using their own writing. She said:

You have to realize you're putting yourself out there, but in showing your writing you are challenging the students' view that teachers know it all, but that can be bad because they might not like your writing and might not think you can teach them anything about writing.

Others like Paul believed teachers had to be writers in their own classrooms or they would be unable to earn the respect of their students. In an interview during the first week of the class, Paul compared teachers who don't write to football coaches that he had known who never exercised or did the drills. He said:

I'm telling kids to do two journal entries a day and do this free writing, but I'm not doing it. My biggest thing from now on is that I'm doing whatever the students are doing. I need to write because those frustrations as a writer I need to know so I can relate to my students.

These polar discourses around the role of the teacher's writing established a frame of extremes around the issue, which seemed at times to facilitate an awareness among the preservice teachers of the value of

alternative beliefs expressed by others. In an exercise where the class was asked to form small groups and make presentations to the class regarding different readings, Beth became very engaged in an effort with Paul to shape a presentation that would involve the class rather than take on the structure of a mini-lecture. Even in the face of criticism by Emily, who had found the interaction manipulative and beneath graduate school students, Sara expressed real satisfaction from having taken a chance and investing herself personally in the exercise. It could be argued that working with Paul gave Sara an opportunity to challenge her own tendencies to focus on the material without giving much thought to how the presentation of the material reflected her understanding of how persons learn.

There were also moments in much of the small group work around lesson planning and discussions of classroom management where Paul voiced concerns for how his belief in an open classroom might negatively impact his other aim of being a school reformer with the clout to challenge administrators in the way his parents, both of whom were teachers, had challenged their administrations.

The variety of voices in the classroom and the dissonance between those voices did not always result in the preservice English teachers making choices about which voice was correct. The personal nature of the teaching writing beliefs seemed to give real weight to the preservice English teachers' beliefs, but that did not seem to prevent them from adding on more beliefs and creating a richer definition of what constituted good writing. It seemed like the original beliefs remained high in the hierarchy, but the prior beliefs did not cause the beliefs of others to be dismissed. As the literature on beliefs

claims, they were filtered and adopted, leaving the preservice English teachers with more complex and inclusive beliefs about the elements of good writing.

Learning to Respond by Listening to Why Others Respond

The discussion of rules for responding involved eliciting the preservice English teachers' beliefs about what constituted good responding. Here again there was a complicating of original discourses and a peeling away of blinders in regards to the aspects of good responses to student writing. Just as Bakhtin talks about the limits of viewing the self in a mirror and the impossibility of the mirror revealing the complete self, the preservice English teachers' responses to writing discourses seemed to reveal aspects of responding that were not immediately apparent to those who held different beliefs about responding.

In the class discussion around teacher response new meaning seemed to come from the interaction among the preservice English teacher's different definitions of good responding. Lauren, who was concerned with being an effective guide for students, said that responses had to be specific. Paul, who hoped writing would nurture a stronger sense of self in students, said that responses should begin by identifying the strengths of a piece. Together, these responses to writing discourses put forth the idea that specific comments about the strengths of a piece might be effective in creating an open dialogue with students.

Gale, who worried about personal issues distracting students, valued responses that kept focused on the piece of writing. Sara, who shared Gale's concerns about getting too personal with students, believed it was important to give specific suggestions to the writer. Helen, who believed getting personal with students was the most important thing she did in being able to teach them, believed that the responder should be sensitive to the feelings of the writer. Although these members of the class were clearly conflicted over the issue of student-teacher interaction, their comments shed some light on the importance of knowing students. Helen believed that knowing students helped her to get personal. Sara and Gale believed that same awareness of students could be used to keep from responding to student writing in such a way that the comments were taken as anything more than reactions to the writing. Helen showed Sara and Gale how knowledge of students could support their efforts, and the emphasis that Sara and Gale placed on staying with the writing gave Helen a way to be critical of student writing without being critical of the students. This interaction along what Bakhtin would define as a borderzone where alternative views clash, produced the principle that knowing students improves the quality of teacher responses to student writing. What seems crucial is that the same principle was supported by different purposes for responding.

The Revealing Nature of Dissonance

These comments were followed by a time for the writing groups to gather and offer feedback to on another. Adam asked that each writer in the

groups of three receive twenty minutes of feedback from the other two readers. The one rule was that the writer was not allowed to speak while the two readers responded to what they read.

These small group sessions were followed by a full class discussion. Sue, who was very concerned over the lack of attention given to mistakes the writing students produced and the emphasis that was placed on the content of student writing and student intentions, found it difficult to not say anything during the responses to her piece. She felt that remaining quiet helped to increase the quality of her listening. Bob, who had taken part in many similar writing workshops, shared how he liked the space that was created between the writer and the two readers. He believed that not as much came out when the writer was involved in the discussion. Helen, who was critical of methods she found to be manipulative, shared her concern that the whole experience just did not feel right or natural.

Emily's criticism of the workshop exercise sparked a discussion of some alternatives that would allow for the same type of listening, but in a more natural setting. The class seemed to acknowledge Emily's concern and to want to find a way to retool the exercise so that it both felt natural and enabled the writer to listen more carefully to what the others had to say. The desire for a compromise and the effort to reach some agreement around this approach to work shopping student writing was typical of the class. Emily's different view was not dismissed or challenged so much as it was absorbed and considered as a means for making the approach better. The dissenting voice served as the lever for getting at something more than the majority had seen in their original view of the exercise.

This collaboration to accommodate the minority view seemed to pull the class together around the dissenting voice as a show of support in much the way the creatures who take part in the caucus race gather around the Dodo to understand who has won and who will give the prizes. Emily's response was met with questions that took the group deeper into understanding the nature of the exercise. The class wanted to know what felt unnatural and why Emily thought the writer had to have a voice in the readers' discussion about her piece. They wanted to know how her voice would contribute to quality of the experience. What is interesting is that the single dissenting voice was not dismissed as the minority or deconstructed by the majority opinion. There was something about the tension created by Emily's other perspective that caused reconsideration. It was as though they found their agreement with one another uninteresting and not so worthy of consideration as the disagreement voiced by Emily.

Adam closed the class by referring back to the original list and explaining that they had not had the opportunity to get to the piece of student writing that he had brought for the fish-bowling exercise. He set a goal for doing the fish bowl during the next class. He also said that he would read through the drafts of the work that had been completed and put examples of the strongest writing on an overhead for discussion.

Novices as Others

Adam opened the class by asking about the reading assignments. The preservice English teachers explained that they were overwhelmed by the

reading and confused by how many different things Atwell was covering in her book. Several of the preservice English teachers who were also involved in the first phase of student teaching admitted that they had been unable to complete the reading. Adam advised the class to simply think of the Atwell text as a reference and to mark sections that might prove helpful. Jen and others enjoyed reading Romano's work around Grammar B.

The preservice English teachers seemed to want to synthesize their reading, and there seemed to be some anxiety around the realization that they were being exposed to more than they could possibly remember. They seemed to struggle with Adam's advice to think of the reading as an opportunity to just inventory a variety of methods that they found interesting. They wanted ownership of everything and yet they also seemed to want to put their own spin on what they learned. In many ways they seemed to be looking for themselves in those they read and as soon as some aspect of that other did not match with their vision of the writing teacher they would be, they were inclined to want to move to another model. However, the more others who were introduced, the more obvious it seemed to be that they would have to shape their writing teacher selves more out of the bits and pieces of multiple others than by taking on the teaching persona of any particular other.

In an interview held during the semester following the class, Adam expressed the possibility of using texts in the future that dealt with teaching writing in contexts that were closer to the urban setting where he knew most of his students would be teaching. The rationale for such a change in text came largely from his recognition of the resistance that the preservice English

teachers showed towards Atwell because she taught in Maine under what they perceived to be ideal conditions. It was interesting that Adam had selected the book because it had proved so helpful in his own teaching. His teaching had been done in an urban setting with the same student population as that which the preservice English teachers were preparing to teach. His success in teaching writing in a variety of settings calls into question the preservice English teachers' belief that the others they learn from must be of a certain match.

It might be that Atwell was a significant other for the preservice English teachers precisely because she was not a perfect model. The facts that she taught in Maine and had come to develop her expertise over years and years of trial and error, which were the two main complaints the preservice English teachers used to dismiss the reading, raised questions of the role context plays in teaching and of what was reasonable to expect from first-year teachers of writing. Atwell was instructive because she was not what the preservice English teachers wanted. The specifics of her work presented problems by suggesting that in many ways the preservice English teachers would have to reinvent the wheel for themselves and their students. Their learning would be incomplete always, so long as they remained aware of the others like Atwell whose experiences were so different from their own.

Students as Others Who Impact Learning to Respond to Writing

After getting feedback about the reading, Adam asked the class about their experiences so far working on the two "finished" pieces of writing. The

responses about the writing seemed more positive. Although a handful of the class had abandoned their original pieces in frustration and taken on new projects, there seemed to be a shared sense of appreciation for the opportunity to write for themselves. Gale shared how much she was enjoying the opportunity to work on her own writing. She spoke of feeling like a writer and the benefits of meeting in the small writer groups to get feedback. Helen also commented on how helpful she had found the comments from her group. Sally explained that she had abandoned her original piece and had returned to an earlier piece of writing that she was developing. Paul also changed his topic after getting stuck with the original piece. Natalie shared that she was really unhappy with her piece. Even those like Natalie who voiced their frustration with the writing seemed to be grateful for the opportunity to spend time on writing they found to be personally meaningful. The amount of writing that they were being asked to complete had come as a pleasant surprise and a break from the type of work that they were being asked to do in their other classes.

Adam moved the discussion about the preservice English teacher's writing to the issue of student writing by introducing the piece of student writing he had hoped to use in the previous class meeting. He asked each of the preservice English teachers to read over the piece of student writing and make a decision about how to respond. About fifteen minutes was given to reading the piece and considering means of responding. For the next step of the exercise, Adam asked three of the preservice English teachers to form a group in the center of the larger circle of the preservice English teachers. Those three were then asked to talk about how they had responded to the

piece. The other preservice English teachers were given instructions to simply watch the work of the three in the center of the "fish-bowl."

Adam asked that those outside the circle consider what type of advice the student was receiving from each responder in the "fishbowl" and what each person's method of responding revealed about the responder's beliefs about writing.

Paul, Bob, and Natalie volunteered to be the three responders in the "bowl." Paul was the first in the "bowl" to speak. He explained that he had not put any comments on the piece. Natalie also decided to leave the student piece blank. Bob showed how he had written all over the piece. Natalie explained that she had not marked the paper because she believed it was important to know how the student felt about the piece before she offered her own reactions. Paul had turned the piece over and written questions on the back that he hoped would help the student think about the characters in the piece. Like Natalie, he was concerned with learning what the student hoped the piece was saying. Natalie said that although she had not written her questions down, as a reader she had many questions for the student.

Bob explained that he had the same types of questions as Natalie and Paul regarding the student's intentions as well as some more practical questions about what certain sentences meant. None of the three responders knew where to begin with asking their questions. Paul suggested that the questions be asked one at a time in steps rather than being posed all at once. Bob expressed the belief that the reader probably knew what she was trying to say in her head and just wasn't at the point where those ideas were making their way onto the paper.

At this point Adam stopped the small group discussion and suggested it was time for those in the outer circle to respond to what they had observed. Interestingly, Sue, who had consistently expressed her concern that mistakes were not identified in student writing, said that she liked that two of the preservice teachers had not written on the piece and that one had. This conflict had made her wonder how a teacher decides whether to write on a piece or not. Helen, true to her concern for caring about students' feelings, was pleased that each of the three members of the group had responded respectfully. As an experienced English teacher, she shared how difficult it was as the teacher to keep from getting too involved in a student's piece. Helen always seemed to come back to the importance of finding a balance between guiding students and respecting their need to find their own way. She was particularly concerned with finding ways to help students feel valued as writers in her classroom.

Samantha, who shared Helen's concern for students but in a much more hands-off approach, drew attention to a feeling of reluctance that she had gathered from the group. She got the sense that those in the group were very aware that they were being watched and even judged by the others outside the group. This comment echoed Emily's earlier criticism of how contrived the writing workshop with the silent writer had felt. Natalie responded to Samantha's comment with the admission that she felt comfortable as a reader, but not as a teacher reading student writing.

Natalie's admission elicited by Samantha's critical observation, opened to the door to a discussion about the differences between reading as a reader and reading as a teacher. The class seemed to draw a clear distinction

between the two types of reading, making the later more evaluative and political. Natalie felt that as a reader she could be honest and ask questions to get a clearer understanding of the piece of writing, but when reading as a teacher there was an entirely different agenda. As the teacher the responder assumed more of an expert role and there seemed to be more of a need to both justify any criticism and to share some responsibility in determining the quality of the finished product.

This struggle with the level of responsibility associated with reading like a teacher seemed to distance the preservice English teachers from the student and assume a more clinical relationship with the piece. In an interview regarding the dilemma of grading student work, Jen explained that in her student teaching she had come face to face with the reality of attaching a numerical grade to student writing and found the whole experience troubling because she did not clearly understand how she could justify selecting a particular number. She wondered if there could really be any explanation for assigning one paper a score of eighty-six and another paper a score of eighty-seven. She said:

Grading essays on their (students) tests is one of the difficult things . . . you feel like you have to know what each point of the hundred points counts for . . . what is twenty point versus twenty three points . . . it is helping to set up criteria so I know going into it what I am giving points for . . . setting the criteria makes grading easier, but I'm still struggling with numbers . . . the purpose of my comments is to explain the grade so they are not confused by the grade . . . I don't spell it out, but if they were to come to me then I could back it up.

This concern over being able to justify a particular grade suggests that responding to student writing is just as much about the teacher's ability to teach writing as it is about the student's ability to write well. It seems that

Jen uses the students' perceptions of her as a writing teacher as one means of assessing her work. Such a use of the students as others who inform the teacher's view of their teaching self creates a dilemma: students who receive praise are likely to return that praise and value their teacher, students who feel judged and devalued are likely to judge and devalue the teacher, but unjustifiable praise might also cause students to see teachers in a poor light. As the primary observers of the teacher, students, who are required to attend English class and depend on the teacher for their grade, are much like an audience the teacher pays. This means that the writing teacher's own self-assessment is intimately linked to the teacher's assessment of each student's writing. All of this suggests that the preservice English teachers, although they do not know their future students, may already be considering them as the "others" who will judge how successful they are during that first year. This might explain some of the hesitancy and the change in tone of the class when the preservice English teachers were called upon to read student work as a teacher. So long as they remained readers only they could join with the students in working on writing just as they joined with their peers in the small writing groups. Adam absorbed the role of assessor and allowed the preservice English teacher to collaborate. The moment they were asked to read as teachers, the preservice English teachers changed their relationship to the writing and spoke with much less confidence about the writing. The change in perspective from reader to teacher seemed to change the relationship the preservice English teacher had with the author who created the piece.

Imagining Students as Writing Teacher Evaluators

During the next phase of the exercise I volunteered to play the role of teacher in a fishbowl with Adam, who would play the role of a ninth grade student. Together we would attempt to model a student-teacher writing conference. Adam left the room to give the preservice English teachers an opportunity to read the next student piece. When he returned the two of us sat across from one another and began our dialogue. I opened the discussion by asking several specific questions regarding the plot and the characters in the short story that had been written. Those questions led me to make suggestions about how the student could make the descriptions of the character more vivid. I suggested it might be a good idea to draw a picture of the character and surround that picture with words that described the drawing. Then the student could use those new words to make the descriptions more vivid. During the discussion Adam asked several off-the-topic questions like what was for lunch. At the end of the conference Adam asked for reactions from the preservice English teachers.

Samantha explained how different my response would have been from her own. She would have let everything come from the student. She believed that I had been too suggestive and not given enough room for the student's voice. From her perspective, I had just given the student a list of directions about how to better meet the deficits I had identified in the piece. I had not let the student decide on his own purposes or develop his own methods for revision. I defended my actions by explaining how my own teaching experience had led me to believe that students want to have concrete

things to do once they walk away from a student-teacher conference. Helen agreed with Samantha and expressed her belief that the issue was how to let the reader lead and not have the teacher provide too much instruction.

Helen volunteered to take my place in the role-play. She began by asking Adam what he was trying to do with the story. Adam gave no real response and acted confused by such an open-ended question. At this point Helen began making suggestions about things that Adam could do. At times she waited for his reaction to her suggestions and questions, but when no immediate response was given she quickly made more suggestions. As the time passed she seemed to become more and more anxious and to make more and more suggestions. At the end of the five minutes she apologized for getting so out of control.

Bob made the observation that the student had said very little in either of the role-plays. Helen commented that Helen had also seemed to be giving tools to the students. Adam broke out of character and shared his sense that Helen had been giving him too much advice, and that she had actually talked a lot. Lauren raised the point that there was no real solution arrived at. Natalie wondered why more time wasn't spent on the students' intentions and why both Helen and I had gone right to specifics. Sue expressed her frustration that neither Helen nor I had drawn any attention to the glaring spelling errors in the piece. Lauren joined in this comment by asking where the students were supposed to get their understanding of what was correct. Helen shared her experience as a student who didn't want to revisit her writing when the teacher had pointed out all of the mistakes. She explained that she worked best when others saw value in her writing. Sue expressed

the belief that there had to be some direction. Adam suggested that such issues about correctness could be dealt with in mini-lessons like those described in Atwell's text. He expressed the belief that it was important to help the student get the story out first.

This class produced the most tension that had been expressed. Each class had been filled with different beliefs around nearly every topic, but those differences had been negotiated and to a large degree tolerated. But the topic of responding seemed to give a more definite edge to the class. The members of the class seemed to become more entrenched and more concerned with arriving at some synthesis of what defined good responding. There seemed to be more at stake, it was as though these discussions counted and that there was some right answer to the questions about responding. This shift in attitude could have come from the introduction of an actual piece of student writing, but it seemed to be more the result of a shift in the perspective of the preservice English teachers who were being called upon more and more to do teacherly activities. The thought that their own assessment would be somehow tied up with their assessment of student writing seemed to create some anxiety. The work around writing had seemed more important on some personal level, but the work around teaching others seemed to take on even more importance on a deeper personal level. There was something about judging others that weighed heavily on the preservice English teachers.

Jen's concern that she would be able to justify the grades she placed on student writing seemed to get to the core of the concern that students would be judging their new teachers. The thought of being new seemed primary in

the minds of the preservice English teachers, on some level it even seemed as though they acknowledged the expertise of their future students at recognizing good teaching. In later classes that dealt with a class visit to the Center School where writing was taught without grades, many of the preservice English teachers agreed with Sara that the lack of a grades at Center School seemed to remove much of the pressure usually associated with teaching writing in a school setting, and that without the grades both the teachers and the students were able to take more chances with their work around writing.

What was still unclear was whether the anxiety over grades was rooted in confusion over what constitutes good writing or frustration with the way grades seemed to distance teachers from students. The variety of responses to both of these dilemmas suggests that both these concerns are factors that, to varying degrees, explain the resistance to grading the writing of preservice English teachers. What seems most interesting and unexplored was the notion that the preservice English teachers showed such concern for justifying their assessing ability to their students, whom some apparently saw as the others who would evaluate the preservice English teachers' writing teacher selves during that first year.

English Educator as Other

Following a two-day English Education Program retreat to a convent located in a small town, the class met for the sixth time. The majority of the preservice English teachers from the class attended the retreat which seemed

to take their personal relationships to a new level. The convent had become a regular location for the retreat and it was a peaceful setting on the water and surrounded by farmhouses and winding country roads. The idea of the retreat was to develop a stronger sense of community among the preservice English teachers in the program and to take some time to write together. While there were writing assignments and a regular schedule of workshops, the students were able to do the work outside or sitting in the large rooms that overlooked the bay. Everyone shared meals in the common dining hall and students were assigned to rooms in pairs and groups of four. The one evening was used to hold a party with music and dancing that eventually made its way down to the water front.

To begin the post-retreat class, Adam asked the preservice English teachers to write down five words that they would use to describe their retreat experience. From these lists it became clear that the preservice English teachers had enjoyed the opportunity to get away from the school, but there was also a sense that they would have preferred to not have had their time so carefully managed. While they explained that they had learned from the seminars and the writing and reading assignments, they seemed to place more value on just having an opportunity to hang out with each other and relax. They saw value in getting to know each other in a new way, and they found the change of scenery from city to country very relaxing. Several of the preservice English teachers pointed out how the members of the class had stuck together as a class throughout the retreat.

Once again Adam put the agenda on the board. It read as follows:
review reading of writers on writing, lesson planning and mapping a writing

class, Atwell and Romano reading, mini-lesson assignment, developmental lesson planning, work in writing groups, review of deadlines for major assignments. In addition to helping the class organize itself, this placing of the agenda on the board gave the class a look into Adam's own teaching. His stories of teaching middle school and periodic meta-teacher talk about why he did things like close the classroom door when class began or bring the class together for discussion and closure around topics made Adam an "other," who served as a possible model.

The preservice English teachers were bifurcating as they experienced Adam as both their own teacher and as a model of teaching. The preservice English teachers were, in effect, enrolled in the class in two simultaneous ways, they were graduate students learning the subject of teaching writing, and they were novice teachers observing the way Adam taught. Although this bifurcation was never made explicit by either Adam or the preservice English teachers, it was made evident in the ways they reacted to the opportunities they had during the class to act as teachers. The majority of these teaching opportunities mirrored the teaching behaviors Adam used.

In accord with Bakhtin's notion that the self is revealed when viewed through the perspective of another, it seemed that many of the preservice English teachers were experiencing elements of Adam's teaching, like using the earlier name games to get the class feeling comfortable with one another. The preservice English teachers were taking their original images of their writing teacher selves and placing those images along side Adam's teaching for comparison. This comparison seemed to expose the incompleteness of their original self-image and encourage the preservice English teachers to

imagine that self more completely. For Emily this retooling of teacher self resulted in her deciding that she would follow Adam's lead and put time and effort into building a class community, a behavior she had never considered as part of what she would do as a teacher.

When the preservice English teachers actually taught in the teaching of writing class in Adam-like ways they seemed to become more aware of the complexity of teaching. Imitating the Adam-like decision to use a writing prompt to engage the class was followed by the more complex process of trying to decide what the prompt would be and to justify that choice to other members of the group in light of some guiding purpose. Like Alice who comes to the conclusion that playing croquet with the Queen is a "very difficult game in deed (Carroll, 1992, p. 80), the preservice English teachers became aware of the complexity of what appeared to be simple teacher moves like giving writing prompts or framing class discussions. Adam's teaching modeled effective teaching behaviors, but more importantly his example presented the need to look beyond his teaching behaviors and to give some consideration to the teacher-thinking he had used to arrive at his decision to implement certain behaviors like providing writing prompts.

Unlike Alice, whose willingness to learn the game of Wonderland croquet is impaired by the near paralysis that is caused by the tyranny of the Queen, who is constantly ordering executions, the nurturing atmosphere of the teaching writing classroom seemed to encourage the preservice English teachers to take risks. When Alice finds herself playing croquet with live hedgehogs as the balls, live flamingos as the mallets and soldiers as the arches, she is terrified at the thought of being seen by the Queen and she

looks around desperately for an escape. She finds such an escape when the Cheshire Cat appears and poses the question "How are you getting along?" (Carroll, 1992, p. 80). While the Cat does offer some solace for Alice, she does not ever learn to play Wonderland croquet. For the preservice English teachers, future school administrators were often demonized and imagined as playing the role of "Queen" roaming the halls. There was this sense that, like the Queen, the administrator's schooling demands would be a constant distraction from the real work of teaching students about writing. Like the Queen's calls for execution, calls for high stakes exams seemed to loom large in the minds of the preservice English teachers who wanted to be able to help their students succeed at such exams irregardless of how beneficial they believed such exams to be in the more valued process of learning to write. The combination of Adam's openness and the imagined tyranny of future administrators made the teaching of writing class a safe place for the preservice English teachers to experiment and take chances by modeling Adam's teaching strategies.

This modeling behavior became apparent during the first exercise that Adam began by giving cards to each of the preservice English teachers. These cards had a preservice teacher's name on one side and the name of an author to review on the other side. The preservice English teachers then organized themselves into groups of three. Each group was given fifteen minutes to develop a presentation of what they knew about the author whom they had been assigned read. The first group covered the reading of Bird by Bird. Their presentation was organized like a fish bowl where they sat in the center of the room. Bob played the role of teacher while Beth and Jen acted as

the students. Bob asked Beth and Jen to write about their summer vacations. He prompted them by putting a web of ideas on the board and then asked the "students" how they began their own writing. The "students" responded that they did not know how to write. Bob suggested that they write a very bad draft first. The presentation was designed to show that anyone could write about anything. This group closed their presentation by asking the class where the lesson on starting to write might have gone next.

The next group also dealt with the Bird by Bird reading. They opened their presentation by asking the class to write down three things they saw in the room. They explained that this exercise was designed to show that writing gets you to notice things, to slow down, and to become more aware. Natalie added that it is important for the teacher to be able to begin by inviting students to be writers. Beth expressed her belief that keeping a journal helped to keep students constantly aware. Tricia pointed out the importance of recognizing how long it can take to get into a piece of writing. Natalie raised the question of what that time factor meant for students and the time constraints placed on them in schools.

Emily, Helen and Samantha presented next. During a previous presentation Emily had made the comment within her own group that she found the approaches of the other groups insulting and manipulative. She did not think the exercises, which she called appropriate for middle schoolers, allowed for the level of discussion that she hoped to have. Not surprisingly, her group was the only one to not model their presentation after some strategies that had been used by Adam. The group dealt with the reading of Writing toward Home. Helen began by expressing her belief that a

teacher should bring her writing into the classroom and let her students see her mistakes. She explained how she took many risks in sharing her personal life with her students and wondered if sometimes she didn't go too far. Paul responded that the risks a teacher takes should depend on the class. He expressed the importance of knowing the class and how they respond. Beth shared her belief that by putting yourself out there in front of your students you were challenging the students' view that teachers are experts, and she wondered if such exposure would compromise the degree to which students would value what was being taught by the teacher. She worried about the impact on students who did not like the teacher's writing. Paul explained that it was important to be aware of your intentions in bringing your own writing into the class. Gale expressed her concern that the focus stays on teaching writing and not turn to gossip about the teacher.

June, Cheryl and Paul asked the class to write down how they defined a writer and to share whether or not they considered themselves to be writers. Helen responded by saying that she believed everyone in the class was a writer. The only differences she saw were that some writers went public and had their work published and some stayed private. June said that she wrote herself, but that she did not consider herself to be a writer because she did not go to the next level of publishing her writing. Adam said that he hoped to work against such a view of writing in his own classroom. Lauren also shared that she wrote all the time, but did not think of herself as a writer. Wendy said that it was important for students to know that you could be a writer without being published. Adam agreed that students should think being a writer simply means having to write. Jen suggested that persons

don't like to call themselves writers because then the standards are higher for everything they write. Gale expressed her belief that what was most important was that persons use writing to work things out.

The use of writing prompts by the majority of the groups was consistent with the way Adam was teaching the class. In fact, he followed this exercise by introducing yet another writing prompt of his own, which called upon the class to make a list of personal goals that they each wanted to achieve over their life time. It seems clear from these interactions that Adam's own teaching played an important role in determining the ways the preservice English teachers were imagining themselves as writing teachers. It seems likely that Adam's methods were modeled because the preservice English teachers found those methods to be effective for them as students. They were simply using teaching strategies that they knew from their own learning experiences were effective. This suggests that while Adam served as a model teacher, the preservice English teachers served as models for students. They were making decisions about their own teaching by seeing their teaching from the perspective of both Adam as teacher and themselves as students. Their decisions reflected what they had seen Adam do effectively for them. In this way Adam became a teaching resource and the preservice English teachers served as assessors of that resource. Adam modeled the teaching behavior, but their own learning experiences determined the effectiveness of those teaching behaviors.

The presentations were followed by a writing prompt that called upon the members of the class to list personal goals they wanted to achieve over a lifetime. Once the lists were drafted, Adam asked that they select one of their

goals and develop a set of objectives for meeting that goal. This exercise was used to introduce lesson-planning language, so they could begin work around the next topic: lesson planning.

Adam distributed examples of actual lesson plans and a sample template for creating a lesson plan. He asked the class to look at the examples with a critical eye to determine whether they would work. The class ended with Adam suggesting that the preservice English teachers look at Bloom's taxonomy and give particular attention to the verbs.

The interplay between the preservice English teachers' images of themselves as writing teachers and the actual teaching of writing they experienced as students in Adam's class seemed to create new writing teacher images. The preservice English teachers did not necessarily teach like Adam, in fact some like Emily and Samantha seemed intent on not teaching like Adam, but it could be argued that their teaching decisions were made with an awareness of how they were being taught by Adam. In trying to decide how best to get the others in the class learning, they used what they believed had worked for Adam in the class. In this way they seemed to act as experts in regards to Adam's own teaching. Such a practice of consulting with the student-self as expert learner in making teacher decisions seemed to make the teaching of the class relatively straightforward. It was the challenge of making decisions for teaching in an English class that seemed to be more problematic. This is interesting because while they used the few months of experience they had as graduate students to make their teaching decisions in that class, they had far more experience as high school students that could be used to make teaching decisions for that environment.

Thus while Adam became the significant "other" teacher they could use for seeing themselves as teachers of the graduate level class, it seems that their former English teachers and the preservice English teachers' learning experiences in those class would serve the same role. Such a use of former teachers might explain the myth that teachers teach they way they were taught. As experienced teachers, Adam and the preservice English teachers' other teachers represent teaching that works and it was by imagining their teaching selves in the light of those others that the preservice English teachers could feel some confidence in the choices they were making.

School as Other

This class took place a Center School where Adam had worked as a teacher for the last few years. The Center School is a public middle school located in a large city and has a progressive reputation. Moving the class to the context of an actual school and observing actual writing classes with students and teachers had a significant impact on the nature of the discussions among the preservice English teachers. Being in a new social setting impacted the preservice teachers' utterances by shifting the attention to more "how to" concerns. Bakhtin explains that "the speaking subject, taken from the inside, so to speak, turns out to be wholly the produce of social interrelations. Not only external but also internal experience fall within social territory" (Voloshinov, 1973, p. 107). He recognizes that the utterance is constructed between two socially organized persons. During the class held at Center School, the fact that the teachers and students were socially organized

by their day to day school interactions seemed to draw the preservice English teachers attention to that interaction between teacher and student. The teachers at Center School expressed their interest in understanding how to bring writing to their students in meaningful ways, consequently, the interaction between the preserve English teachers and the Center School teachers seemed to always come around to the importance of teaching in response to students. The Center School teacher response to nearly every preservice English teacher inquiry seemed to be this: know who your students are as writers.

What the preservice English teachers brought away from their visit to Center School was not at all general. It mattered that they visited Center School and engaged in "Center School Dialogue." Had they visited a different school, it seems likely that they would have had a very different experience. That Adam taught at Center School and believed in the school's philosophy also seemed to make a difference in the degree to which the discussions at the school seemed to be natural extensions of the discussions that had been taking place in the teaching of writing classroom. Center School seemed to add another layer of complexity to the teaching of writing discourses.

The class assembled in a teacher room. The room was filled with a large table that everyone squeezed around. Adam assigned the preservice English teachers to particular classrooms where they were going for their observations. I was paired with Wendy to observe a writing class with twelve students. The students were working on science fiction stories.

As we wound our way down the hall among the seventh and eighth graders there was a high level of energy as the students talked with each

other in an effort to cram as much social time into the break between classes as possible. When we entered the class the students were spread around the room and they spent the first part of class reading. The teacher sat at her own desk and read along with the students. The second portion of class was spent working on their writing of science fiction stories.

During reading time the students read their own books and the teacher also read at her desk. The teacher seemed to be modeling how to read independently. Remaining quiet seemed to more of the emphasis than the reading. The students seemed to be doing two things at once: trying to look like they were reading, and actually reading. Many of the students remained quiet, but they did not seem to be too involved in the reading of their books. Their eyes wandered around the room and pages were flipped periodically. I found myself studying their body language and the way their eyes strayed around the room. As time passed they did seem to settle more into their reading. The teacher kept an eye on the class while she read, so she also seemed to be doing two things at once and not really focusing on her own reading.

During the silent reading time Wendy asked the teacher a question and engaged her in a hushed discussion. Wendy was a very conscientious student in the teaching of writing class and gave every indication of taking the work very seriously. Her decision to talk with the teacher during the quiet reading time suggested that she did not realize that speaking with the teacher in that situation was just like going up and speaking with one of the students, or disrupting the class in some other obvious way. Apparently, Wendy was not thinking about teaching as modeling. Wendy certainly would not have

interrupted a lecture to ask questions, so it seemed odd that she was comfortable interrupting what appeared to me to be a silent lecture by example on how to read quietly.

This interaction between Wendy and the class revealed her as an outsider, which suggested that being at the school provided her with an important opportunity to see her teacher self in a new light. Wendy had not begun her student teaching, so this was her first opportunity to really test some of her ideas in the light of an actual writing classroom. Although she had been learning with others, in many ways that learning had been taking place in isolation, which by Bakhtin's thinking does not allow for an alternate view of the self. In the teaching of writing class the preservice English teachers were creating what amounted in many ways to self-portraits of themselves as writing teachers. In arguing for the need to break out of isolation and see a more complete view of the self as offered by the perspective of others, Bakhtin points to what he calls the "ghostlike character" (Bakhtin, 1997, p. 22) of Rembrandt's self-portraits. In the world of Center School those self-portraits were examined by the preservice English teachers by both observing the real teaching of writing and speaking with the teachers who worked in those classrooms. The event of the school visit allowed the preservice English teachers to join with the others at the school in revealing a more complete image of the preservice English teachers' views of themselves as writing teachers than seemed possible in the more decontextualized setting of the teaching of writing class.

In Wendy's particular case, her need to speak with the teacher during the silent reading suggested that she valued the teacher as a resource who

could provide her with answers about the purposes of behaviors she observed. When Alice first witnesses the cards painting the white roses red she finds the behavior curious and asks, "Why are you painting those roses?" (Carroll, 1992, p. 76). The cards respond by explaining that the roses are supposed to be red and that they are using the paint to correct the error before the Queen arrives. This behavior only makes sense, given that the paint will obviously cause the roses to die, for those who understand that the priority in Wonderland is to appease the Queen. Many of the behaviors the preservice English teachers witnessed during the Center School visit also came to be understood once it was clear that the priority at Center School was to engage students in writing they found personally meaningful. Acknowledging this connection between teaching and school philosophy helped to reveal the extent to which the preservice English teachers' own teaching would probably come to reflect the philosophies and cultures of the schools where they would teach. This connection between teaching and school culture further complicated lesson planning discussions the preservice English teachers held toward the end of their Center School visit by calling into question the point of creating lessons that were not designed with a particular setting and specific students in mind.

Once the students had stopped reading they were asked to write summaries of what they had read. The teacher moved around the room and made a visual check to see how the summaries were going and to offer advice to keep the students on task. Wendy did not take one note until the teacher went into "action." It seemed as though she was not really aware of all that was happening in the room among the students while the teacher was

reading. It appeared as though Wendy took notes on the same types of things that the students took notes on: teacher talk.

Next the teacher asked the students to take out work they had been doing. The students took out their notes on heroes and heroines and the types of fantasy characters they had been studying. Wendy wrote down the directions that the teacher gave to the students. The students were instructed to write one-page introductions that described their characters. In order to do this writing, the students drew from artifacts and charts they had developed during their study of characters. The students were also allowed to interact by working with one another.

The teacher modeled brainstorming exercise to help the student begin, and then she wandered around the room giving individual help to students. It was clear during her wandering that some students struggled to stay on task while others became focused and seemed to need no help. The teacher's body language and occasional glances suggested that she was quite aware of the students who had the most difficulty staying focused on the task. During the writing time the teacher pointed out that they were all working on first drafts and she told the students to not worry about mistakes. She just wanted them to write as much as they could as fast as they could. When the teacher walked around the room and cast her eyes over the entire group the tone changed and students appeared to become more focused.

As the time passed the students seemed to settle into their writing, but it was difficult to tell what they are doing, and it may have been that they were just growing quieter. The teacher explained to us that the students would not write a whole story, they would just do a lot of short pieces of a

story, nothing longer than two or three pages, this was explained as being in keeping with where the students were developmentally. The students worked this way three times a week for ten weeks.

Hearing Rationales for the Observed Behaviors of the Other Teachers

After the individual class observations Adam's class gathered together in another classroom to discuss the experience and have an opportunity to speak with some of the teachers whose classrooms were observed. To begin the discussion Adam asked each of the classroom teachers to explain how today fit into the bigger picture and to highlight some tips or principles for teaching writing.

After a few brief remarks by the teachers, Lauren asked how long it took to develop a plan and how the teachers decided on the first step to take. The senior teacher explained that she picked a lot of material to start and then waited to see what happened in her classes. She tried to be prepared and remain open to learning what was appropriate for each class. One of the other classroom teachers seemed to agree with this notion of improvisation when she suggested that the summer was a good time to develop lofty ideas of what would happen during the school year, but that ultimately the teaching had to be designed off of the students.

The teachers from Center School presented their students as the most significant others in their teaching lives. They used the students as the primary resource for seeing their own teaching more clearly. In this way the students and teachers formed a partnership within their classrooms, and it

was the interplay between the teaching and the observed learning that gave shape to future plans. This type of teacher talk echoed much of what Adam had told the class about his own teaching and how important it was to know your students.

Paul asked how the teachers kept track of what each student was doing and how many drafts they completed. The teachers seemed to agree that you just got to know who your kids were during the course of the year and you developed a sense of which kids did which work and who needed the most help and who could pretty much work on their own.

Beth asked if there was anyway to judge the quality of the effort put into the assignment. Again the teachers spoke of getting to know the kids and understanding what they were capable of doing. Beth followed this response by asking if there was any particular way to provide feedback. Here again the teachers spoke of knowing the students and developing a sense of the type of feedback that worked for particular students. Some students worked well with direct feedback that told them exactly what to do and others only needed suggestions or to have certain questions posed to them.

Paul went a step further with Beth's line of questioning by asking how grades worked in the writing classes and in the school in general. The teachers explained that the school did not really use grades because they relied more heavily on extensive narrative responses to assess how the students were progressing. The teachers explained how they were only called upon to produce grades when it came time for the students to graduate and move on to high schools where grades had to be submitted as part of the entrance process.

At this point the conversation turned toward grading and writing progress reports. The preservice English teachers expressed almost overwhelming curiosity over how it was that the teachers assessed each student's work. Aside from more general concerns over class management, grades seem to provide the most anxiety for the preservice English teachers. The thought of having to judge student writing ran counter to the overriding desire they expressed to join with students and serve as allies in the struggle to understand writing. The consensus among the preservice English teachers was that grading was a schooling practice that only caused disruption in teaching writing. Specifically, they worried over how to justify a grade and what distinguished one letter grade from another.

When asked about grading, Emily spoke about her first experiences grading students' essays in her student teaching. She admitted that:

Grading essays on their (students) tests is one of the difficult things . . . you feel like you have to know what each point of the hundred points counts for . . . what is twenty point versus twenty three points . . . it is helping to set up criteria so I know going into it what I am giving points for . . . setting the criteria makes grading easier, but I'm still struggling with numbers . . . the purpose of my comments is to explain the grade so they are not confused by the grade . . . I don't spell it out, but if they were to come to me then I could back it up.

Emily's use of comments to justify her grades suggests that her ability to read student work like a reader is impaired by her belief that students need to understand why they receive a certain grade.

Paul expressed less of a concern for justifying his grades, but he did express frustration over having to serve as judge and jury for student writing. He explained that:

The pieces I read from students, you know, I definitely looked at it as a reader first. Because ultimately then I just become a judge and jury . .

.well this is good "A" or "B" fix this, what are you doing, but to look at it as a reader you can say well I enjoyed this. Maybe I can become less than that authority, but I can become something else as well. I can become the reader.

Paul seems determined to remain a genuine reader of student work, but he is already expressing the belief that he will be the primary judge of student work and that his judging will be based on his tastes alone.

Emily took her beliefs about grading a step further by considering the possibility that students could receive a variety of grades for a variety of reasons. This view of grades as subjective seemed to be a view shared by the preservice English teachers. Many of them found the thought of rubrics to be too controlling and thought of grading as more intuitive. Emily even spoke of the possibility of different types of "A"s. She explained that:

A Kid can deserve an "A" even though another kid gets and "A" but is a better writer . . . Look at the students and what they are struggling with if it is second language or something they are struggling with and that makes it even harder because it becomes so personal. When it comes down to picking a number it becomes so subjective. I feel that if I take or give a point it makes such a difference . . . What is the difference between a ninety-three and a ninety-four? If everyone gets and "A" am I a bad teacher. I think its okay if everyone gets and "A" or a "B" does this look like I am an easy grader.

Here again the emphasis came back to the teacher and how grading might reflect something about the quality of the teaching.

Jen shifted the conversation slightly when she asked if the teachers found there were many students who just did want to write no matter what the teachers did. The teachers seemed to agree that by keeping the emphasis on the students' interests and not worrying too much about the final product, they were able to get students hooked into the writing. The teachers seemed to share a belief in spending significant time getting students to care about what they were writing before there was any attention given to revising or

correcting the writing. The teachers all agreed that the emphasis has to remain on the act of writing.

The question of "how to" motivate students was often followed by wondering over whether teachers should motivate students. There seemed to be some concerns for whether or not students should be expected to enjoy writing. Some of the preservice English teachers questioned the notion that they should be teaching students to love writing. Those who questioned such an effort towards conversion wondered if it wasn't enough to just help students understand writing.

In light of the topic of motivating students to become writers, Emily asked:

Can we expect students to become writers? Is that fair? What are we expecting of them, to love it? We come from a different perspective because we love writing . . . We want them to live the writers life, but in the end isn't it just about giving them the basic writing skills, I would love to have a class where kids were all passionate, but I wonder if that is fair to want to make them writers . . .How do you tap into the writer in the student?

Emily's closing question is interesting because it suggests that each student is a potential writer, which suggests that writing teachers need to look to students for answers about how to help the writer-within to evolve.

Paul offered some support for this notion of looking to the students for pedagogical inspiration when he said:

If I'm bored then they have to be because this is my chosen profession. I feel like I do a lot on the fly and I'll be able to mix it up when I feel them getting bored. So many of the writing exercises I did this summer just seemed right and worked because I understood where students were at and what interested them.

Paul's use of the students as a pedagogical resource suggests that these preservice English teachers recognized that students play a crucial role in

determining the type of methods and the type of material that writing teacher should use.

June commented that the kids amazed her and how much was done in such a short amount of time. She had not expected to see the students doing so many different types of work with writing during a single class. It seemed as though she was most struck by the variety of activity that took place in the class she observed.

Beth said she was impressed with how the teacher she had observed had students only enter the classroom when they believed they were ready to do their work and be quiet. Adam followed that observation by expressing his own belief that it was important to set a tone for kids in the classroom. He thought the student needed to know exactly what was expected of them so they could make informed decisions about their own behavior.

At that point the discussion turned to issues of rules and behavior. Specifically, the preservice English teachers wanted to know about how to begin class and how much freedom to give students. Here again the teachers returned to their earlier point about getting the kids interested in what they were writing so that such issues of class management did not really come into question. It seemed clear from the classroom teachers' responses and the general feel of the school that behavior was not something that was given a great deal of thought. Control did not seem to be a major concern. The teachers seemed much more interested in finding ways to get the students to be excited and personally invested in the work they were doing.

In light of the conversation about the close knit community of the school and what Adam had said about the level of collaboration that took

place at the school, Natalie asked if the teachers ever disagreed on how to handle situations. This question was met with some sense of humor and enough hesitation to suggest that the teachers did not agree on everything and that in fact they were a collection of strong individuals with definite and different beliefs about teaching writing. However, they spoke of such differences as something that should be expected and even valued in the name of diversity. The teachers seemed to share similar philosophies about the purposes of teaching writing, but they seemed to differ on the methods they used to reach that common goal of getting the students to care about what they were writing.

The preservice English teachers acknowledge that they would have to teach many types of writers simultaneously and they believed they would have to learn to be accommodating. They seemed to understand that they would have to assume a variety of teacher-selves in the classrooms. Sometimes they would be able to act as a writing peer in helping the sophisticated student writers to fine-tune their prose. Other times they would have to serve as a "how to" resource for the basic writers who needed help understanding the conventions of writing. And there would be those times when they would have to act as a cheerleader or motivator in getting resistant students to take chances with writing. This chameleon quality was driven by the belief that they had to be the ones to change in the structure just as Alice has to be the one to change when she finds herself busting through the walls of the rabbit's house until poor Bill is forced through the chimney. The preservice English teachers did not want to force students out of their classroom and seemed willing and almost desperate, like Alice, to find any

means possible of accommodating their teaching to meet the particular situation.

The preservice English teachers worried that many students would struggle with writing and be resistant. They recognized that students would be at a variety of levels as writers and believed it was important for students to be able to take some control over their own learning. They did not want to dictate what students did each second by micromanaging their learning about writing, but they also recognized that writing would not be something that students would necessarily do unless prompted.

Shirley spoke about the responsibility of getting to know students and being willing to spend the time identifying ways that would help students get excited about writing. Shirley believed that:

A teacher must be willing to devote patience and be very alert to the individual needs in their classroom. They also need to be aware, enthusiastic and creative when presenting an idea to students. You need to be aware of your audience when teaching writing.

This assumption that students needed to be encouraged to write and would not come to writing enthusiastically was complicated by the other belief that students wanted to learn. The preservice English teachers seemed to believe that there was a willing learner inside of each student who just needed to be found by the teacher.

The preservice English teachers saw themselves as explorers trying to discover the key that would unlock the writer inside of their students. Their ideal was to teach in ways that allowed each student access to a life filled with writing. Cheryl shared her belief that:

Students want to understand ideas and events and understand how to express them to create new ideas . . . they want to be successful, but

you can't expect them to just be like hey I love writing, as the teacher you have to give them those experiences that get them to say hey writing isn't bad.

This notion of the student as potential writer and the teacher as liberator revealed a consistent view of the writing teacher as someone who was in a position to really make a difference in the quality of students' lives by providing them with a tool that would serve them both academically and personally. The preservice English teachers saw teaching writing as a serious responsibility.

This belief in facilitating liberation for the writer within the student was often where the preservice English teachers began with their thinking about students, but such a view of students did not seem to inhibit their capacity to recognize when students were already comfortable with writing. This belief that students would resist writing was more of a caution that the preservice English teachers held. When Emily introduced work shopping to the class she was student teaching she was surprised by the enthusiastic response. She recalled:

I wanted to have them doing more work shopping and talking with each other about their writing and reading their writing . . . so I had them read their writing in class to each other. I thought they would be intimidated by sharing their writing, but they really jumped at it. I was hesitant about having them share, but they were really into it.

This hesitancy followed by a shift in her view of her students and their relationship with writing shows how ready Emily was to have her belief of students proved wrong. That openness suggests that while beliefs may filter preservice English teachers' learning, those beliefs are not fixed and do not necessarily limit the preservice teachers' capacity to replace old beliefs with new beliefs.

After the classroom teachers left the room, Sue described that the class she observed was good, but chaotic. She explained that the students were working on a newspaper. She said the activity in the class never really stopped, and that there was control but it was “different” than what she typically thought of as control. The students were all over the room and talked constantly, but all their activity seemed to have a purpose that was in line with the task of working on the newspaper.

Samantha said the best thing she got out of observing the class was not to be afraid to be yourself because the teacher she observed was really out there with the students. She explained how his unconventional behavior seemed to draw the students in and get them excited about the work they were doing. She acknowledged that his behavior would not have worked for her, but the chances he took and the responses he received from the students helped her to think more liberally about how she might be herself with students.

Natalie acknowledged the seemingly ideal environment of the school and expressed her belief that the ideal was a good place to start. She said it was nice to have the ideal there as a goal and then be flexible with that goal in response to the situation. Natalie was doing her student teaching in an alternative program designed for “at risk” students struggling with social issues and in danger of dropping out of the system.

At this point Adam shifted the discussion to deal with the lesson plans that the preservice English teachers had been developing as an assignment for the teaching of writing class. Jen designed what she described as an ideal lesson that she believed she probably couldn't do the first or second year, but

which she hoped she would be able to do later. She saw the lesson as a goal to work towards. Lauren followed Jen's ideal lesson with a story of her own ideal lesson plan that failed within the first few moments of class. She shared her story of a grammar lesson she had prepared until 2am and her frustration when it didn't go well. She explained how she had not been able to anticipate how students would react and that she had found herself having to improvise.

Natalie added to Lauren's story of how the ideal lesson plays out in the real classroom when she shared her own story of how she did lesson plans last year when she was a student in the English Education Program and had not been involved in doing any student teaching. She explained that she had developed lessons but never had the opportunity to put them to the test of a real class. Her conclusion was that lesson planning without having to take those plans into a real classroom was not really a helpful exercise. She closed her observation by explaining that now that she was actually teaching a class the stakes were much higher, and she was learning a great deal more about what worked and what didn't work in the classroom.

June, who was not doing any student teaching, countered Natalie's point and said that writing the lesson plan was helpful because it got her thinking about sequences. She shared that writing the lessons down changed the lessons in her mind and forced her to actually struggle with how a lesson might play itself out in a classroom. She appreciated the opportunity to put lessons down on paper without the added stress of knowing she would actually have to teach them. Gale agreed that writing the lessons down was helpful. She added that the assignment of writing out five lesson plans had

helped her grow more comfortable with the idea of planning. She found the assignment to be good practice. Beth echoed Jen's comment about using the lesson in the future.

Wendy said she wanted to be working on a plan for the age group that she would be teaching. She did not like Adam's suggestion of having the preservice English teachers prepare lesson for the teaching of writing class because she did not believe that teaching a graduate level course was connected to teaching the middle school students she would be facing in the coming school year. She said that teaching for the graduate school class was not really the context she was preparing to teach. Helen added that planning for an entire unit did not really seem to be getting at the heart of teaching a class.

Tales of the class gone wrong and outrageous student behavior in the face of "weak" teaching seemed to weave their way into preservice English teachers' imaginations. There seemed to be this sense that as the teacher you were either in control or the students were in control. The classroom was perceived as a limited democracy. No one wanted to become like the queen in Wonderland and be either reduced to ranting and raving or simply ignored. The preservice English teachers wanted to be respected and trusted, but they also wanted to be in control. Cheryl put it best when she asked, "What do I do when it gets out of control? . . . I need tips for being firm and yet friendly."

In the face of this dilemma of respecting students and keeping control, Paul spoke of the culture of the classroom and he recognized the need for the

teacher to create an environment rather than find the right rules. He explained that:

Initially I will have to work to change the culture of the class itself. I want to be able to have the education and the experience to transform that culture of school from the ground up . . . I hope to set up learning as such that ultimately it is the students' responsibility for the type of learning that happens. I think that its my responsibility initially, but I hope to make it engaging enough so that the students want to do it, want to take that responsibility for themselves. I can sit there all day and talk in front of a class, but if the students don't value it then they are going to learn.

Here Paul pointed to the notion that there is a connection between how student behave and what they are asked to do. Paul raised the possibility that classroom management is not separate from lesson planning and that keeping control has more to do with developing creative and exciting learning experiences than it has to do with micromanaging student behavior.

Bob acknowledged this need for a level of micro planning when he explained how every detail had to be mapped out for the students in the class where he was doing his student teaching. He explained that it was almost like they were looking for him to break things down into the smallest possible units.

The class spent a great deal of time working on lesson plans and talking about all the different things that teachers could have students do with writing. A primary concern for the preservice English teachers was keeping students busy and filling the time. They were anxious about the possibility of running out of time and even more anxious over the possibility of lesson plans that did not fill the time. The primary concern seemed to be "how to" keep students busy between bells.

The preservice English teachers also wondered about how their lesson plans would actually play out in the classroom. They wanted feedback on whether or not their ideas would work. The class seemed to be divided on the value of writing up lesson plans that were never taught. Some like Samantha found the exercise valuable because it got her "thinking about all the possibilities and how to make choices about what to do." Others like Jen questioned the value of such planning with no particular class in mind because the stakes were not high enough. She wondered how you could plan if you didn't "know what the kids are like and what they find interesting."

Such concerns over how their learning about teaching writing would actually serve them in real classrooms seemed to be another theme of the experience. This wondering about the usefulness of studying the teaching of writing outside the context of an actual classroom became most evident during the session when the professor played the role of a ninth grade boy during a mock teacher-student conference. Paul reflected on that experience and said,

I'm not sure how helpful it is to see someone pretending to be a ninth grader . . . I mean it's not like that is what a ninth grader is really going to be like. I think you have to work with the real thing to know what happens. It's just not realistic to pretend.

There were also those like Cheryl who found lesson planning and mock teaching helpful as a first step. Cheryl explained:

Just having to sit down and imagine what I might do with a class showed me how much time it takes to plan . . . seeing the role play in class showed me how students are going to be distracted and how you have to keep pulling them back to the writing.

Cheryl's wondering about planning shows how she is not ready to consider how those plans will work in the classroom. She simply wants the experience of planning and the opportunity to see some teaching modeled. She wants to become comfortable with lesson planning by having the freedom to write plans that will not be used.

Emily had spent her first few years out of college working in journalism and got excited about being able to help students in the way that editors had helped her with her own writing. She spoke about her student teaching experience with a class that had students who knew the basics and what a pleasant experience it was to not have to just teach the rules of writing. She said,

I can teach the kids I have now because they understand writer language and they know what I mean by a run-on. I can talk with them about style, they already have the basics . . . I want to work with kids who have more sophisticated writing skills because I love to write and like to play with making the writing better.

This class seemed to shift attention away from the preservice English teacher and draw more attention to students. The preservice English teachers seem to be recognizing the incompleteness of the writing teachers' self-portraits because of presence of students in the talk of the Center School teachers. One can imagine the preservice English teachers questioning the isolated nature of their writing teacher portraits. During the Center School visit students began to populate those portraits, transforming them into teaching writing landscapes complete with school cultures and learning students. The Center School teachers' talk of themselves with their students seemed to help the preservice teachers begin looking for the students who would frame their writing teacher selves. As with the other interactions, the

preservice English teachers seemed to walk away from the Center School experience with a richer and more complex view of teaching writing. This recognition of the role of context would surface later in interviews when the preservice teachers acknowledged their awareness of the limits of learning about teaching writing outside of the context where they would actually be teaching.

There were those like June who welcomed the opportunity to think generally about teaching, but there were others like Natalie whose student-teaching turned full time teaching had really made her question the point of studying teaching outside of any specific context. What surfaced from these different views was an acknowledgement of a learning to teach continuum which allowed for a layering of learning rather than a one shot experience.

Classroom Teachers as Others

The dialogue the preservice English teachers began with Center School teachers during the visit were allowed continue into this class meeting because Adam had invited two of the teachers from Center School to come and talk with the class.

While waiting for the Center School teachers, a class discussion grew out of concerns that Center School offered too much of an ideal to really apply to many of the classroom settings where the preservice English teachers imagined they would be teaching during the next school year. These concerns over matching the others they learned from with the world in which

they imagined they would be teaching echoed the same type of concerns that had been voiced earlier around the reading of the Atwell text.

The discussion about the ideal nature of Center School began with Cheryl mentioning the luxury of class size at Center School and the reality of a public school classroom with 35 students. She wanted to know how it was possible to manage thirty-five students, and create the type of learning about writing that she and her peers had observed at Center School. Rather than discuss how the Center School teaching might play out in another setting, there was a sense that it would be more useful to study the specific teaching dilemmas and environments that the preservice English teachers would most likely face.

Cheryl shared her own student teaching experience in a setting that she believed was more typical of the type of classroom where she would probably find herself next year. She explained how at first she had believed her cooperating teacher was militant. She had wanted him to be more open to the students taking charge of their own learning and less confined by such attention to proper procedures and rules of conduct in the classroom. She went on to say that she had come to believe that the teacher's unyielding behavior was necessary to ensure that the students engaged in serious learning. This search for a perfect match and tendency to dismiss other teachers who did not fit the criteria suggested a desire on behalf of the preservice English teachers to identify teaching writing methods that would transfer directly from the other teacher's practice to the preservice English teacher's practice. Such a desire for direct transference was also supported by the positive reaction preservice teachers like Sue showed toward methods

that accommodated a variety of learning. Sue commented that she liked the fact that the workshops allowed for many different themes. Sue seemed pleased to have found a strategy that could be applied in a variety of cases. This type of one-size fits all method seemed to be what some of the preservice English teachers were hoping to have going into their first year.

Beth closed the conversation by suggesting that the lack of a grades seemed to remove much of the pressure usually associated with teaching writing in a school setting, and that without the grades both the teachers and the students were able to take more chances with their work around writing. This "unique" aspect of Center School seemed to cast a shadow over the experience by calling into question how much could actually be learned from such an ideal setting. Some expressed the belief that the experience could serve as a goal to work towards. Most seemed to doubt that they would find themselves in such a setting.

Sharing Incompleteness

The first teacher from Center School to speak was Shirley. She was a graduate of the English education program at the university where the teaching of writing class was being taught and she seemed to share in the progressive theories of the program while at the same time having some very specific ideas about how student creativity needed to be structured. She began her talk by challenging the open Atwell workshop. She recommended using themes or genres so students would do more different writing and challenge themselves to move outside their comfort zones. She did not

believe that the students were capable of pushing themselves far enough beyond what they could already do as writers.

Shirley also talked about the way she looked at what made her a better writer and tried to give her students that experience. She spoke about using her own writing life as a resource for understanding the steps she took to accomplish certain goals with her writing. This use of the writer within the teacher as a valued other in making teaching decisions was supported earlier in the class by the ways the preservice English teachers had been using their own writing workshops to get a feel for what it was like to be a student of writing. Shirley expressed the belief that students benefited from having specific and manageable steps presented to them. She valued freedom, but thought the framing of that freedom was crucial for ensuring that the students do quality work that challenged them to advance with their writing.

She explained how she used writing jams or prompts as a means to get students started with their writing. Here again she emphasized the importance of structuring the student's freedom. She explained that without the structure the students would produce very predictable writing that did not push them outside of their comfort zones. She talked about using writing exercises to get the students to do things with writing that they did not normally do. Wendy wanted to know exactly what Shirley did when she used writing jams and prompts in the classroom.

The thought of students who were resistant to writing raised an ethical dilemma. Many of the preservice English teachers recognized that their enthusiasm for writing would not be shared by all students and while they wanted to share their passion, they did not want to impose themselves on

their students. There was a concern that some students might be turned away by the suggestion that everyone should love to write.

In an interview, Paul expressed that he was very concerned about the degree to which students would feel comfortable in his classroom. He spoke about the need to be aware of what students needed. He said,

You need to bring in different things because there are so many different types of learners, some are thinkers some are feelers . . . Creating a culture in your classroom which makes students feel safe and good . . . My job isn't to tell students what to value. I have certain values, but learning is far more real when the students learn for themselves. When I see myself as a teacher I see myself as a facilitator . . . A professional teacher is one who can create an environment where students aren't intimidated by peer pressure voice their real opinions and not worry about feeling uncool. Important to do activities early on which teach respect. I can show students why they are doing something.

Paul spoke also about those kids who would not like writing and were not going to learn to like writing. He had thoughts about how it would be important for such students to be able to identify with him in some way other than as a writer. He believed that as a teacher he had to make several different connections to his students' lives. He explained:

What about those students who don't like it? . . . I'm more concerned with the middle kids and the kids that maybe haven't found their voice yet. It's necessary for the teachers to be involved outside that specific classroom be it sports or extra curricular programs or whatever. . . It was much easier for me as a student to relate to teachers I also had out on the football field or the yearbook community or whatever. It made me respect them more because they put in that time and it allowed me to have a different relationship with them as well.

Lynne shared Paul's concern for the students that would not be excited about writing no matter what the teacher did. She wanted to know about what teachers did with such students and how they managed students who

failed with writing. She spoke specifically about English teacher success stories like those found in her reading of Nancie Atwell's In the Middle:

That perfect picture of the classroom where everything goes as planned is really frustrating . . . I mean I know that I might get their someday, but for now there is no way that my classroom will be like that. I want to know what happened to get her to that point. I want to hear about the failures and see what she did when things didn't work . . . what about the journey to get to be a great teacher like Atwell?

This reaction to many of the success stories that are found in the literature was typical. Success stories seemed to just increase anxiety and highlight how unprepared the preservice English teachers were to enter the classroom. The greatest frustration seemed to be that no matter which models they were given they knew that things would be different for them in their classrooms because they were different and their students would be different from those in the model. This realization about the idiosyncratic and contextualized nature of teaching writing seemed to increase the desire for more generic methods that would at least give them some place to begin teaching writing.

Bob wanted to know what poems the students read and how Shirley decided what to have them read. He wondered if the decisions about the reading came from the students or Shirley. Shirley explained that here again she saw herself as the framer of the learning experiences. She considered the students in her decisions about the reading, but wanted to have them read writing that would challenge them to read at a new level and expose them to types of writing that they might not have found if she had left them on their own. Shirley said that she thought of the rules she imposed as a kind of game that the students played.

The lack of any resistance or challenge to Shirley's call for structured freedom may have been due in part to the preservice English teachers being respectful and not wanting to make Shirley uncomfortable. However, the lack of any later mention during the class of how Shirley had come off as too rigid, seemed to suggest that as a stranger who worked outside of the world of the preservice English teachers teaching of writing class, Shirley achieved expert status and gave her a degree of credibility not held by Adam or the other experienced English teachers like Helen who were in the class.

Beth asked Shirley if she shared her own poetry with her students. Shirley said that she did not really, but that sometimes she created examples for them to model and that she tried to write with them in class. She did not want to get too personal by sharing her own poetry and place too much emphasis on her own work, but she saw the value in letting the students into her writing life to a certain degree. Shirley said that she did what she was comfortable with and she emphasized how important it was to be your self in the classroom. Shirley illustrated this point by explaining that she did not value analysis as much as she valued an appreciation of language and how those values came through in what and how she taught. She acknowledged that other teachers at Center School were more interested in analysis. She seemed to think that the variety of approaches and values placed on writing was important for the students to experience.

Wendy shared her concern about being in a school where there were more constraints than those in a school like Center School. Shirley pointed out that constraints might force you to be more creative. She shared her own story of having to teach science and computer when she really knew nothing

about either one. She said that she had become the technology expert at the school and that was something that would have never happened if she had not been challenged by certain constraints at Center School that demanded she do more than teach to her strengths. She expressed her belief that teaching was about creativity.

This interaction around the issue of a school impacting teaching raised the issue of the school behaving as an other in a teacher's development. The preservice teachers' concerns for finding the "right" school seemed to be revisited with Shirley's view that teaching was a creative job that required improvisation and a willingness to learn and grow beyond one's self. She portrayed more of a partnership between the teacher and the school. Center School seemed to have helped her develop expertise in technology even though that had not been one of her initial goals. Her story revealed the teacher as problem solver and learner, which was different than the more traditional view of teacher as expert.

Helen asked about how Center School dealt with tests. Shirley said that they did not do test prep, but that they had the highest scores of the schools in their district. Adam followed this observation with the comment that it was important to get students to feel comfortable with language. The preservice English teachers wondered about how difficult their classes should be. They wanted to challenge students, but they did not want to make writing so difficult that students were not able to have fun with it. For many this being challenged and having fun posed a real dilemma. They feared that by being too challenging they would alienate students and become too much of what Paul called "the traditional judge and jury" writing teacher.

There were those in the class who spoke of the demanding teachers who they had come to appreciate only upon reflection. This notion of not being appreciated until years after students had left the class was unsettling to many of the preservice English teachers who hoped they could be challenging without alienating their students. May recalled her Russian literature class in college and said,

I did cautious journal writing when younger, but never really showed myself for fear that someone else might read it. High school English was a joke for me, as an Asian I was more math and science focused and just saw writing as something you had to do for a grade and get over with. A professor I respected gave me a "D" which really served as a wake up call and got me serious about writing and helped me to find my voice.

This need to be tough and hold to high standards raised the question of "how to" teach writing in such a way that students were challenged. The preservice English teachers wondered about "how to" determine what students could handle.

Discussion of rigor also raised questions about what the level of difficulty said about the quality of teaching. Emily wondered if teachers who gave lots of "A"s were good teachers or easy teachers. She said,

I want my students to do well, but I wonder if I am being too easy when they get "A"s . . . I don't think it's bad that they get "A"s but you wonder what other teachers think about you giving so many "A"s. I don't know, it just seems like you should want kids to do well.

This wondering about finding ways for students to succeed seemed to be driven by the need to be an advocate for students. The preservice English teachers seemed to think of school as the enemy and hoped to find ways to help students succeed in spite of the school environment.

Beth asked if the tri-mester schedule at the school gave Shirley and the other teachers enough time to cover the material and get to know the students. Shirley explained that it would be nice to have more time with the students but that you learned to let go and that there were other benefits to being able to teach different groups of students during the year.

Gale was curious about selecting books that could be read by students that ranged in grade levels from fifth grade to eighth grade. The writing classes were mixed across grade levels, and organized more thematically rather than on ability. Shirley said it was just important to read a lot and not really on the books you already know. Here again she seemed to place emphasis on the importance of the teacher's learning. Gale followed this response with another question about how to deal with teaching students at multiple levels.

It is interesting to note the emphasis that seemed to be placed on understanding students. The preservice English teacher's questions seem to take on a Center-School-like quality by reflecting the value the Center School teachers placed on their students. This suggests that one of the benefits of bringing the Center School teachers to interact with the preservice English teachers was that as others outside the immediate context of the preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing experiences the Center School teachers helped to reveal aspects of teaching writing that had not yet been fully explored. It seems reasonable to assume that a different group of teachers from a different school would have taken the class to an entirely different place in the teaching writing landscape.

Shirley then reviewed the structure and rules that she used for facilitating class discussions. In this description she returned to her earlier belief about the importance of the teacher imposing the structure so the students would be pushed to challenge themselves. Shirley also shared her difficulty in knowing how to teach students who struggle as basic readers. She explained that she was really struggling in the fantasy class she was teaching because the students just had not reached the level of reading they needed. She explained that it was her first year teaching the fantasy class and that she was confident that with time she would better understand how to teach the class.

This willingness of Shirley to share her own incompleteness as a writing teacher echoed many of Adam's own claims about all that he continued to learn. When Shirley shared her own frustrations she seemed to at once move closer to the preservice English teachers as a fellow teacher struggling to understand the teaching of writing, and to lose some credibility. The next speaker, Megan presented herself as more of an expert simply by the way she presented the class with lists of "how to" information based on her own successes.

Sharing Successful Practices

The second Center School teacher was Megan. Whereas Shirley's time had been spent more in dialogue with the class, and she had served more as a sounding board for the students, Megan presented her own practice as more of a lecture. Her presentation was listened to carefully and the students took

many more notes that during the time with Shirley. The preservice English teachers seemed comfortable with the notion of Megan as an other who would give them what they needed: detailed explanations of what to do when using her proven methods.

She was an older teacher and her time in the class was used to present more of a lecture in which she went over the step by step procedures she used in her classroom. She taught a creative non-fiction class. She presented what happened during her activities. She explained how she used pictures and drawings as writing prompts. During her presentation the preservice English teachers took what looked be very detailed notes on the step-by-step activities. There was a sense in the room that Megan was giving the preservice English teachers the type of information they wanted to have in regards to what actually happened during an activity. There was no discussion about why Megan did what she did. It seemed like Shirley's talk had been largely theoretical while Megan's was much more practical.

While the majority of the preservice English teachers' note taking during Megan's presentation suggested that they really valued being told what happened during effective activities. In response to the questionnaire question regarding what advice the preservice English teachers might give to English education professors, Helen expressed her need for more theory and discussion around why activities were effective.

When Megan had finished with her presentation she asked if there were any questions. Jen wanted to know what Megan did to deal with spelling and grammar versus the content of the student writing. Megan explained that she used mini-lessons when she found consistent problems

with the student writing. When she worked one on one with students then she focused on particulars. Megan did not believe in using a red pen to mark student writing and she did not believe that grading should play a role in teaching writing. She kept the focus on nurturing the students' appreciation for writing.

Bob, who defined himself as a writer, spoke of the need to hold off on prescriptions until students saw themselves as writers and became invested enough to learn the details. He shared his story of winning an award for writing and how that got him serious about writing. He said,

I was in college when I won this award for a short story I wrote. That was when I first thought of myself as a writer . . . I started taking writing seriously and was suddenly interested in learning everything I could about being a better writer . . . but I was in college before I was that interested.

Others, like Samantha, acknowledged Bob's experience and his concerns for placing too much emphasis on correctness before students were ready, but they became frustrated by the notion that you couldn't hold students to high standards. In light of Bob's remarks and the attitude being expressed that prescriptions didn't matter, Samantha said,

I am getting frustrated. I have a problem with ignoring the spelling and the grammar. I don't know how to touch on the bad. What happens when you never say anything bad and all of a sudden you're talking about ignoring corrections on every sentence?

Emily echoed this concern for correctness when she said,

Writing is for others to read, yeah there is personal writing, but it loses its value if it is not correct. You need the skills to write technically. I would have to short-change them a little because I think the technical more important for them at this point.

Differences of opinion like this about the role of the writing teacher when it comes to teaching the basics revealed the degree to which preservice teachers

definitions of good writing inform their view of good teaching. None of the preservice teachers argued that prescriptions were not important, but their level of interest in prescriptions and their level of comfort with the prescriptions of writing did seem to inform how the teaching of such knowledge would be prioritized.

Bob asked how Megan organized the workshops and if there were any guidelines in doing things like forming the groups. Megan said that the students fell into their own groups. This willingness to let the students form their own groups seemed to counter the approach that Shirley had favored when it came to structuring the students' experiences.

Adam asked Megan about how she prepared and how structured she was. Megan said she could be structured once she understood what the students needed. She explained how reading and writing helped her come up with ideas, she said she just got a feeling for what would work and what would not work. She said she could not really describe her process of structuring her classes.

Adam asked Megan if she had some tips about how to deal with the weak reader and weak writer. Megan said the main thing was that the students must be interested in the topic they are working on. She explained that personal interest in a piece of writing sparked students to write. This belief in the need for students to become personally invested in the writing seemed to be the common theme that came through with all of the Center School teachers. Megan went on to say that in a larger setting the teacher needed to become aware of student's weaknesses and find ways to guide them toward better understanding.

The preservice English teachers expressed a desire to be demanding and they consistently expressed their concern over how to be accepted by students. They seemed to struggle with how rigor and compassion could both be aspects of their work with writing. They took their responsibility for preparing students very seriously and did not want to let students slide by without getting the skills they needed. Lynne spoke to the importance of having students write frequently. She said,

I believe it is essential to encourage students to become good and frequent writers . . . I believe it is important to teach students how to write academically and how to do this well while encouraging and supporting creative writing in the classroom. It is important to give students the time they need in the classroom to write . . . I believe the more students write, the more they will want to write and the better their writing will become.

Emily spoke to the important of exposing students to a variety of assignments so they would be prepared to do more than produce the standard five-paragraph essay. She expressed the belief that:

Students should learn a variety of writing genres, not just the five-paragraph essay. Also, students should be given opportunities to produce more than one draft and work off of teacher feedback.

This call for writing multiple drafts and her concern that students have as much time as they needed was consistent with the more general concern the preservice English teachers had over helping students to succeed. There seemed to be an assumption that as writing teachers they would be working for their students and against the system.

Paul spoke of this high stakes encounter with students and of the possibility that their would be students in the class who might write better than him. He talked about the possibility of having such students learn from each other:

The writing for me it seems, the most important thing seems to be on the process and that's what I'm trying to figure out. How can I teach writing to someone? Even though at this point it's a generic someone. Cause it's going to be different for . . . even having this conversation now I'm thinking about it a lot more, you know what if I'm teaching someone who is barely literate? How do I teach them writing? What then become my criteria for success for that student? If I can get them to write three coherent sentences that's great or then I have other student who writes better than I do and I'm like what are you doing here. Then how do I use that student as a resource for the class? Which gets a little dangerous cause you don't want to hold up one student as the model for the entire class.

This notion of having students teach students in workshops and through discussions was favored by the majority of the preservice teachers as a means for coping with the dilemma of having a class filled with good and basic writers. But their was also the belief that work shopping would require a level of classroom management that would take time to develop.

Adam closed the class by giving the preservice English teachers a writing prompt to finish these two statements:

When Carolyn spoke...

When Megan spoke...

English Education Professor as Other

The class following the visit by the teachers from Center School began with Adam sharing his experience teaching a weekend workshop that involved sketching and writing. He used this story to introduce the writing assignment for the class. The preservice English teachers were asked to take their notebooks to a museum in the school's Humanities Department. The museum was filled with the painting and collages of grade school students. Each preservice English teacher was directed to select one piece of art for

inspiration and to sit and write for thirty to forty minutes before returning to the classroom.

The museum was a one-room gallery with works displayed on the walls and a few larger pieces set up in the middle of the room. The pieces were part sculpture and part painting. Adam explained that the pieces had been put together by grade school students during the weekend.

This writing exercise was followed by the class generating a list of mini-lesson topics. This list was placed on the board: form/structure, audience, voice, tone, getting started, drafting, talking out a frame, transitions, word refining, presentation, peer work to edit, perspective of writer, what's missing, feedback can vary, listening with purpose, grammar. Adam put checks by the topics that seemed to repeat, so the class could identify common concerns. The final list of common concerns included the following: audience, transitions, short story, narrative voice, setting, revision/editing, conflict, workshop organization, chronology, intentional gaps, title, word choice.

Once the mini-lessons had been listed, Adam handed out lesson plans and asked each of the preservice English teachers to read a lesson plan and pass it to another preservice English teacher, having identified the purpose of each lesson. The class was then broken into groups and each group was asked to decide on the purpose of the lesson.

This exercise was followed by Adam's explanation that he wanted to involve the preservice English teachers in the process of assessing their work during the semester. He asked the class to divide into groups and come to some agreement about the purpose of each assignment that had been

complete during the semester. Adam distributed a rubric from the New York Regents test and an article that discussed portfolios and rubrics.

During one group discussion Bob pointed out that the teaching of writing classes portfolio may have shifted from writing more to teaching of writing. He wondered if getting published was as crucial as the class had thought.

After the groups had spent time discussing the assignments they had been given, the class came together for a time to share the findings of each group.

The first group presented the results of their discussion about the two finished pieces assignment. This assignment was to include revisions and comments from peers in the smaller writing groups and comments from Adam himself. One of the pieces was to be submitted for publication. The group presented the following list of purposes for that assignment: see progression of writing, personal growth, sense of drafting, creating a pressure for quality, use of workshops, publishing, encourage us as writers, to assess us as writers.

The second group to share their findings had discussed the journal assignment which had required the preservice English teachers to keep reading journals regarding their reading of the *New Yorker* and the *New York Times*. The purpose of the journal was intended to help the preservice English teachers write each day. Adam cited Ralph Fletcher's thoughts about journals in the syllabus. The essence of Fletcher's message was that keeping a journal would enable the preservice English teachers to experience writing as an opportunity to find a quiet place to collect their thoughts. They made the

following list: make sure we did the work, practice writing, understand the students' perspectives, provide a thinking place where you take chances, and to experience samples of good writing.

The third group was asked to discuss the lesson plan assignment. For this assignment the preservice English teachers were asked to create five lesson plans and/or a mini-unit developed for a middle school and/or a high school classroom. Class time was spent discussing the lesson and unit planning. Particular attention was given to goals, objectives, do-nows, activities and evaluation. The assignment was intended to reflect classroom management strategies and a philosophy of teaching. The preservice English teachers were allowed to work on these lessons individually or in groups of two to three.

Group three listed these purposes for the lesson plan assignment: to practice writing lesson plans, to show employers, to form our philosophy, to evaluate our development.

The fourth group was asked to determine the purpose of the assignment to read the New York Times. The preservice English teachers were asked to read the New York Times as often as possible each week through the week of October 28. They were instructed to skim each issue and read one piece carefully. They were then instructed to respond weekly in their journals to one particular piece. They were to bring their selected article and journal piece to class each week.

Group four listed these purposes for the New York Times article: broaden perspectives outside literature, use article as source for lessons, to document the process of using the articles for lessons.

Adam closed this class by explaining that the homework was to keep the lesson plans and revise them, to develop a new lesson plan, to respond to a partner's writing, and to draft a second piece.

Consideration for purposes of teaching writing became less theoretical and more practical when Adam asked the teachers to develop a rubric he could use to assess their portfolios. Several teachers spoke with frustration about their belief that designing the rubric was Adam's job. Samantha had difficulty with the notion that by designing her own rubric she was doing "teacherly" work with the advantage of knowing exactly how that work affected the assessment of her writing. There was a great deal of confusion around the whole concept that the preservice English teachers' portfolios could not be assessed by Adam unless he knew the purposes they were designed to serve.

To facilitate this rubric development, Adam broke the class into groups to decide on the purpose of each assignment. The goal was to determine both Adam's expectations for each assignment and how the teachers had actually used each assignment. One teacher pointed out that the portfolio may have shifted from writing more to teaching of writing, for example, getting published might not be as crucial as we thought. The first group identified eight purposes for assigning students to write a fiction or non fiction piece for publication: to see progression of writing, personal growth, sense of drafting, creating a pressure for quality, use of workshops, publishing, encouraging the teachers as writers, to assess the teachers. Group two listed these purposes for doing journals: make sure teachers did the work, practice writing, understand the students' perspectives, thinking place where you

take chances, to experience samples of good writing. Group three listed these purposes for developing lesson plans: practice writing lesson plans, show employers, form our philosophy, evaluate our development. Group four listed these purposes for cutting articles for discussion out of the New York Times: broaden perspectives outside literature, use article as source for lessons, to document the process of using the articles for lessons. These discussions presented the dilemma of finding a balance between a teacher's expectations for an assignment and the students' intentions for an assignment. The notion of negotiating assessment came up and seemed to challenge prior beliefs about assessment as work that teachers did in isolation for students. The idea of collaborative assessment seemed to offer hope to those teachers who felt uncomfortable with playing the role of judge, but it also raised issues of control and the need for the teacher to maintain credibility among students.

Preservice English Teacher's Student Self as Other

The next class began with Adam placing a list of topics to be covered for the evening. The list included the following: a copy change writing prompt of a piece called "White Angel," a quiz on our reading of Inside Out, revisiting the rubric for Adam's grading of the class, writer group discussions around the second "finished" piece, and reviewing the lesson plans that were to be revised. Once the list was on the board, Adam asked the class to decide how to proceed. The class agreed to return to the previous discussion around designing the rubric that Adam would use to grade the class.

There was a great deal of confusion in the class over both the process of developing a rubric and the purpose. The task was to identify purposes for each portion of the portfolio and then to arrive at some agreement over how each element would weigh in determining the final grade. In light of the array of questions about the process and some of the complaints about why we were even bothering with such a task, many of the preservice English teachers expressed the belief that assessment was Adam's responsibility. They did not necessarily feel comfortable or qualified to assess their own work. The greatest sticking point seemed to be the problem of trying to decide what Adam expected out of each assignment.

The amount of time spent in class discussing both the purpose and process of developing the rubric suggested that the preservice English teachers struggled with the notion of seeing the assignments from Adam's perspective. While much of the teaching they did in the class suggested that they were very much aware of Adam as a model for their own teaching, they did not seem to be comfortable trying to determine rationales for Adam's design of the assignments. They did not really express any interest in looking behind the scenes of Adam's teaching. It might have been that as students they had come to expect to not be taken into the teacher's thought process and to simply accept the teacher's decisions on face value. It was also interesting that those in the class who had voiced the most resistance to Adam's teaching, Emily and Samantha, were also the most opposed to the idea of determining the purposes of the assignments.

Natalie attempted to ease some of the confusion and discontent by sharing her own experiences in developing rubrics for the class she was

student teaching. She explained that the process was about identifying what should be valued and determining how to grade the work that was to be valued. This did not seem to ease concerns over how the preservice English teachers were supposed to determine Adam's expectations of them.

Helen, the most experienced English teacher in the class, shared her insight that Adam was trying to show us what it was really like to be the teacher with the responsibility of determining how to assess student work. She claimed that in time the others in the class would come to see this creating of a rubric as a very practical experience.

Sue raised her concern that the class was being asked to look back at what had already taken place rather than looking ahead and deciding what should be done. There seemed to be a sense that a rubric was used to establish a plan of action and to guide what students would do during a class. There was confusion over the thought of a rubric as a tool for considering what had taken place and what should be valued. Adam explained that the task was to look at both what work had been done and to make some determinations about how that work should have been done. It seemed from the conversation that establishing a rubric in the early days of the class would have been a good exercise and given the preservice English teachers something to look back at for consideration while redesigning the first "looking ahead" rubric to be consistent with what had actually taken place and the type of work that had been completed.

Adam shifted the discussion to the exercise he wanted the class to work around. He asked the class to organize themselves back into the groups they had formed in the earlier class. Once again the preservice English

teachers grouped themselves according to the different sections of the portfolio that would be completed. This time the instructions were for each group to take a large piece of paper and write down the elements that should be included in each section. Then based on that criteria there would be a determination of three levels of grades: high, medium, and low.

Once the posters were completed they were placed on the board for presentation to the class. The first group to present covered the assignment to have two "finished" pieces of writing. They titled their section Writing Process. This group decided to make a list of the things the section of the portfolio should contain. They listed the following criteria: attach each draft to the "finished" piece, include copies of the drafts with comments from the workshop sessions, a paragraph that explained your writing process. They also suggested the assignment met the following purposes: witnessing the transformation of a piece of writing, an opportunity to develop as a writer, and experience knowing what it is like to learn writing.

The second group to present dealt with the lesson plan assignment. Their presentation focused on the purposes of the work. They did not list the criteria for the assignment. They listed the following purposes: to practice writing and using lesson plans, to create a resource for future classes, to have models to present to future employees, to develop a teaching philosophy, to serve as a marker for Adam to assess our development as teachers, to provide a chance to consider some possibilities for classroom management, to provide the opportunity to see other's work and learn from peers.

The fourth group dealt with the *New York Times* assignment. This group presented both purposes and criteria. They broke the assignment

down into two sections. Section one was to contain the following: a statement of purpose for the assignment, a folder or some other means of organizing the work, a statement about what had been learned, a statement about how the folder would be used in the future. Section two of the criteria dealt with the displaying of the articles from the reading of the newspaper and called for the assignment to include articles that had been selected, responses to the articles, explanations of how the articles could be used in teaching, and rationales for the selections. The purposes for the assignment were listed as the following: use newspapers for lesson planning, be aware of resources for the classroom, gain exposure to a variety of writing styles, gain practice using writing to respond to reading, learn to read selectively.

During these presentations there seemed to be confusion over how the work of the groups would be used to determine grades. Cheryl was uncertain of how quality was going to be determined. She understood the criteria and purposes that were being identified, but there still did not seem to be any means for determining the quality of the final products in the portfolios. She made the specific point that the class had not made any determination about what constituted a good piece of writing.

There seem to be no problem identifying the processes that could be used to meet the intended purposes of each assignment, but when it came to assessing the quality of the product there was much more tension and confusion. Gale shared how uncomfortable she was in defining good writing. She cited the wide variety of definitions of good writing and the variety of purposes for writing that had been expressed by her peers. There seemed to be this sense that much of what was good was relative. The whole tone of the

class seemed to change when the discussion turned to determining high, medium and low marks for each assignment. At this point the tone of the class became defensive and it seemed like the personal concern for the grade they would be receiving made it difficult for the preservice English teachers to remain objective.

Adam addressed this tension by wondering why everyone seemed to believe they needed to earn a score of "high" on each section of the portfolio. This suggestion did not lead to any further discussion about such an approach. Rather, the focus turned back to how to determine quality. The newspaper assignment group explained how they had included a rationale section in their criteria so that Adam could be aware of the author's intentions for the section. Helen pointed out that creating rationales for each section would just create more work. Bob countered this with the suggestion that the rationales would not have to be very long. This suggestion seemed to persuade Helen.

Helen would later identify the work around the rubric as the discussion that had the most impact on her beliefs about teaching writing. She explained that "the discussion about portfolios was helpful . . . I hadn't thought about it as a way of validating the art, like painting or architecture. The discussion also reinforced my sense that there is a time gap between generations. I had the sense that Adam was responding to a different experience of schooling that the one I had."

Jen wanted to know whom the intended audience was for the portfolio. She wondered if the portfolios were for Adam, for the preservice English teachers, or for future employees. Cheryl wanted to see an example

of a completed portfolio. Bob wanted room for a variety of portfolios. He also wanted to respect students' decisions for earning the grade they wanted rather than imposing the need for everyone to earn an "A." Bob admitted that he had not done sections of the portfolio, and that he did not believe he deserved to earn an "A" for the class. This led Adam to discuss the approach of making a contract with students in the beginning of a class. Helen did not like the use of language like contract because of the tone it created in the classroom.

Bob worried about the students who just faked their way through the process by doing all the work at the last minute or by finding all the loop holes to get the "A" without really doing the work the way it was intended. He wondered if getting through the system was a skill that they should be teaching to students. Here we can see how being asked to imagine the class from Adam's perspective encouraged the preservice English teachers to think about what a teacher considers when designing assignments capable of both facilitating student learning and serving as an accurate measurement of that learning.

During this experience of having to determine how the quality of their work would be measured, the preservice English teachers seemed to use their student of teaching writing selves as the primary resource. Imagining themselves as Adam had helped them to determine the purposes of each assignment, but quality seemed to take them to their own intentions and the way they had gone about completing the work.

This revealed yet another aspect of the writing teacher: assessor of students' intentions. Rather than see grading as confrontational, they could

consider the possibility of grading as an opportunity to give students credit for what they had completed. During the reunion class that took place during the semester following the class, it became apparent that grading was still seen as adversarial and a means of measuring the degree to which students met the teacher's expectations. This view came out when Bob voiced his frustration at not being able to get students to follow directions, which forced him to give them low grades for their work. The suggestion that Bob might consider the work students had completed and grade that work on its own merits was not seen as a reasonable means of coping with the dilemma of student work that didn't adhere to the teacher's expectations. This interaction around grading and the outcome of the rubric work suggests that it became more difficult for the preservice teachers to consider students' intentions once they found themselves in the role of teacher.

Recognizing the Difference Others Make

From my perspective it did not appear that these preservice English teachers learned to teach writing on their own. There was a crowd of others who were also involved in the effort. For the preservice English teachers enrolled in the teaching of writing class those others included the following: fellow preservice English teachers, experienced English teacher classmates, the writer within, the student within, imagined students, schools, experienced teachers outside the class, and the English education professor. It also appeared that these preservice English teachers did not act as passive receivers of teaching writing knowledge. Adam's structuring of the class and

his own beliefs about the role students play in their own learning allowed these preservice English teachers to be active participants in their own learning. It was this interaction between the individual preservice English teacher and the others that seemed to reveal a more complex image of each preservice English teacher's self as writing teacher. There seemed to be very little in the way of synthesis and a spiraling outward of possibilities for teaching writing rather than a focusing in on the "best" teaching of writing practices.

For a discussion of what all this interacting with others means for the teaching of teaching writing, I turn in the next chapter to a consideration of the implications of my observations for preservice English teachers, for English education professors, and for English education curriculum. Each of the "others" identified in the study is discussed with the aim of determining principles for learning to teach writing.

The hope is to provide the same type of resource for those concerned with preservice English teachers learning to teach writing as that which Lewis Carroll provided for his readers. Carroll revealed the value of children and offered a metaphor for the chaotic process of growing up so that coming of age might be both better understood and recognized as being beyond complete understanding. In short, the story of Alice serves as a resource for those engaged in the adventure of growing up.

The preceding chapters were presented to show what it means to learn about teaching writing. Those chapters identified the others who influenced the preservice English teachers learning about teaching writing and presented some analysis of how those others involved in that dialogic process came to

help preservice English teachers reveal more complete images of who they were becoming as writing teachers.

The final chapter considers how that process might "best " be experienced by presenting the implications of the principles named in accord with each of the others. The result is a list of recommendations aimed at enhancing the likelihood of preservice English teachers walking into their first classrooms with a dialogical understanding of teaching writing that will withstand the "washout" effect of experience and make a lasting difference for both them and all of their students.

V – SEEING THE VALUE AND COMPLEXITIES OF LEARNING TO TEACH WRITING

What did learning to teach writing do for these preservice English teachers? Each of these preservice English teachers provided a different answer to this question. Bob began this class believing that teaching writing would be a good "part-time" job that would allow him to pursue his own writing. He emerged believing that teaching writing would be more than a full-time job and feeling excited about the ways that teaching writing would allow him to live and work creatively around writing. Caylin began this class believing that teaching writing meant letting students follow their own paths without interference from teachers. She emerged believing that students need guidance in order to find their writing voices. Paul began this class wondering if he could make writing real for his students. He emerged believing that his hopes could be realized. Jen began this class believing that students needed to learn the basic of writing first. She emerged believing that students had to learn to care about their writing before they could be taught the basics. Emily began this class believing that teaching writing would be an intellectually challenging and exciting professional change. She emerged with serious doubts about changing her career.

Each of the preservice English teachers emerged from class differently. Some changed their beliefs. Some reinforced their beliefs. Some made unimagined discoveries. All learned to see writing, the teaching of writing, and who they were becoming as writing teachers more completely.

The one thing these preservice teachers had in common as they made their way to that first class was that they all faced the challenge of rethinking the teaching of writing from a more pedagogical perspective. The transition from an understanding of subject matter to an understanding of teaching subject matter is not automatic (Feinman-Nemser, 1996). Secondary English teachers need explicit knowledge about the purposes and strategies involved in teaching writing, and they need an understanding of how adolescents learn writing. Writing knowledge alone will not provide preservice English teacher with the pedagogical understanding necessary for teaching writing to a diverse student population. "Creating appropriate pedagogical representations of the content requires that teachers have sufficient understanding of how student learn particular subjects" McDiarmid, Ball, and Anderson's study (as cited in Grossman, 1990). Preservice English teachers need to understand how students learn to write.

This teaching of writing class gave these preservice English teachers an opportunity to explore the theoretical foundations and pedagogical, social and political implications of teaching writing. It provided them with a place and time to think about teaching writing without the pressure of having to teach writing. The greatest paradox to emerge from the study is that learning to teach writing without teaching writing served as an important initial step in developing a deeper understanding of teaching writing. June expressed the value of this opportunity during the class visit to Center School when she expressed how grateful she was for the opportunity to write lesson plans that did not have to be taught. Planning without the pressure of having to teach gave June the freedom she needed to imagine teaching free from the

pressures of performance and the practical limitations that she would eventually have to cope with as a teacher. While Natalie spoke during the same class about how valuable it was for her as a student teacher to finally be able to teach her lessons, she had already spent a year growing comfortable with planning without teaching. These remarks suggest the value of a learning continuum that gradually brings preservice English teachers along by acknowledging where they are in the process of learning to teach writing. Learning to teach writing without teaching writing makes sense if the purpose is to support the development of thoughtful writing teachers with an appreciation for the difference it makes to ask the question why when it comes to teaching practices.

These preservice English teachers seemed ready to enter their classrooms aware that they have to do more than ask the question "What?" when they are confronted with teaching writing problems. These preservice English teachers had the opportunity to consider that the more significant, though less pressing, question is "Why?" A belief in asking the question "Why?" could make a significant difference in these preservice English teachers' professional development and in the contributions they make to the professional development of their colleagues. The time they spent wondering about teaching writing and the variety of approaches they discussed for teaching writing seemed to problematize early assumptions that writing is best taught in any particular way. Such an awareness of the complexity of teaching writing might help these preservice English teachers to question or at least hesitate to automatically adopt the practices they find in the House of Lore (North, 1987). The time they spent looking at the complexity of teaching

writing may lead them to proceed with some caution and skepticism when they are presented with “proven practices” and accepted norms.

Learning to teach writing did not appear to prepare these preservice English teachers by giving them a laundry list of answers to the problems and the dilemmas they would face as writing teachers. But it did appear to give them the experience of wondering out loud among others about why certain practices work in certain situations. Once they are in classrooms and feeling the pressures to be pragmatic, such an awareness might help to question the limits of that pragmatism. The time they spent wondering together about the teaching of writing may make them more conscious of the potential they have to go deeper into understanding their own teaching of writing.

These preservice English teachers appeared to emerge, each in the own ways, from this class aware of the possibility of a more varied knowledge of teaching writing than that offered by the trail-and-error approach of learning to teach writing from experience. Their questions and increasing curiosity around the teaching of writing suggest that they emerged knowing how much more there is to learn about writing. They emerged from this class more aware of how much more they had to learn about teaching writing. They emerged knowing what it is like to learn from colleagues.

These preservice English teachers emerged from their learning to teach writing experiences with questions about teaching writing that might challenge school norms and push the current limits of the teaching writing knowledge base. Likewise, Alice emerges from her adventures in Wonderland with stories that help her sister to see the world in a different light. Both Alice and these preservice English teachers have stories to tell that

are valuable because they are different than the stories we already know. Alice's stories are not moral ridden lessons in disguise like those of the Duchess. The preservice English teachers' learning to teach writing stories do not offer answers to teaching writing problems. However, hearing these stories does present things in a different light and raise new questions.

Waking from a "Curious" Study

When Alice wakes from her dream she exclaims to her sister, "Oh, I've had such a curious dream!" (Carroll, 1992, p. 98). She then goes on to recount the adventure for her sister. When Alice is finished telling of her adventure, her sister acknowledges the curious nature of the dream and rushes Alice off to have tea. Carroll ends his story with Alice's sister sitting and "thinking of little Alice and all her wonderful adventures, till she too began dreaming after a fashion" (Carroll, 1992, p. 98). In keeping with Carroll's design of concluding by having Alice's sister looking back at Alice's Wonderland adventures, this final chapter begins by considering how Alice's Wonderland adventures can be used to shed a different light on what learning to teach writing did for these preservice English teachers.

This chapter is organized into five sections. The first section revisits the pivotal moments of the teaching of writing class in light of analogous moments in Alice's adventure. The second section looks at the larger school reform movement and considers the ways in which learning to teach writing might help preservice English teachers become change agents in their own field. The third section discusses the paradoxical nature of learning to teach

writing and offers English educators recommendations for helping preservice English teachers to cope with those paradoxes. The fourth section considers implications for preservice English teachers, English education programs and schools. The chapter concludes with some final thoughts about coping with the dilemma of learning to teach writing without teaching writing and the value of such an endeavor.

Learning to Teach Writing in the Light of Alice's Adventures

The 14 preservice English teachers who experienced this class each appeared to have their own unique experiences. Each emerged from the class expressing more awareness of the complexity of teaching writing and asking questions that demonstrated more complete views of what it might be like to teach writing. The class took place during a particular time, at a particular school, in a particular program, and was taught by a particular English educator. As such this class is unlike any other and cannot stand as a typical teaching of writing class that is representative of all teaching writing classes. However, from all those differences some patterns did emerge that offer a deeper understanding of what learning to teach writing can do for preservice English teachers.

In order to illuminate those patterns and extend the discussion of what they seem to tell us about learning to teach writing, I turn my attention to the pivotal moments in that class in light of similar pivotal moments in Alice's

learning experiences. By putting the learning to teach moments into dialogic with Alice's adventures a different and I hope helpful view the learning to teach writing experience comes to light. The following discussion is organized by juxtaposing the pivotal learning to teach moments with the moments from Alice's adventures that seem most analogous. As with the organization of chapter four, this section follows the chronology of what actually took place during the semester.

The Class - Learning Names and Swimming in a Pool of Tears

The first teaching of writing class began with Adam explaining the importance of knowing students' names. Adam asked the preservice English teachers to think of an adjective that both described something about their character and began with the same first letter as their first name. The class was arranged in a circle, and once everyone had selected an adjective and shared it with the class, each preservice English teacher was asked to recall the name and adjective of each person in the circle. The second phase of the game followed the same naming of each person in the circle, but this time the naming was attempted after everyone had changed seats.

When Alice first falls into Wonderland her efforts to get into the garden lead her to grow both very tall and very small. Unlike the preservice English teachers, Alice does not have anyone to introduce her to the others in her new world. Consequently, she feels alone and finds herself quickly reduced to tears. These tears form a pool that Alice, once she has grown very

small, slips into. Splashing around in her own pool of tears, Alice has her first face-to-face encounter with a Wonderland creature, the mouse.

Although Alice is quite aware of the fact that mice are afraid of cat's, her longing for home leads her to talk openly of her cat Dinah. This shocks the mouse out of the pool of tears and puts Alice back in danger of being left alone again. When Alice apologizes and promises not to speak of Dinah again, the mouse promises that he will tell Alice his history so that she will "understand why it is I hate cats and dogs" (Carroll, 1992. p. 19).

This need for Alice to understand the mouse's history and the importance that Adam placed on getting the preservice English teachers to know each others' names both point to the role that the knowledge of who others are plays in developing self-awareness. Bakhtin talks about how the I is revealed through interactions with others whose outsider perspective sees the I more completely. So it seems with both Alice and the preservice English teachers that the others who surround them create a world filled with mirrors, so that the I is able to consider itself from a variety of different perspectives. Whether is it while swimming in a fantastic pool of tears or going around a circle trying to put names to new faces, being introduced to others seems just as much of an act of getting to know others as it is an act of getting to know a more complete self.

Given that learning to teach writing for these preservice English teachers was really more about discovering who they were becoming as English teachers than it was about learning any particular way of teaching writing, it seems that Adam's decision to play the name game played a pivotal role in introducing the preservice English teachers to the others who

could offer more complete views of who they were becoming as writing teachers. When Alice hears the mouse's history, she learns to appreciate the cruelty of her own behavior, and thus gains a more complete understanding of who she is and the impact she has on the world around her. When the preservice English teachers learned each other's names and then went on to hear about each other's histories as writers they had the opportunity to understand who those others were well enough to see themselves from the perspective of those others, thus gaining a deeper understanding of who they were becoming in the world of teaching writing.

Writers - Defining What Writers Do and Talking with a Pigeon

During the second class meeting Adam turned attention to what the preservice English teachers had written about their notions of what it means to be a writer. The preservice teachers shared their various ideals of the characteristics that defined a writer. The responses ranged from very practical descriptions like being paid for writing to the more theoretical like using writing in some personally meaningful way. Through this discussion it became clear what the different preservice English teachers valued about writing and that those values were as different as their writer biographies.

After Alice meets the Caterpillar, who tells that one side of the mushroom makes you tall and one makes you small, she eats from the mushroom and finds herself growing up through the trees. With her neck stretched into the sky Alice is confronted by a pigeon, who mistakenly identifies Alice as a serpent. This puts Alice into a position of having to

explain what she is to the pigeon. Similarly, the preservice English teachers were called upon to describe the characteristics of a writer.

In both of these cases the process of identifying characteristics has the effect of calling into question the very definition that is provided. Alice's discussion with the pigeon leads to the acknowledgement that because Alice eats eggs she is, as far as the pigeon is concerned, very much of a serpent. The preservice English teachers' debate around the characteristics of a writer also seemed to expand the "label" of writer to include a variety characteristics, which suggested that there were actually many more writers than those who made a living by writing. It is interesting that having to identify characteristics leads both Alice and the preservice English teachers to broader and more general characterizations.

As with the name game, this defining of characteristics in the company of others produces a more complex image of the self. Rather than synthesizing the various characteristics and agreeing on one type of writer or serpent, the efforts at developing a deeper understanding out of the dissonant discourses is more of an effort in embracing the force of heteroglossia and battling against the tendency to synthesize. The result is that both Alice and the preservice English teachers are awakened to dialogic understandings when they are asked to justify their own identities in the company of others.

Teaching Writing - Imagining Teaching Writing and Playing Croquet

During the third class meeting Adam asked the class to come up with questions about teaching writing. These questions ranged in nature from

how teachers could take students from the traditional setting into a free environment without giving the students the structure to questions about *how to deal with the students who did not like to write*. Several of the preservice English teachers were concerned with how to take what Nancie Atwell had to say about teaching students in her classroom in Maine and apply that teaching of writing to an urban setting. Several of the preservice English teachers wanted to know how to grade writing and still keep learning to write a positive experience.

The preservice English teachers seemed to be somewhat frustrated with their increasing awareness that their learning to teach writing experience was not going to produce a list of "how to teach writing" practices they would be able to directly transfer to their own classrooms. Their student derived perception of the teacher having some set plan and being in control of the learning was challenged by theories of more constructive teaching and discussions of the ever changing nature of classrooms filled with students. Through this initial discussion of the teaching of writing it became clear that improvisation and coping with a level of uncertainty were going to be required.

When Alice finds herself playing croquet with the Queen she is also filled with questions about how to play the game she thought she had known so well. She is frustrated by the hedgehog balls that move by themselves, the flamingo mallets that refuse to straighten their necks, and the soldier wickets that move from place to place without rhyme or reason. Croquet in Wonderland is not the croquet that Alice knows from her other world and like the preservice English teachers she begins to realize that in order to

participate she must acknowledge the norms of the new and strangely familiar activity.

In both Alice's case and the case of the preservice English teachers, using prior knowledge is problematic because the nature of what they are learning is so different than what they know. For the preservice English teachers their knowledge of what it means to be a student in a writing class is far simpler than the complex look at teaching writing they encounter. Alice's knowledge of playing croquet puts her at a disadvantage when it comes to Wonderland croquet. Both the preservice English teachers and Alice face the challenge of looking at their new experiences without the prejudices of the similar prior experiences they have had. In many ways it seems that it would have been easier and less confusing if they had not had their prior experiences. In other ways, it may be that having their prior knowledge put them into dialogic with new knowledge around similar behaviors and actually challenged them to develop deeper understandings as they negotiated the dissonance between the two. The conflict seemed to open the possibility for going deeper into understanding the teaching of writing.

Good Writing: Defining Good Writing and Having Tea

During the next class the preservice English teachers engaged in a two pronged discussion about what qualities were associated with a good piece of writing and some rules for guiding teacher's responses to student writing. As with the earlier discussion of what characteristics defined a writer, this discussion revealed the wide variety of views held by the preservice English

teachers. Notions of any absolute definition of "good" writing were challenged by this experience, and the preservice English teachers were left feeling overwhelmed by the possibilities. They expressed their frustration and concern over whether they would be able to attend to those differences and justify the definition of "good" writing they used to assess the writing of their students.

Alice experiences similar dismay when she attends tea with the March Hare and the Hatter. As is the case later in her adventure with the croquet game, Alice comes to this experience with a great deal of prior knowledge. Alice's knows the rules of having tea. She knows you do not ask personal questions. She knows you do not offer what you do not have. She knows that tea has a starting time and an ending time. What Alice does not know is that none of these rules are the rules of having tea in Wonderland. Alice finds the tea party a chaotic and disquieting experience, which is just the opposite of what she has come to expect from tea parties.

Here again we see the problematic nature of prior knowledge in the face of strangely familiar experiences. If Alice had never had tea, then one could imagine her being more at ease learning how to have tea in Wonderland. It might also be that preservice English teachers with no prior knowledge of writing and no biases about what constitutes "good" writing would have less difficulty simply accepting others' definitions of "good" writing. However, as was the case with imagining teaching writing and playing croquet, it can also be argued that the problematic nature of prior knowledge is what puts Alice and the preservice English teachers into dialogic around the characteristics of "good" writing and having tea.

Ultimately, it is the dissonance they face which challenges them to create new understandings to replace their prior assumptions and beliefs about that which they believed they knew.

Both Alice and the preservice English teachers' learning seems to be more about getting confused than about becoming clear and more about seeing the complexity than recognizing the clarity of what they encounter. It also seems that the prior knowledge they bring to their learning is at once problematic and constructive. It is problematic in that it challenges the new discourses they encounter. It is constructive in that it forces them to go deeper into the subject matter and develop more dialogic understandings.

Novices - Practicing Teaching Writing and Meeting the Mock Turtle

During the next class Adam introduced a piece of student writing and asked the preservice English teachers to read over the piece. He asked them to decide how they would respond to the piece. Then Adam asked three of the preservice English teachers to form a group in the center of the larger circle of the preservice English teachers. Those three were then asked to talk about how they had responded to the piece. The other preservice English teachers were given instructions to simply watch the work of the three in the center of the "fish-bowl" and to consider what type of advice the student would be receiving from each person in the central group of three and what each person's method of responding revealed about their beliefs about writing.

The mock teacher-student conferences that took place were later discredited by many of the preservice English teachers because they were not perceived to be the real thing. As one of the members of the class who worked with Adam in the fish bowl, I found the experience to be very representative of the type of interaction a teacher might have with an eighth grade boy around a piece of writing. However, the other members of the class, who did not have any teaching experience, assumed that because Adam was role playing the exercise really had no merit and was not worth much to them in their efforts to imagine how they would work with real students under similar circumstances.

When the Gryphon takes Alice to visit with the Mock Turtle she is told quite accurately that a Mock Turtle is what Mock Turtle soup is made of. Of course what this means is that the Mock Turtle is not a turtle, but something quite different and quite the same as a turtle. Likewise, learning to teach writing is not teaching writing. The two experiences have many similarities and they have many differences, but they are not the same. Alice learns a great deal from the Mock Turtle about lessons and the way school works and why fish always need to travel with porpoises. While Alice does not necessarily understand or agree with everything the Mock Turtle has to say, her openness to him and her valuing of him for what he is, a Mock Turtle, exposes her to lessons she would not have experienced otherwise.

The preservice English teachers who dismissed the mock teacher-student conference seemed to do so based purely on the fact that it was not real. Other criticisms of the class like creating lesson plans without actually teaching them and reading about teaching writing in Maine all seemed to be

generated by the desire to having learning to teach writing be the same as teaching writing. In the case of the teacher-student conference, this desire to judge learning to teach writing based on how closely it matched actually teaching writing caused much of the experience to be dismissed.

In the same way that Alice was told by the Gryphon that the Mock Turtle was not a turtle, it might have been helpful to acknowledge up front how learning to teach writing would not be the same as teaching writing, and that being different from teaching writing had both advantages and limitations. It might have even been useful to discuss what learning to teach writing could offer in the way of preparing for teaching writing. These types of meta-discussions might have discouraged some of the efforts that were made to disparage the learning to teach writing experience because it was not a teaching writing experience. The Mock Turtle is able to share his history with Alice as a Mock Turtle, which is something a real turtle could never do. It would have been interesting to engage the preservice English teachers in a discussion about the things that learning to teach writing could do for them, which actually teaching writing could never do for them.

The other opportunity to practice teaching writing began with Adam giving cards to each of the preservice English teachers. These cards had a preservice teacher's name on one side and the name of an author to review on the other side. The preservice English teachers then organized themselves into groups of three. Each group was given fifteen minutes to develop a presentation of what they knew about the author that they had been assigned to read. This experience of teaching the other preservice English teachers in the room was a fairly anxiety ridden experience. What was interesting was

the way that the majority of the groups adopted Adam's teaching methods by using writing prompts to engage the class around the particular subject matter they were presenting. This was the most obvious proof that the preservice English teachers were learning to teach writing like their English education professor taught writing. Adam was very clear at the start of the class about how his way of teaching writing worked because of who he was and that his methods would not necessarily work for others. In spite of those words of caution about the limits of learning through imitation, the preservice English teachers seemed intent on mimicking Adam's style of teaching and consequently were using him as a model for developing their own practices.

Alice is constantly being shown how to behave in Wonderland through her observations of the Wonderland creatures. However, Alice seems resistant to mimicking much of what she believes to be nonsense. When Alice first meets the Queen, Alice observes that the soldiers fall face down in front of the Queen. Alice notes that this behavior prevents the Queen from distinguishing if they are "gardeners, or soldiers, or courtiers, or three of her own children" (Carroll, 1992, p. 64). Alice remains standing during introduction to the Queen and when then Queen cries "Off with her head!" (Carroll, 1992, p. 64) Alice's reply is a simple "Nonsense!" (Carroll, 1992, p. 64).

The contrast between the preservice English teachers' willingness to use Adam as a model and Alice's refusal to follow the behavior of the Wonderland creatures suggests something about learning and respect. It seems that for both the preservice English teachers and Alice their openness

to learning from others is tied up in their relationship with that other and the degree to which they share the same values. Alice does not share the same values as the cards who want only to remain anonymous. Alice wants to be acknowledged. Adam consistently expressed the value he placed on respecting others and getting to know his students so that he could better understand how to support their learning. This genuine concern for his students made Adam a teacher the students respected and felt comfortable being around. This admiration and trust seemed to be at least part of the reason so many of the preservice English teachers taught in Adam-like ways during the class of teaching mini-lessons.

This connection between learning and developing personal respect might suggest something about the role that personal philosophies play in determining the degree to which preservice English teachers emerge from their learning to teach writing experiences with new knowledge they respect enough to carry with them into their own classrooms. It also suggests the need for English educators and preservice teachers to develop trusting relationships with one another. It might be that English educators need to do more than facilitate communities of learners in their classrooms, they may also have to take certain steps to become members of that community who know the preservice teachers on a personal level.

School - Observing the Teaching of Writing and Meeting the Duchess

The next class took place at a Center School where Adam had worked as a teacher for the last few years. Adam assigned the preservice English

teachers to particular classrooms where they were to go for their observations. After the individual class observations Adam's class gathered together in another classroom to discuss the experience and have an opportunity to speak with some of the teachers whose classrooms were observed. To begin the discussion Adam asked each of the classroom teachers to explain how today fit into the bigger picture and to highlight some tips or principles for teaching writing.

The preservice English teachers found it helpful to visit an actual school and see teachers working on writing with students. The one common concern was that they would not find themselves teaching in what they characterized as an ideal setting where the teachers seemed to share common values, the administration was supportive and the students seemed eager to learn. One of the more interesting things to come out of the visit was the shared belief by the teachers that students had to be interested in what they were writing. When asked about selecting assignments and getting students motivated, the English teachers pointed to the importance of adapting to the students and not making too many assumptions about what needed to be taught.

When Alice first visits the Duchess she is given a baby to hold. As Alice stands holding the baby she is shocked to hear a grunt. When Alice looks closer she discovers that the baby has become a pig. Feeling no need to cradle a pig, Alice puts the creature down and watches with relief as it trots away into the wood. Alice reacts to this experience by commenting, "If it had grown up . . . it would have made a dreadfully ugly child; but it makes a

rather handsome pig, I think" (Carroll, 1992, p. 50). The encounter with the pig shows Alice the relative nature of things.

For the preservice English teachers a similar lesson in relativity was learned at Center School when the teachers spoke of how different lessons and units were designed with particular students in mind. The preservice English teachers found themselves challenged to consider students as the source for most decisions they would be making about what and how to teach writing. Alice stops questioning the nature of the pig once she realizes it is not a child. She has come to accept that in Wonderland things are rarely what they seem. However, the preservice English teachers did not change the focus of their questions to ask how the teachers determined what their students needed. The preservice English teachers kept the emphasis on the teachers' behaviors. Not one question was asked about the students. This focus on the teacher and the later discussions the preservice English teachers had about the visit revealed that the preservice English teachers were watching the teachers and giving little attention to what the students were doing or even to how the students were interacting with the teachers. The preservice English teachers seemed to consider the visit as an opportunity to see teaching in action, which for the preservice English teachers meant teacher-watching. Given the consistent concerns they voiced over being able to manage student behavior, it seemed odd that they did not see the school visit as a chance to learn more about who students are.

Alice's extended time in Wonderland opens her to accept the changing of the baby into a pig as the sort of thing that can typically be expected to happen. It might be that the preservice English teachers would have given

more attention to the students if they had been able to spend more time at the school and been able to see how much of what took place was in response to the students rather than from some teacher derived notion of what should take place. The notion of a school being driven by student needs did not seem to be something that the preservice English teachers considered in spite of how often the teachers of Center School said they taught in reaction to the students.

Classroom Teachers - Talking with Experts and Knowing a Cheshire Cat

The next class was used as an opportunity for the preservice English teachers to have some follow-up questions regarding the visit to Center School that took place the previous week. Adam invited the teachers from Center School to come and talk with the class.

The first teacher from Center School to speak was Shirley. She was a graduate of the English education program at the university where the teaching of writing class was being taught, and she seemed to share in the progressive theories of the program while at the same time having some very specific ideas about how student creativity needed to be structured.

The second Center School teacher was Megan. She was an older teacher and her time in the class was used to present more of a lecture in which she went over the step by step procedures she used in her classroom. She taught a creative non-fiction class. She presented what happened during her activities. She explained how she used pictures and drawings as writing

prompts. During her presentation the preservice English teachers took what looked be very detailed notes on the step-by-step activities.

The preservice English teachers seemed to gain a lot from listening to the Center School teachers. They seemed to value what the teachers had to say because they were actually teaching writing on a daily basis. There was a sense during this class that having the teachers there in the room was a window of opportunity to get the truth about how teaching writing really worked.

Alice sees the Cheshire cat as her Wonderland expert who acts as her guide. The Cheshire Cat is familiar with Wonderland. He expects that the baby will turn into a pig. He knows that everyone in Wonderland is mad, including Alice. He knows that it makes no difference whether Alice chooses the road that leads to the Hatter or the road that leads to the March Hare.

Both Alice and the preservice English teachers look to persons they perceive to be experts for guidance. This guidance seems to take on particular value when there appears to be more than one option. Alice turns to the Cheshire cat when she is unsure of which road to follow. The preservice English teachers posed questions like which texts to teach and what types of assignments to give to students. There seemed to be this assumption on the part of Alice and the preservice English teachers that the choices they would make would be more critical than what they did once the choices were made. It seemed as though knowing which book to teach and which assignment to teach was all the preservice English teachers were interested in knowing. This seems to suggest that they felt confident about their ability to teach once they knew what to teach. It might also be that

questions about content were simply the natural place to begin asking questions and that if there had been more time the questions might have become more specific and dealt with more teaching issues.

English Educator - Framing a Rubric and Witnessing a Trial

During the next class Adam explained that he wanted to involve the preservice English teachers in the process of assessing their work during the semester. He asked the class to divide into groups and come to some agreement about the purpose of each assignment that had been completed during the semester. Adam distributed a rubric from the New York Regents test and an article that discussed portfolios and rubrics. After the groups had spent time discussing the assignments they had been given, the class came together for a time to share the findings of each group.

The classes around assessment and in particular Adam's request that the preservice English teachers be involved in their own assessment were the most volatile classes of the semester. Several of the preservice English teachers were opposed to the idea of assessing their own work. Those who went along willingly with Adam's request found the exercise difficult. They had trouble determining what it was that Adam had expected out of them in each assignment.

When Alice enters the courtroom for the trial of the stolen tarts, she is initially pleased to find that she knows the names of nearly everything. However, as the trial progresses Alice becomes increasingly aggravated by the chaotic nature of the proceedings. Alice sees the trial as a mockery of

justice perpetrated by jurors who she finds stupid. She notes that one juror cannot even spell the word stupid. Without rules and some system of justice Alice knows that the Knave, who is on trial for stealing tarts, has no chance of being proven either innocent or guilty of the charges brought against him.

This frustration with the Wonderland judicial system is much like the preservice English teachers' frustration with having to develop a rubric that would fairly assess the work they had done during the semester. The responsibility of developing a sound assessment tool was one the class was happy to leave to Adam. Alice is not happy to leave the trial in the hands of the Queen and it is finally Alice's frustration with the proceedings that cause her to declare the court to be "nothing but a pack of cards" (Carroll, 1992, p. 97). With this declaration the entire of Wonderland fades and Alice finds herself back along the riverbank.

Unlike Alice, the preservice English teachers did not throw up their hands in frustration. Ultimately the class did develop a rubric that was used to assess their work. It was interesting that they had such a hard time developing the rubric since they had already done the assignments and must have had some idea of the purposes of the assignments and what determined the quality of those assignments. As the students, they were actually the experts having gone through the process of doing the work. Their frustration might stem from their student perspective. Just as being students of writing had not fully prepared them to teach writing, doing the assignments had not prepared them to assess the work. Here it seems that perspective is critical. This suggests that students and teachers work with one another around the same subject matter but from different perspectives, which lead them to see

things differently. Students might think of assignments as directions they need to follow. Teachers might think of assignments as guides for measuring student performance. Therefore, being a student of writing does not necessarily translate into being a teacher of writing.

Alice removes herself from Wonderland when the nonsense becomes too much for her to handle. Alice's return to the riverbank seems to be her way of returning to what feels familiar and comfortable. This desire to feel comfortable and certain may be some of the reason that so much of the research has found that teachers teach as they were taught. The preservice English teachers in Adam's class would have gladly given him the sole responsibility of assessing their work and been happy to retain their more passive role as students in the class. But they were shocked out of that more passive role by Adam.

This raises the question of whether preservice English teachers will need to be shocked out of the ways they were taught writing when they are faced with the challenges of their first year of teaching. Where will the support be for them to react to the situation creatively rather than falling back on practices that promise control? It may be that some of the preservice English teachers will not react like Alice and return to the safety of traditional modes of teaching. It may be that a return to traditional modes is sometimes exactly what is needed. The question is this: What forces will be there to ensure that the preservice English teachers will feel supported in the ways that Alice does not feel supported?

Self - Reading "Finished" Pieces and Recalling a Dream

The final class was held as a writing celebration. Adam lit the room with candles and the preservice English teachers gathered in a circle to read excerpts from one of their "finished" pieces. Many of the readings were deeply personal. One reader was brought to tears during her reading and had to ask one of the members of her writing group to complete the reading. The class ended with an agreement to hold some form of reunion class during the next semester, so that the members of the class would not lose touch completely. The nature of this final class and the agreement to hold a reunion class say a great deal about how close the preservice English teachers grew during the semester, the level of trust they developed, and the shared values they gave to writing and teaching writing.

During this final class the preservice English teachers showed that writing and reading their own stories to one another was a way of both celebrating themselves as writers and celebrating the writing lives of the others in the class. When Alice tells her sister the story of her Wonderland dream, Alice is both reliving the experience herself and introducing her sister to the experience. Both Alice and the preservice English teachers use story telling to share their experiences. What seems important for the preservice English teachers is that they came to think of writing as more than prescriptions and the teaching of writing as more than instruction. Writing became a valued means of expression that could take many forms and achieve many purposes all of equal value. Teaching writing became an opportunity to share in the creation of writing with others.

It seemed that presenting the preservice English teachers with the competing discourses of writing and teaching writing put the preservice teachers into dialogic around those subjects. Having to negotiate the world of writing and the world of teaching writing revealed the complexity of each and seemed to help the preservice teachers resist any temptation to create some synthesis of the two. Learning to write and learning to teach writing kept things complicated and messy for the preservice English teachers, and yet it was the messiness and that complexity that seemed to demand so much thought on their part.

Alice is entertained by Wonderland because it is so fantastic and filled with such nonsense that she can help but be drawn into deeper wondering about the place and the creatures that live there. The preservice English teachers seemed drawn to learning to teach writing largely because of their own experiences with learning writing, which put them at the center of each dilemma they knew they would soon be facing as teachers of others. Alice escaped to wonderland because she grew bored of hearing her sister read a story with no pictures or conversations. It seems likely that the preservice English teachers would have grown bored with a learning to teach writing class with no writing.

The Paradoxes of Learning to Teach Writing and Their Implications

Parker J. Palmer (1998) echoes Bakhtin's principles of the dialogical when he cites Neil Bohr's belief that truth is a paradoxical joining of apparent opposites, and that if we want to know that truth, we must learn to embrace

opposites as one. For Palmer teaching is expressed best in paradoxes. Palmer (1998) explains the lifeless nature of the education world by directing attention to broken paradoxes like *the separation of the head from the heart, facts from feelings, theory from practice, and teaching from learning*. These broken paradoxes can certainly be seen in the world of teacher education. Paradoxical thinking of the kind supported by Palmer and Bakhtin demands an embracing of opposites, which will reveal a world that is more complex and confusing than any framed by either-or thinking.

This study of preservice English teachers learning to teach writing suggests there are five paradoxical tensions built into the learning to teach writing experience:

- Preservice English teachers are both students and teachers of writing.
- Preservice English teachers are both students and teachers of teaching writing.
- Preservice English teachers use their differences to identify similarities around understanding teaching writing.
- Outsiders clarify and problematize preservice English teachers' understandings of teaching of writing.
- Schooling norms are recognized as barriers and bridges to powerful teaching.
- Preservice English teachers' defend and critique their beliefs about writing and teaching writing.

To explore means for helping preservice English teachers cope with these paradoxes, I want to revisit the moments when the paradoxes seemed most

evident and speculate on what might have moved the preservice English teachers toward even deeper understandings of teaching writing.

Affirming and Rejecting Beliefs

Recently, as part of the shift in education research from concern for teacher behaviors to teacher concern for teacher thinking, much attention has been given to the impact of preservice English teachers' prior beliefs. Findings suggest that prior beliefs act as filters and should be deconstructed to allow for "cleaner" learning about teaching. These prior student-derived beliefs have been found to impair preservice teachers' efforts to see teaching from a teacher perspective. However, to date preservice teacher's beliefs have been described as relatively stable during their teacher education experience.

One look at any of the "situations" cited in this study also shows that those beliefs are constantly being challenged and in the case of these preservice English teachers their beliefs about writing and teaching writing seemed to be in a constant state of flux. When Adam asked the preservice English teachers to share maps of their writing lives on the second day of class he was valuing their prior experiences and bringing them to light as important factors in revealing the type of writing teachers the preservice English teachers would become. When he asked the preservice English teachers to shape the rubric for their own work he exposed their beliefs again, but this time in opposition to one another around the very sensitive issues of grades. This collective honoring and selective scrutiny of the preservice teachers'

beliefs challenged the preservice English teachers to step forward and answer the question *Who are you as a writing teacher?*

The Caterpillar poses Alice the same question but she never has ample time to offer a thoughtful reply. Likewise, the preservice English teachers might have also benefited from spending more time and engaging more deeply in the question of who they were as writing teachers. This observation, combined with the Kennedy (1998) study that found teacher education does make a difference in learning to teach writing, suggest that preservice teachers' beliefs are any thing but stable. This instability lends even more reason for English educators to consider the implications of the learning to teach writing paradox of valuing and critiquing preservice English teacher's beliefs. This paradox implies that English educators might benefit from considering the following:

- Challenging preservice English teachers to justify their lesson plans in light of their teaching writing beliefs, so they might better see the connection between the two
- Explore their own writer and teacher biographies, so they might better understand how they came to have certain beliefs about writing and teaching writing
- Share their writer and teacher biographies with others, so they might increase their awareness of the multiple paths and influences that shape writing teachers
- Expose preservice English teachers to the research on prior beliefs, so they might better understand their own learning process

This work around beliefs suggests that preservice English teachers play an important and active role in their own learning to teach writing. As experienced learners of writing and persons with particular beliefs about writing, preservice English teachers come to their learning to teach experience with a great deal to learn from seeing themselves revealed more completely in the light of others. The valuable knowledge they hold about what it means to learn to write suggests that they have the opportunity to explore that knowledge more completely by spending some significant time giving consideration to what it means to be both a teacher of writing and person who writes.

Succeeding and Failing at Writing

When the preservice English teachers worked in their writing workshop groups they had an opportunity to be both writing teachers of the others in their groups and students of the others in their groups. While having the preservice teachers deeply involved in their own writing certainly helped them to empathize with their future students, that empathy could have revealed even more about the writing teacher self of the preservice English teachers by serving as a step toward what Bakhtin calls exotopy in which the self uses the perspective of the other to see the self more completely. In the case of the preservice English teachers, they could have used their "writing student" experience as an opportunity to reflect on how the writing teacher they imagined themselves to be would be experienced by students. In this way the preservice English teacher's experience of being taught in the writing

workshops could serve as a mirror to be held up to their own writing teacher identity. Such reflection could be facilitated by journal writing or meta-discussions about what it might be like for the preservice English teachers to be students of their own teaching of writing.

This shift in perspective might feel to preservice English teachers like stepping through the looking glass feels to Alice. When Alice finds herself on the other side of the looking glass, she sees the looking glass house more completely than she did when it was seen within the real world frame. Alice experiences a shift in perspective that shows her the familiar in a strange new light. So too, the preservice English teachers might have come to see the future classrooms and their imagined teaching of writing in a new way by imagining themselves as students of their own teaching of writing.

Adopting and Refuting Practices

When the preservice English teachers took part in the mock student-teacher conference with Adam playing the role of adolescent writer, they had an opportunity to see each other as teachers in action. This exercise highlighted the connections between beliefs and practices and revealed a more complex image of working with students around writing. The one limit, which caused much of the experience to be dismissed by the preservice English teachers, was the fact that Adam was only playing the part of an adolescent student. Given the impact of the visit to Center School and the credibility the preservice English teacher gave to the words and experiences of the Center School teachers, it seems reasonable to conclude that preservice

English teacher-student conferences would have proven even more educational than the mock conference.

An opportunity to observe their peers actually conferencing with students might have helped them learn even more about themselves as writing teachers by seeing how other preservice English teachers saw their work with real students. Bakhtin constantly points to the limited view persons have of themselves as they are situated in the world. Getting the other preservice English teachers to actually observe their peers in a school setting whether through visits or through some recording of student-teacher conferencing could have be quite revealing.

Celebrating and Denouncing Differences

When Adam opened the class with his name game and challenged the preservice English teachers to come together as a community of writers, he established a theme of unity that played an important part in enabling the preservice English teachers to learn from one another. Although he spoke after the semester of wishing he had given the class more of an edge, the data gathered in the fields notes of this study suggest that it was actually that feeling of unity that helped the preservice English teachers feel comfortable enough to share their differences. Paradoxically, the class took on an edge because of Adam's initial efforts to help the preservice English teachers come together harmoniously.

This paradox of uniting to reveal differences and the learning that seemed to come from that work suggests that English educators might consider the following:

- organizing cohorts of preservice English teachers, organizing "retreat-like" opportunities for preservice English teacher interaction away from the classroom
- re-structuring programs to allow for more full-time students who would have a greater opportunity to come together and know and learn from one another
- bringing preservice English teachers together with preservice teachers in other disciplines and across other grade levels to allow for more dissonance
- enrolling preservice English teachers with a variety of experiences and beliefs in classes with one another so they might benefit from learning about those differences
- holding seminars in which preservice English teachers are able to come together and discuss particular topics at length among themselves with the help of an English educator to frame those discussions to be different from those held in the regular class and outside of class
- creating chat-rooms and other cyber spaces where preservice teachers could interact beyond the constraints of time and geography
- forming post-class opportunities for preservice English teachers to continue their work with each other beyond the final days of class and on into their teaching professions

While the preservice English teachers clearly learned a great deal by coming together and sharing their similarities and differences, there were times when their work became too narrowly focused. It was in response to this sameness of the discussions that the voices of others from outside the class made a difference and revealed the next paradox of learning to teach writing.

Clarifying and Complicating Practices

Bakhtin is clear about the importance of others being located outside of the self. He explains that it is the outside perspective that enables others to see portions of the self that are not apparent to the self. He likens the activity to that of an individual who sees himself in a mirror, but is not aware of what he looks like from behind until he has the assisted view of an other located behind the self. The other sees the self as it is in the world. The impact of others in revealing a more complete view of the self was certainly evident in this teaching of writing class when the teachers from Center School visited the classroom. As experienced others, the teachers from Center School gave the preservice English teachers an opportunity to reconsider their writing teacher selves in light of the Center School teachers' stories about how they taught writing.

The role of outsiders in helping preservice English teachers learn about teaching writing suggests that English educators might consider some of the following:

- Inviting alumni of the class to speak about their experiences, giving particular attention the differences the teaching of writing made in their own teaching
- Asking preservice English teachers to interview practicing teachers and make those interview available to their peers as a resource for better understanding the strengths and weaknesses of their own teaching writing pedagogy
- Arranging for preservice English teachers to observe other teachers in a variety of settings outside the English education classroom
- Presenting preservice English educators with a variety of teacher biographies that could be read and shared to reveal the variety of lives lead by writing teachers
- Bringing others into the teaching of writing class whose beliefs and practices run counter to those espoused by the program, so that the preservice English teachers might have an opportunity to see the teachings in the class more completely
- Bringing others in the teaching of writing class who have experienced success implementing the beliefs and practices espoused by those in the program

Through interacting with these others, preservice English teachers will get a good look at how many options lay before them, and they may begin to see the impact that context has on writing teachers. Such considerations for context might be further explored by exposing preservice English teachers to a variety of schools and school cultures with particular attention to how those schools shape the teaching and learning of writing that takes place in their

classrooms. Such exposure to schools might make preservice English teachers aware of another paradox of learning to teach writing.

Crossing Bridges and Hitting Barriers

During the class visit to the Center School there was a great deal of talk about ideal the school seemed and how unrealistic it was to think that the teaching of writing practices that worked at Center School would work in other schools. This view of schools as both bridges and barriers to those teaching writing, particularly when discussed in light of how teachers could cope successfully to overcome barriers, portrayed writing teachers as problem solvers. To encourage more of such an activist view of the writing teacher and reveal more of the writing teacher as a member of a larger school community there are several steps that English educators might consider.

- Invite school administrators to speak with preservice English teachers about the challenges unique to teaching writing in their schools, so they might see their future teaching from the perspective of an administrator
- Invite parents to speak with preservice English teachers about their expectations of writing teachers, so they might see their future teaching from the perspective of a parent
- Invite students to speak with preservice English teachers about their successes and failures with their writing teachers past and present, so they might see their future teaching of writing from the perspective of a student

- Arrange for preservice English teachers to conduct studies of schools to determine the impact on those who teach writing, so they might come to appreciate the contextualized nature of teaching writing
- Introduce preservice English teachers to the literature surrounding the history of public schools and the politics of teaching writing, so they might see a more complete picture of why the teaching of writing has become what it is today

Preservice English Teachers as Prospective Change Agents

Thirty-one years ago I sat, legs dangling, at the dining room table of our house on Jefferson Street and pretended to write. No teacher. No directions. No ringing bells. No rules. Just me and my curiosity.

Summer rain splashed against the windows, and I listened as my mother did laundry in the basement. Secretly, I pulled one of her handwritten letters from an unsealed envelope and lay it on the table. I placed a clean white sheet of paper over-top the letter and traced her scripted writing. Guided by my own hand, the pen produced looping-i-dotted and t-crossed symbols of varied length. A story played out in my mind as the pen moved across the paper, leaving behind my first piece of writing.

It was not until I began school that I learned to hate writing. Mistakes were certainly not valued in Mr. Clark's eighth grade English class where the green Warriners book of grammar ruled supreme. Each day we diagrammed sentences on the board and recited definitions. My writing was quickly reduced to choppy subject-verb sentences. I began to think about writing in

the same ways that I thought about math - linearly and absolutely. I took Mr. Clark's eighth grade grammar test four times and failed four times

Donald Murray (1998) wrote that "in our desire to be responsible and to make our students write correctly there is a danger that they will misunderstand and think they have to write correctly from the beginning"(p. 52). He claimed that students will not learn to use writing as a tool for thinking unless they are "able to allow language to run free and stumble and fall"(p. 52). Murray recognized the dangers of beginning writing instruction with correctness.

School, by its nature, focuses on product and leaves little room for the making of mistakes (Smith, 1994). The need to judge the writing and make definitive statements about where student writers stand in relationship to their peers and agreed upon standards for "good" writing preoccupy both teachers and students.

Mr. Clark's class has helped me understand how school norms affect learning by affecting the degree to which teachers can support students navigating what Vygotsky (1978) called the "developmental process [that] lags behind the learning process"(p. 90). Mr. Clark was a creative and dynamic lacrosse coach who inspired me to develop as an athlete, but he seemed to check his passion and spontaneity at the door of our English classroom. Being in his class has been a resource for my queries over how to attend to both what students need and what the school says students must have. In spite of school and the efforts of so many well-intended English teachers like Mr. Clark, I managed to survive learning to write in school.

Since my days in grade school there have been dramatic shifts in the teaching of writing. Prescription no longer holds the same level of importance it once enjoyed. More and more students are learning to love writing in schools as they are encouraged to find their own voices and take ownership of their writing. However, for many students and their writing teachers the emphasis continue to be primarily concerned with correctness and prescriptions (Kennedy, 1998). Apparently, the teaching writing lore and learning from experience are not enough to bring about the full reform of teaching writing.

It is true that teaching in general, and the teaching of writing specifically, have made significant progress since 1922 when the typical requirements for a teacher were as follows:

Maintain good order at all times; supervise playground; have her work well prepared; follow state course of study; take at least one educational journal; have daily program, approved by county superintendent, posted in the room within the first month of school; keep register in good condition; be neat in attire. (Tyack, 1974, p. 24)

Historically teacher preparation took place at the high school level with some preservice teachers receiving a practice year of teaching in campus laboratory schools. By the turn of the century most normal schools had become four-year state teachers' colleges that granted students bachelors degrees in education. The GI Bill brought men in to the teaching profession by providing World War II Veterans with opportunities to enter the state teacher's colleges.

In 1957, with the launching of Sputnik, teaching became the work of the discipline experts as the government poured money into projects aimed at developing what was perceived as teacher proof curriculum. Again, the

primary role of teacher preparation was to ensure that the directives of the supervisors would be met. By the 1970s universities began closing their laboratory schools in response to criticism that the schools did not represent the real world. This emphasis on real world experience that led to the demise of the laboratory schools reflects a constant dilemma in professional education: how to teach a profession to those who are not yet engaged in the profession. For teacher education this dilemma has been complicated by an even more troubling claim:

A commonly expressed view of teacher education by recently licensed teachers is that they learned little in their college and university courses but came to understand teaching more thoroughly and helpfully during their student teaching and their first years of practice." (Griffin, 1999, p. 13)

In short, there is the perception that teacher education does not make a difference. Further support for the neutral impact of teacher education can be found in the snail-like pace at which schools have evolved in comparison with other professional institutions. The research around school reform claims that this lack of reform in schools is a result, at least in part, of the findings of Dan Lortie (1975) and John Goodlad (1984) that teachers teach the way they were taught.

For teacher education the challenge is to help preservice teachers move beyond the practices and knowledge of their former teachers and become part of a school reform effort. Teacher education is about helping Tomorrow's teachers see themselves as more than technicians. It' is about helping preservice teachers see themselves as professionals who carry the responsibility of acting as change agents who have the unique perspective of insiders. The aim of teacher education should be to take steps to ensure that

Tomorrow's schools meet the needs of Tomorrow's students and we break free from the tradition of schools asking students to meet the outdated needs of their predecessors.

In 1973 P. Cusick "attended" a high school to carry out a participant observation study of students. He attended classes with students, ate lunch with students and hung out with students outside of school. Cusick observed students experiencing little interaction with teachers; learned students are more concerned with compliance to rules, regulations and the routine than the construction to knowledge; and found that students spend most of their time hanging around together in small groups, having little or nothing to do with school. He concluded that schools are set up so teachers pass-on knowledge and students receive it, creating a doctrine of adolescent inferiority and downward communication which denies students freedom of activity by only requiring minimal competency to do well in classes. Cusick recommended a change in basic structures of schools so that the role of teachers might change.

Cusick's call for the restructuring of schools had been publicly echoed by educators and non educators since the launching of Sputnik in 1957, which awoke Americans to the fact that schools must change. This public concern that poor education might cause the United States to lose its place in the world as an economic and military leader led politicians to formulate the National Defense Education Act in 1958, which called for increased federal aid to education and an all out assault on current conditions of schooling.

The 1960's followed Sputnik as an era of failed innovation in which outsiders from the federal government and universities attempted to "fix"

what was wrong inside of schools with little or no attention given to the beliefs and assumptions held by school insiders. In 1970, theorists like John Goodlad and Seymour Sarason asked why certain innovations were being adopted and they challenged the lack of forethought given to follow-through (Fullan, 1991). Although efforts in the 1970's seemed to be concerned less with what was being taught and more concerned with how students were being taught and how students and schools could be assessed, top-down improvement efforts in the form of legislative action like the 1975 Public Law 94-142, which called for the inclusion of handicapped children, and policy making designed to make schools teacher proof through carefully designed curriculum both failed to improve schools because they had little effect on the actual day to day teaching and learning taking place in the classroom.

Ultimately all of this concern over education, the election of Ronald Reagan to replace Jimmy Carter, and the nation's concern for its weakening economy led to a 1983 series of evaluation reports which crystallized the national consensus for school change. These reports include the following: High School (Boyer, 1983), A place called school: Prospects for the future (Goodlad, 1984), and A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence and Education, 1983). Complaints raised in these reports included concerns over the nation's economic and strategic competitiveness in the global market place, failing test scores, decreasing international competitiveness of students, the increasing inequalities between rich and poor, the desire to professionalize the practice of teaching and overall perceptions that the educational system was failing. Kirst (1990) would note the public demanded change because of the presumed linkage between international and interstate

economic competition and the importance of an educated work force that was considered crucial to higher productivity.

The first wave of school improvement was a direct response to fears that our nation was falling behind and the belief that intensifying current educational practices would improve the educational system and subsequently keep the United States competitive in the world economy. Bacharach (1990) writes, "The first wave can probably be best be identified as an intensification of the current system, which has evolved over the decades. Rather than changing the fundamental nature of the educational system, this process aims to make students work harder"(p. 7). The first wave of educational reform was more concerned with repairing the current system based on the assumption that schools were fundamentally sound, and sought to raise achievement through rigorous academic standards for students and more recognition and higher standards for teachers. However, the first wave of school reform and school renewal efforts was viewed as a failure (Cuban, 1990; Fullan, 1991).

Consequently, the second wave of school change efforts attacked the problem from a different perspective by attempting to rethink, reinvent or "restructure" schools. The second wave was an attempt to intensify the existing delivery system, promote professionalism among teachers, allocate funding to schools based on merit, create an employer driven strategy which would encourage educators to work as partners in the business of schooling, and create a consumer driven strategy which would place to the burden on schools to treat students and parents as customers by introducing choice in the form of vouchers. The blueprint for the second wave came from the

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in 1986, which concluded that teachers were frustrated to the point of cynicism (an attitude established in the post-Sputnik days when outsiders came into schools to fix what was broken with little or no regard for insiders) and there was a danger of political gridlock between teachers and policy makers, who saw themselves as adversaries in the restructuring process. The report acknowledged a need for, "a professional environment for teachers, freeing teachers to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children but holding them accountable for student progress"(p. 26). The forum outlined the following keys for restructuring: restructure schools to provide a professional environment; restructure the nature of the teaching force; revise the recruitment, education, and induction of teachers; make salaries and career opportunities market competitive; relate incentives to school-wide performance; provide technology, services, and staff needed for teacher productivity. The report was followed by the Time for Results (1986) report by the National Governors' Association, which called upon states to, "assume larger responsibilities for setting educational goals and defining outcomes standards"(p. 3). The report also acknowledged the need to stimulate local inventiveness, increase educational productivity and professionalize teaching by requiring new school structures that allow "more varied instructional arrangements, greater collegian interaction among teachers, and greater teacher involvement in decision making"(p. 3).

Cuban (1984) outlined the difference between the two waves by calling the first wave comprised of first-order changes or those that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what is currently done. Second-order changes

look beyond current practices and beliefs by seeking to alter the fundamental ways in which organizations are put together including goals, structures and roles such as collaborative roles for teachers and administrators. Fullan (1991) noted that most reform efforts during the century had been first-order changes with second-order reforms largely failing. He wrote, "The challenge of the 1990's will be to deal with more second-order changes-changes that affect the culture and structure of schools, restructuring roles and reorganizing responsibilities, including those of students and parents"(p. 29).

The first wave of restructuring proposals emphasized broad philosophical questions about schools' structures, missions and methods. The second wave focused more heavily on the need for increased teacher participation, improved working conditions for staff, teacher empowerment and site-based management (Evans, 1996). The current third wave focuses on choice and calls for changes which define more challenging standards for learning while restructuring schools to produce better outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 1996). Unlike the earlier two waves that tinkered with the system, this third wave, the wave of choice, challenges the fundamental organization of schools as the government has managed them. Proponents of choice argue:

Although our public schools honor diversity and pluralism by bringing together students from many different backgrounds, they simultaneously dishonor those values by requiring conformity to state-imposed policies on controversial issues about which reasonable people differ and by prohibiting the use of public funds in schools that differ from the majoritarian consensus." (Ravitch & Viteritti, 1998, p. 252)

The third wave presents options like vouchers and charter schools, which place schools back in the hands of the community while requiring that

each school meet certain national standards as a means of maintaining quality. Current research suggests that the most successful schools have a sense of purpose, a mission, and an identity that honors the values and beliefs of the community while simultaneously acknowledging the standards of education set by society.

Twenty-five years have passed since Cusick's research, but there is a feeling one could step in a high school today and observe the same behaviors and come to the same conclusions as he did. Seymour Sarason (1996) reflected:

What I attempted to do when I wrote the book 25 years ago was to indicate how that sense of powerlessness had self-defeating consequences for everyone in the school culture, i.e., students, teachers, principals, parents. And I emphasized; reform efforts that did not change the sense of pervasive powerlessness wouldn't achieve their goal of improving the quality and outcomes of schooling. Nothing I observed and read since I wrote the book has caused me to change my views. I have known a classroom here and a classroom there, a school here and a school there, where power relationships have been appropriately changed with encouraging results. That cannot be said for any school system I know or about which I have read. (p. 344)

This study suggests that even these 14 preservice English teachers hold a wide variety of beliefs about writing and teaching writing. Each of the 14 is already composing a unique writing teacher life that seems destined to become even more uniquely contextualized with each passing year. Shaped by their own emerging biographies, the qualities of the others with whom they interact, and the richness of the environments where their teaching will take place, the only certainty is that they will all emerge as teachers of writing who understand writing and teaching in their own ways.

Just as Alice is drawn to the animals of Wonderland who remind her of the animals in her own world like her cat Dinah, the preservice English teachers were interested by the aspects of teaching writing that they felt most comfortable with. They wanted to teach in ways that made sense to them and they valued the areas of writing that had been most valuable to them in their lives. The preservice English teachers' interests around aspects of teaching writing were clearly in line with more personal interests in writing. Just as Alice consistently turns to the Cheshire cat who reminds her of the safety she felt with her own Dinah, the preservice English teachers would return again and again to their particular writing passion whether it was personal reflection, self-expression, or effective communication.

Alice is both confused and supported by her prior knowledge as she struggles to make sense out of the nonsense that is Wonderland. The preservice English teachers were also haunted and spurred on by their previous experiences and spent a great deal of time struggling to understand writing and teaching writing in new ways.

Coloring Our Stories with Empirical Evidence

Learning to teach writing made a difference for these preservice English teachers. Each in their own ways became more aware of who they were becoming as writing teachers. In his preface to the *Ninety-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, professor Gary Griffin (1999)

recognizes how far teacher education has come since the early nineteen hundreds. He explains:

Because of the tighter intellectual, practical, and organizational connections across higher education and the schools, it has become almost impossible in recent years to isolate teacher education as a distinct and separate phenomenon, a set of efforts guided and implemented solely by university professors. Instead it is now coin of the realm that teacher education is the focus of partnerships, of new amalgams of institutional collaboration marked by shared expectations and mutually reinforcing education strategies. (p. 4)

This building of bridges between teacher education and the others in education has done much to help teacher educators and preservice teachers cope with the dilemma of having to learn to teach without teaching. In order to support such an effort it seems crucial that education researchers gather empirical evidence that helps us to better understand why such collaboration works. We cannot afford to rely on the education tradition of using personal intuitions and generalized theories to support our practices. We need evidence that will reveal both the wisdom and the ignorance of our actions. We need to know that we know what we are doing.

As a soccer coach, I know intuitively that the girls on my team need to play soccer during practice. I know that they will not improve as players by watching me play. Players learn to play by playing. However, when comes time to justify my coaching methods to some "concerned" parent or "interested" athletic director, I do not talk about my intuition or how strongly I feel about the need for the girls to play each day. For support of my coaching I turn to my stories. To prove the importance of practice in developing shooting technique, I tell the story of the afternoon when Erin and I stayed at the field until well after dark taking shots from near midfield.

Then I describe how two days later, in an important league game, Erin scored a goal from just over midfield. I tell the story of how our goalkeeper Mara met with me in the evenings after everyone else had gone home. I describe how we practiced her diving until she wore holes in her shorts and in the grass. I recount how that season she had made the winning save on a penalty shot that sent the team to the regional finals for the first time in school's history. I tell those stories because they are real and they show that practice makes the difference.

Many of us know that others help in the learning process. We know the story of Alice. We understand Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic. We have stories from our own teaching and learning that support the notion that true understanding is dialogic in nature. For me it is the graduate school stories of running around Central Park with Scott and how we talked on those runs until we understood what our education professors were trying to teach. For my wife it was her friendship with Steve during law school that helped her understand what her law professors were trying to teach.

In this period of increased pressure to streamline teacher education and develop alternatives to teacher education, we need stories that expose the complexity of learning to teach. We need learning to teach stories that are colored with empirical assertions, so that critics of teacher education will have reason to stop and wonder at the complex and complicated work of learning to teach. We need such stories to attest to the value of subject-specific teacher education. We need such stories so that preservice teachers have the opportunity to engage in dissonant discourses that challenge traditional practices of educating preservice teachers within discourse of

agreement (Vinz, 1996). Teacher education reformers who hope to silence the critics by offering overly simplified assessments of what is wrong with teacher education (Damerell, 1985; Fosnot, 1989; Tyson, 1994;) are missing the point. The first step in gathering support for reforming teacher education is to go public with evidence of the complexities, dilemmas, and paradoxes of learning to teach.

Teacher education can not expect to gain the financial and political support that is necessary to bring about systemic changes so long as there is such overwhelming support for the assumption that teaching is best learned from experience. This study of 14 preservice English teachers learning to teach writing draws attention to the complexity of learning to teach writing so that others will be more aware of the problems and dilemmas faced by English educators and preservice English teachers. At first glance, learning to teach writing may seem to be a waste of time. After all preservice English teachers have already spent thousands of hours sitting in classrooms observing the teaching of writing. Some argue that apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), and a college level degree in English are all that are needed before learning to teach in real classrooms.

This story of what learning to teach writing did for 14 preservice English teachers shows the type of learning and the differences that can be made by subject-specific teacher education. It shows how even a full semester of intense study of teaching writing did not prepare the preservice English teachers to teach writing. Their uncertainty about teaching writing and all that they did not manage to learn are evidence of the need to develop deeper understandings of learning to teach writing. The fact that these

preservice English teachers did not emerge from their experience as experts ready to meet any and all teaching writing problems is not evidence that subject-specific teacher education is not necessary. Just the opposite. The limits of their preparation and the shortcomings of the class are evidence that subject-specific teacher education is in need of more serious consideration by practitioners, researchers, and policy makers.

Learning to teach writing made these preservice English teachers aware of how little they understood the teaching of writing. It opened their eyes to the complexity of teaching writing. It gave them cause to become life long learners of teaching writing. It made a difference because it did not provide them with a laundry list of teaching writing practices and the false impression that teaching writing would be easy. It gave them a place to begin by suggesting to them that teaching writing is more complex than they might have imagined. This study goes public with their story so that others can become more aware of the confusing and overwhelming nature of teaching writing.

Today we look with horror at the days when doctors worked without anaesthetic and bleeding was common practice. Research in the field of medicine has revealed the overwhelming complexity of the human body and given justification for supporting the medical profession's efforts to better understand medicine. Medical schools now receive funding and political support that schools of teacher education cannot even imagine. Why?

I believe that part of the reason is the popularly held assumption that anyone can teach. Everyone knows schools. Everyone knows classrooms. Everyone knows teachers. Everyone knows students. But very few have seen

school, classroom, teachers, and students from the perspective of an educator. When looked at from the inside-out education looks very different. It looks complicated. We understand so little about teaching and learning.

Unfortunately, the long-term nature of education hides our ignorance.

Students do not go blind because their teachers do not understand how to teach reading. Students do have their hands amputated because their teachers do not understand how to teach writing. Students do not die of malpractice or faulty research in the way that patients die on operating tables. Or do they?

What about the child who sits silently at the back of the classroom (in part) because her teachers do not understand how to cope with her low level of participation? What about the teenager who drops out of school (in part) because his teachers do not know how to deal with his outbursts? Think of all the children who lie awake in the middle of the night, wanting to do well in school, longing to be smart and get good grades so they can fulfill their dreams of becoming scientists, artists, and entrepreneurs. What about when those dreamers find themselves dropping out of school, becoming addicted to drugs, having their own children while they are still children themselves, getting arrested and sent to prison all (in part) because they did not receive the education they deserved. Because their teachers did not have the opportunities or resources to develop an understanding of teaching that could have made a difference for those students. Isn't living a life without hope just as tragic, just as worthy of attention, as living a life with a terminal disease?

In many ways teacher educators have a moral obligation to go public with how little they understand and how much more needs to be done to bring teaching and learning out of the dark ages and in line with a world where organ transplants are back page news. Only once others know what takes place in education classrooms and have some appreciation for what learning to teach does to preservice teachers will teacher education be recognized as a worthy endeavor. Hiding behind neatly articulated solutions and professing to have gotten things under control will only reassure policy makers and the voting public that teacher education is not in crisis.

Learning to teach writing did not make any of these preservice English teachers capable of performing an organ transplant that will some day save the life of a teenager struck in the middle of the night by a speeding car. But learning to teach writing might have helped all of these preservice English teachers take a step toward becoming the type of teachers who bring writing into the lives of students in meaningful ways.

It might be that having such a teacher keeps a few teenagers off the streets or out of gangs and hopeful for a better future. It might be that better teacher education would leave emergency rooms, prisons and morgues less crowded. Having teachers who are better prepared might mean less crowded emergency rooms, fewer teenage pregnancies, fewer suicides, a stronger economy, fewer gangs, emptier courtrooms, less pollution, stronger communities, fewer homeless, and more safe parks. It might be that by learning to teach writing all of these preservice English teachers made the difference for the thousands of children they will teach. The trouble is that

we do not yet understand the differences that teachers make. We do not understand the impact that teacher preparation has on our society.

Until teacher educators go public with the complexities of their work and develop a better understanding of how teacher preparation impacts society, the profession will remain under valued, under funded, overly simplified, and in crisis. The public will continue to support zero-tolerance legislation and the building of more prisons. Politicians will continue to preach about the need for education reform while diverting funding to more immediate and quantitative solutions to our problems. If we do not develop more a complete understanding of the complexity and the values of preparing preservice teachers, then teacher education may be washed out by the current wave of reform demanding direct routes for new teachers looking to teach in tomorrow's classrooms. Teacher educators need to show what learning to teach looks like, so that others can draw their own conclusions based on empirical evidence of the complexity of teaching, not tradition bound assumptions about the simplicity of teaching.

My Hope

When I was eleven, I gave my grandmother a short story I had written about the deaf, mute widow, Mrs. Olson who lived near the end of my street. I remember the morning I walked up to my grandmother's drawing table with the story tucked behind my back. She was sketching a cartoon for the magazine she and my grandfather published. Smiling up from her drawing

table, she accepted my story, set it on a stool, and promised to read it that afternoon. The next day she called me into her kitchen.

I remember feeling important as I stood on the soapbox she had placed in the middle of the room. She asked me to read the story out loud while she sat cross-legged on the linoleum floor. When I finished reading, she sat me down at the kitchen table and gave me some advice: if you want your writing to make a difference, don't tell readers what to think, just show them what happens.

I hope this piece shows what learning to teach writing did for these 14 preservice English teachers. My aim was neither to damn the influences that shaped these preservice English teachers' interactions with writing and teaching writing nor to praise them. I only wanted to show what I saw take place so that others could begin to appreciate the complexity of learning to teach writing and give more thoughtful consideration to the value of such an experience.

I hope that this study of what learning to teach writing did for these preservice English teachers makes a difference in increasing our understanding of the value and complexity of learning to teach writing.

References

Ackerman, J. (1993). The promise of writing to learn. Written Communication, 10(3), 334-70.

Adams, P. (1991). "Revising: An approach for all seasons." Writing Notebook, (9)2, 11-12.

Anderson, A., Blumenfield, P., Pintrich, P., Clark, C. Marx, R., & Peterson, P. (1995). Educational psychology for teachers: Reforming our courses, rethinking our roles. Educational Psychologist 30, 143-157.

Andrasick, K. (1993). Classroom publication: Motivation for literacy. English Journal, 82(6), 90-91.

Applebee, A. (1985). Traditional and reform in the teaching of English: A history. Urbana, IL: National Council Teachers of English.

Atwell, N. (1987). In the middle: Reading, and learning with adolescents. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Atwell, N. (1998). In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Auerbach, N. (1973). Alice in Wonderland: A curious child. Victorian Studies, 17, 31-47.

Ayers, W. (1993). To teach: The journey of a teacher. New York: Teachers College.

Bacharach, S. (Ed.). (1990). *Education Reform*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Baker, N. (1993). The effect of portfolio-based instruction on composition students' final examination scores, course grades, and attitudes toward writing. Research on Teaching English, 27(2), 155-174.

Bakhtin, M. (1935). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), The Dialogic Imagination (pp. 259-422). Austin, Texas: Univ. of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1970). Response to the question of the editorial committee of *Novyj mir*. Novyj Mir, 42, 328-35.

Bakhtin, M. (1973). Problems of Dostoevsky's Art. (L. Matejka & I.R. Titunik, Trans.). New York: Seminar Press. (Original work published in 1929).

Bakhtin, (1974). Concerning methodology in the human sciences. Kontekst. (42), 361-73.

Bakhtin, M. (1977). Author and character in aesthetic activity. Voprosy Filozofii, (7), 7-180.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin, M. Holquist (ed.), trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin: Texas University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Bakhtin, M. (1990). Author and hero in aesthetic activity. In M. Holquist & V. Liapunov (Eds.). Art and Answerability. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Balajthy, E. (1986). Do writers really revise? Paper presented at the Conference on Language and Literacy, Geneseo, NY.
- Bateson, C. (1990). Composing a life. New York: Penguin.
- Bateson, C. (1994). Peripheral visions. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bennet, W. (1992). The de-valuing of America: The fight for our culture and our children. New York: Touchstone.
- Berkenkotter, C. (1983). Student writers and their audiences: Case studies of the revising decisions of three college freshmen. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Berthoff, A. E. (1981). The making of meaning: Metaphors, models, and maxims for writing teachers. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Bird, T., Anderson, L., Sullivan, A., & Swidler, S. (1993). Pedagogical balancing acts: Attempts to influence preservice teachers' beliefs. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9(3), 253-267.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklin, S. (1998). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Book, C., Byers, J., & Freeman, D. (1983). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we can and cannot live. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 9-13.
- Bowers, C. & Flinders, D. (1990). Responsive teaching: An ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture, and thought. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bramald, R., Hardman, F., & Leat, D. (1995). Initial teacher trainees and their views of teaching and learning. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(1), 23-31.
- Bridwell, L. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14(3), 197-222.

- Brisbane, B. & Hamilton, G. (1997). Student teaching: A guide for student teachers, cooperating teachers and university professors. English Education Program, Teachers College.
- Britton, J. (1970). Language and learning. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Britton J. (1982). Prospect and retrospect. In Gordon M. Pradl (Ed.), Selected essays of James Britton. (pp. 304-351). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Britzman, D. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Brooke, R. (1991). Writing and sense of self: Identity negotiation in writing workshops. Urban, IL: NCTE.
- Brookhart, S. M. & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. Review of Educational Research, 62 (1), 37-60.
- Brooks J. & Brooks, M. (1993). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brown, S. (1994). Validation of curriculum: Creating a multi-level book as a portfolio and more. Exercise Exchange, 39(2), 29-32.
- Bruffee, K. (1983). Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts. In the writer's mind: Writing as a mode of thinking, 159-169. Janice N. Hays, et al. (Eds.) Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bruner, J. (1977). The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchmann, M. & Schwille, J. (1983). Education: The overcoming of experience. American Journal of Education, 92, 30-51.
- Bullough, R.V. (1989). First-year teacher: A case study. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bullough, R. V. (1995). Exploring Personal Teaching Metaphors in Preservice Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education, 42 (1), 43-51.

Bullough, R. & Gitlin, A. (1995). Becoming a student of teaching: Methodologies for exploring self and the school context. New York: Garland Publishing.

Bullough, R. V. & Stokes, D. K. (1994). Analyzing personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education as a means for encouraging professional development. American educational research journal, 31 (1), 197-224.

Calderhead, J. (1991). The nature and growth of knowledge in student teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(5/6), 531-535.

Calderhead, J. (Ed.). (1987). Exploring teachers' thinking. London: Cassell Educational Limited.

Calderhead, J. (Ed.). (1988). Teachers' professional learning. New York: The Falmer Press.

Calderhead, J. & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(1), 1-8.

Calkins, L. (1982). A study of children's rewriting. Final Report for NCTE Research Foundation Project No. 80:11.

Calkins, L. (1983). Lessons from a child: On the teaching and learning of writing. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Calkins, L. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A Nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Report of the Task Force on Teaching as Profession. New York: Author.

Carroll, L. (1995). Alice's adventures in wonderland. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Chapman, C. (1992). Co-authoring: A natural form of cooperative learning. Clearing House, 66(1), 44-46.

Charney, D. & Carlson, R. (1995). Learning to write in a genre: What student writers take from model texts. Research on the Teaching of English, 29(1), 88-125.

Charney, D., Newman, J., & Palmquist, M., (1995). "I'm just no good at writing": Epistemological style and attitudes toward writing. Written Composition, 12(3), 298-329.

- Clandinin, D. J. & F. M. Connelly. (1995). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. Educational Researcher, March, 5-12.
- Cohen, D. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus que ça change. In P. Jackson (Ed.), Contributions to educational change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.
- Colette, D. (1990). The role of play in writing development. Research on Teaching English, 24(1), 4-47.
- Collins, J. (1998). Strategies for struggling writers. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Conti, S., Ellsasser, C. & Griffin, G. (in press) School restructuring: A literature review. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Cooper, C. & Odell, L. (1977). Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cotich, J. (1994). Our writing, ourselves: Portrait of a writing group. Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of Writing and Literature, 16(1), 10-13.
- Crow, N.A. (1987). Socialization within a teacher education program: A case study: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.
- Cuban, L. (1964). The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.
- Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1980. New York: Longman.
- Cuban, L. (1990). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. Teachers College Record, 90(3), 453-477.
- Cuban, L. (1993). How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American Classrooms 1890-1990. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cusick, P.A. (1973). Inside high school. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Daiute, C. (1986). "Physical and cognitive factors in revising: Insights from studies with computers." Research in the Teaching of English. 20(2), 141-59.

- Dale, H. (1997). Co-authoring in the classroom: Creating an environment for effective collaboration. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). The right to learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Delpit, L. (1986). Skills and other dilemmas of a progressive Black educator. Harvard Educational Review, 56(4), 379-385.
- Delpit, L. (1988). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. New York: The New Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Chicago: Henry Regency.
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Chicago: Henry Regency.
- Dunkin, M. J., Precians, R. P., & Nettle, E. B. (1994). Effects of formal teacher education upon student teachers' cognitions regarding teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 19 (4), 395-408.
- Dysthe, O. (1996). The multivoiced classroom: Interactions of writing and classroom discourse. Written Communication, 13(3), 385-425.
- Eisner, E. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan.
- Elbow, P. (1973). Writing without teachers. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). The composing process of twelfth graders. Urban, IL: NCTE.
- Emig, J. (1983). The web of meaning: Essays on writing, teaching, learning, and thinking. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Esbensen, B. (1975). A celebration of bees: Helping children write poetry. Minneapolis: Winston.
- Faigley, L. (1985). Nonacademic writing: The social perspective. In Writing in Nonacademic Settings, 231-340. Les Odell and Dixie Goswami (Eds.) New York: Guilford Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook. (pp. 63-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fenstermacher (1979). Review of Research in Education, (6), 157-185.
- Flinn, J. (1984). The role of instruction in revising with computers: Forming a construct for 'good writing.' St. Louis, MO: University of Missouri.

Florio-Ruane, S., & Lensmire, T. (1990). Transforming future teachers' ideas about writing instruction. Curriculum Studies, 22(3), 277-289.

Fosnot, C.T. (1989). Enquiring teachers, enquiring learners: A constructivist approach for teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freedman, S. (1992). Outside-in and inside-out: Peer response groups in two ninth grade classes. Research on Teaching English, 26(1), 71-107.

Freire, P. (1971). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1997). Pedagogy of hope. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom. Boston, MA: Rowman and Littlefield.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change: An Introduction to educative research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gardiner, M. (1992). The dialogics of critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the theory of ideology. New York: Routledge.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: HarperCollins.

Gee, J. (1993). What is literacy? New York: Teachers College Press.

Gitlin, A. et al. (1992). Teachers voices for school change: An introduction to educative research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glassner, B. (1983). Discovering audience/inventing purpose: A case study of revision in a cooperative writing workshop. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Goetz, J. & M. LeCompte. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. Educational leadership, 49/3, 4-7.

Graff, H. (1987). The legacies of literacy: Continuities and contradictions in Western culture and society. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Grant-Davie, K. & Shapiro, N. (1987). Curing the nervous tick: Reader-based response to student writing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Graves, D. (1979). What children show us about revision. Language Arts, 56(3).

Graves, D. (1984). A researcher learns to write: Selected articles and monographs. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Graves, D. (1988). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Greene, M. (1978). Landscapes of learning. New York: Teachers college Press.

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, G. (1999). Changes in teacher education: Looking to the future. The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grossman, P. (1990). The making of a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press.

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hatch, J.A., Hills, C.A., & Hayes, J.R. (1993, October). When the messenger is the message: Reader's impressions of writers' personalities. Written Communication, 569-598.

Hawisher, G. (1986). "The effects of word processing on the revision strategies of college students." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco).

Hays, Janice, et al. (1997). The writer's mind: Writing as a mode of thinking. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Hillocks, G. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 47(2), 261-278.

Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition: New directions for teaching. Urban, IL: PAUL Clearing House on Reading and Communication Skills.

Hillocks, G. (1995). Teaching writing as reflective practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hillocks, G. (1999). Ways of thinking. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hillocks, G., Kahn, E., & Johannessen, L. (1983, October). Teaching defining strategies as a mode of inquiry: Some effects on student writing. Research in Teaching of English, 275-284.

Hirsch, E. (1996). The schools we need and why we don't have them. New York: Doubleday.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Journal, 26(2), 160-189.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 325-349.

Howard, J. (1984). Writing to learn. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Howey, K.R. & Zimpher, N.L. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. New York: State University of New York Press.

Jackson, P. (1990). Life in classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jersild, A. (1955). When teachers face themselves. New York: Teachers College.

Johnston, S. (1992). Images: A way of understanding the practical knowledge of student teachers. Teaching and teacher education, 8(2), 123-136.

Johnston, S. (1994). Conversations with student teachers - Enhancing the dialogue of learning to teach. Teaching & Teacher Education, 10 (1), 71-82.

Joram, E. & Gabriele, A. (1998). Preservice teachers' prior beliefs: Transforming obstacles into opportunities. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14(2), 175-191.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62 (2), 129-169.

Kantor, K. (1984). Classroom contexts and the development of writing institutions: An ethnographic case study. In *New Directions in Composition Research*, pp. 72-94. New York: Guilford.

Kennedy, M. M. (1998). Learning to teaching writing: Does teacher education make a difference? New York: Teachers College Press.

Kirby, D., Liner, T., & Vinz, R. (1988). Inside out: Developmental strategies for teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Kirst M.W. (1990). Accountability: Implications for state and local policy makers (policy perspective series). Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Kitzhaber, A.R. (1963). Themes, theories, and therapy: The teaching of writing in college. New York: McGraw.

Krater, J., Zeni, J., and Cason, N. (1994). Mirror images: Teaching writing in black and white. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Krest, M. (1987). Time on my hands: Handling the paper load. English Journal, 76(8), 37-42.

Kurth, R. (1986). "Using word processing to enhance revision strategies during student composing." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco).

Kutz, E. & Roskelly, H. (1991). An unquiet pedagogy: Transforming practice in the English classroom.

Lansdon-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. Portsmouth, NH: Jossey-Bass.

Langer, J.A., & Applebee, A.N. (1987). How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Lasley, T.J. (1990). Journal of Teacher Education, (31), 38-41.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. Theory into practice, XXXI/2, 87-99.

Legge, A. (1980). Small groups in college writing classes: Why and how?

Li, X. (1996). "Good writing" in cross cultural context. New York: Oxford University Press.

Light, M. (1995). Research for the social good: Information, persuasion, illumination. English Journal, 84(2), 95-98.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Macrorie, K. (1984). Writing to be read. Upper Montclair, NJ: Bpynton/Cook.

Malinowski, B. (1922). Argonauts of the Western Pacific. New York: Dutton.

Maxson, M. & Sindelar, R. (1998). Images revisited: Examining preservice teachers' ideas about teaching. Teacher Education Quarterly, 25(2), 5-26.

Mayher, J.S. (1990). Uncommon sense: Theoretical practice in language education. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook.

McDiarmid, G. (1990). Challenging preservice teachers' beliefs during early field experience: A quixotic undertaking? Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 12-20.

Mehan, H. Learning lessons. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). The case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moffett, J. (1983). Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Montessori, M. (1995). Absorbent mind. New York: Henry Holt.

Morris, C. (1991). Giving at risk juniors intellectual independence: An experiment. English Journal, 80(3), 37-41.

Morris, P. (1994). The Bakhtin reader. New York: Arnold.

Murphy, S. & Smith, M. (1992). Writing portfolios: A bridge from teaching to assessment. Markham, Ontario: Pippin Publishing.

Murray, D. (1985). A writer teaches writing. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murray, D. (1989). Expecting the unexpected. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Murray, F. (1996). Beyond natural teaching: The case for professional education. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook. (pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (1997). Write/Rewrite: An Assessment of Revision Skills. Selected Results from the Second national Assessment of Writing. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

National Commission on Excellence in education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report. Washington, DC: Author.

Neill, S. (1982). Teaching writing: Problems and solutions. AASA Critical Issues Report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

Nelson, J. (1990). This was an easy assignment: Examining how students interpret academic writing tasks. Research in Teaching English, 24(4), 362-396.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. Curriculum Studies, 19(4), 317-328.

Nettle, E. (1998). Stability and change in the beliefs of student teachers during practice teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14(2), 193-204.

Newell, G. (1994). The effects of written between-draft responses on students' writing and reasoning about literature. Written Composition, 11(3), 311-347.

Newkirk, T. (1995). The writing conference as performance. Research on teaching English, 29(2), 193-215.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethical and moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

North, S. (1987). The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Cook.

Nystrand, M. (1997). Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., Greene, S., & Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? Written Communication, 10(3), 267-333.

Oliver, E. (1995). The writing quality of seventh, ninth and eleventh graders, and college freshmen: Does rhetorical specification in writing prompts make a difference? Research on Teaching English, 29(4), 422-450.

Owston, R., et al. (1991). "The effects of word processing on student writing in a high computer access environment." Technical Report 91-3. York, Ontario: York University Centre for the Study of Computers in Education.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62(3), 307-332.

Pajares, F. & Johnson, M. (1994). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and apprehension. Research on Teaching English, 28(3), 313-331.

Palmer, P. (1998). The courage to teach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmquist, M. & Young, R. (1992). The notion of giftedness and student expectations about writing. Written Composition, 9(1), 137-168.

Penrose, A. (1992). To write or not to write. Written Communication, 9(4), 465-500.

Pintrich M. (1990). Houston W.R. (Ed.). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: MacMillan Press.

Polette, K. (1995). Tracking": Writing rotten to write well. English Journal, 84(8), 72-74.

Porter, A.C. (1989). A curriculum out of balance: The case of elementary school mathematics. Educational Research, 62(3), 307-332.

Powell, R. (1992). The influence of prior experiences on pedagogical constructs of traditional and nontraditional preservice teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 8(3), 225-238.

Prawat, R. (1992). Teachers beliefs about teaching and learning: A constructivist perspective. American Journal of Education, May, 354-395.

Pressnall, B. (1995). Skeletons out of the closet: The case of the missing 162%. Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of writing and Literature 17(3), 20-25.

Ravitch, D., & Viteritti, J.P. (Eds.). (1998). New schools for a new century: The redesign of urban education. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Reid, L. (1983). Talking: The neglected part of the writing process. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Conference.
- Rijlaarsdam, G. (1987). Effects of peer evaluation on writing performance, writing processes, and psychological variables. Paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.
- Rodriguez, A. J. (1993). A dose of reality: Understanding the origin of the theory/practice dichotomy in teacher education from the students' point of view. Journal of Teacher Education, 44 (3), 213-221.
- Romano, T. (1987). Clearing the way: Working with teenage writers. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Romano, T. (1995). Writing with passion: Life stories, multiple genres. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Rothermel, D. (1995). What's so funny. Voices from the middle, 2(3), 20-25.
- Russell, C. (1985). Peer conferencing and writing revision: A study of the relationship. Service Bulletin No. 48, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English.
- Ryder, R. (1994). Using frames to promote critical writing. Journal of Reading, 38(3), 210-18.
- Sarason, S. (1996). Revisiting: The culture of the school and the problem of change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schoonmaker, F. (1998). Promise and possibility: Learning to teach. Teachers College Record, 99 (3), 559-591.
- Schubert, W. H., & W. C. Ayers, eds. (1992). Teacher lore: Learning from our own experience. New York: Longman.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shaughnessy, A. (1994). Teaching to the test: Sometimes a good practice. English Journal, 83(4), 54-56.

Shrofel, S. (1991). Developing writing teachers. English Education, 23(3), 160-177.

Shuman, R. & Wolfe, D. (1990). Teaching English through the arts. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Sikula, J. (Ed.). (1996). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan Press.

Simic, M. (1993). "Publishing Children's Writing." PAUL/REC Digest.

Simmons, E. (1990). Student worlds student words: Teaching writing through folklore. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, F. (1994). Writing and the writer. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smylie, M.A., Bay, M., & Tozer, S.E. (1999). Preparing teachers as agents of change. The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sommers, N. (1982). "Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers." Washington, D.C: National Institute of Education.

Spandel, V, & Stiggins, R. (1997). Creating writers: Linking writing assessment and instruction. New York: Longman.

Sperling, M. (1990). I want to talk to each of you: Collaboration and the teacher-student writing conference. Research on Teaching English, 24(3), 279-321.

Sperling, M. (1991). Dialogues of deliberation: Conversation in the teacher-student writing conference. Written Communication, 8(2), 131-162.

Spivey, N. (1990). Transforming texts: Constructive processes in reading and writing. Written Communication, 7(2), 256-287.

Stoddard, B, & MacArthur, C. (1993). A peer editor strategy: Guiding learning-disabled students in response and revision. Research in Teaching English, 27(1), 76-103.

Stodosky, S. S. (1988). The subject matters: Classroom activity in math and social studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stolareck, E. (1994). Prose modeling and metacognition: The effect of modeling on developing a metacognitive stance toward writing. Research on Teaching English, 28(2), 154-174.

Sykes, G. (1992). The needs of children and the education of educators. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Tatto, M. (1998). The influence of teacher education on teachers' beliefs about purposes of education, roles, and practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(1), 66-77.

Tiger, M. (1994). Following the dots. Teachers and Writers, 25(4), 7-11.

Tillema, H. (1994). Training and professional expertise: Bridging the gap between new information and pre-existing beliefs of teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 10(6), 601-615.

Todorov, T. (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogic principle. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Tom, A. (1997). Redesigning Teacher Education. New York, State University of New York.

Tyack, D. (1974). The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyson, H. (1994). Who will teach the children? Progress and resistance in teacher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Valli, L. (1993). Reflective teacher education. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Vinz, Ruth. (1996). Composing a teaching life. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Vinz, R. & Erdahl, (1993). Taste of lightning in your teeth. English Education, (May), 84-99.

Voloshinov, V.N. (1973). Marxism and the philosophy of language. New York: Seminar Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). Thought and language, trans. A. Kozulin, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Wallace, D. (1996). From intentions to text: Articulating initial intentions for writing. Research on Teaching English, 30(2), 182-219.
- Waller, W. (1961). The sociology of teaching. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Wauters, J. (1988). Non-confrontational critiquing pairs: An alternative to verbal peer response groups. Writing Instructor, &(3-4), 156-165.
- Weaver, C. (1996). Teaching grammar in context. Portsmouth, NH: Boyntpn/Cook.
- Weinstein, C. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1), 31-40.
- Weinstein, C. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 53-60.
- Wei, Z. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students comments and interaction. Written Communication, 12(4), 492-528.
- Weir, K. (1991). Freedom and responsibility. English Journal, 80(3), 43-46.
- Whitehurst, P. (1993). Writing the stars: Why writers write in the real world. English Journal, 82(7), 36-38.
- Williamson, M. & Hout, B. (1992). Validating holistic scoring for writing assessment: Theoretical and empirical foundations. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Wilson, S., & Wineburg, S. (1988). Peering at history through a different lens: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. Teachers College Record, 89(4), 525-539.
- Winitzky, N & Kauchak., D. "Constructivism in Teacher Education: Applying Cognitive Theory to Teacher Learning," *Constructivist Teacher Education*: 59-83).
- Wolf, S. & Davinroy, K. (1998). The clay that makes the pot: The loss of language in writing assessment. Written Composition 15(4), 419-464.
- Woomble, G. (1984). "Process and processor: Is there room for a machine in the English classroom?" English Journal, 73(1), 34-37.
- Wooten, J. (1988). Audience -based composition: The freshman writer and the professional journalist. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Wubbels, T. (1992). Taking account of student teachers' preconceptions. Teaching and teacher education, 8(2), 137-149.

Xiaoguang, C. (1996). Metadiscourse: A technique for improving student writing. Research on Teaching English, 30(2), 149-181.

Yagelski, R. (1995). The role of classroom context in the revision strategies of student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 29(2), 216-238.

Yeh, S. (1998). Empowering education: Teaching argumentative writing to cultural minority middle-school students. Research on Teaching English, 33(1), 49-84.

Yin, R.K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yoder, S. (1993). "Teaching writing revision: Attitudes and copy changes." Journalism Educator, 47(4), 41-47.

Young, R. (1982). Concepts of art and the teaching of writing. In J.J. Murphy (Ed.), The rhetorical tradition and modern writing. (130-141). New York: The Modern Language Association.

Zeichner, K.M., & Gore, J.M. (Eds.). (1990). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: MacMillan Press, 329-348.

Appendix A
Post Class Questionnaire

Thank you for helping me contribute to teacher educators' understanding of the teaching of the teaching of writing to secondary students. My goal is to present teacher educators with preservice teachers' needs and beliefs about the teaching of writing so that Teaching of Writing Classes might be grounded in preservice teachers' needs and guided by preservice teachers' beliefs.

Confidential Contact Information:

In order to respect your privacy, pseudonyms will be used in the study. However, contact information will enable me to confirm the accuracy of my interpretation of your information. In order to minimize the affects of my own assumptions and beliefs, I plan to ask study participants for feedback about my findings and conclusions.

Name: _____

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Part I:

Imagine that you are a first year teacher of secondary English. Please provide a description of the following context characteristics of your school:

- the demographics of the school's community (suburban-upper middle class, urban-working class, etc)
- the type of school (urban-public, suburban-public, urban private, etc.)
- whether the students are a heterogeneous or homogenous group in terms of their cultural backgrounds and learning styles
- the grade level of the class
- the number of students in the class
- the lesson's objective(s)
- any other characteristics you feel are important

Part II:

Imagine that you are in your first year of teaching in the context described in Part I. Please describe one class meeting in which writing is the focus. The description should present a picture of what happens from start to finish.

Part III

Please answer the following two questions:

- What do you believe about learning, teaching, and writing?
- What do you need from the Teaching of Writing Class in order to teach your imagined class?

Please place this form and your response in the envelope and return to the folder on the door of the English Department, 310 Main Hall, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Appendix B
Initial Interview Questions

- 1) What readings challenged or reinforced your prior beliefs about teaching writing?
- 2) What discussions challenged or reinforced your prior beliefs about teaching writing?
- 3) What assignments challenged or reinforced your prior beliefs about teaching writing?
- 4) What in class work challenged or reinforced you prior beliefs about teaching writing?
- 5) What did you value most during the class? (other students, readings, the professor, etc.) Why?
- 6) What advice would you give to professors who teach the teaching of writing?
- 7) What advice would you give to a student starting to learn about the teaching of writing?
- 8) Describe a particular moment when you became frustrated or confused.
- 9) Describe a moment when you discovered something you had not yet considered.
- 10) Describe a single experience or idea from the semester which you hope will stay with you once you enter the classroom as a full time teacher of writing.

Appendix C

Consent Form

Informed Consent Document**For****A Study of Preservice Secondary English Teachers**

This study is designed to provide English educators with an understanding of where prospective English teachers are in their understanding of the teaching of writing. The study focuses attention on what takes place in a learning to teach writing class. The bulk of data is comprised of the researcher's field notes taken during the one semester class, interviews with prospective English teachers, and interviews conducted during the following semester.

The data gathered from the prospective teachers will be used to shed light on the teacher's experiences and perspectives. The hope is that this information will help teacher educators to design methods and curriculum in light of some increased understanding of where prospective teachers are in the process of learning to teach writing at the secondary level. Prior to publishing any findings, the researcher will offer subjects the opportunity to comment on the findings.

The researcher agrees to answer any inquiries regarding the procedures, and to respect each subject's request to withdraw his/her consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time.

Researcher: Christopher Ward Ellsasser

Subject: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D

Syllabus

English Education

Teachers College, Columbia University

Fall 1998

A&HL4151: Teaching of Writing

A&HL4151: Writer's Workshop

Professor: Greg Hamilton

511A Thompson

Office Hours: Tuesdays & Wednesdays, 3-4:30

(212) 678-3316

gwh5@columbia.edu

"A work is never *necessarily* finished, for [she] who made it is never complete, and the power and agility [she] has drawn from it confer on [her] just the power to improve it . . . [She] draws from it what is needed to efface and remake it."

Paul Valery

"I don't wait to be struck by lightening and don't need certain slants of light in order to write."

Toni Morrison

"I listen to the voices."

William Faulkner

Required Texts

Atwell, Nancie. (1998) *In the Middle*

Fletcher, Ralph. (1993) *What a Writer Needs*

Kirby, Liner, Vinz. (1988) *Inside Out: Developmental Strategies for Teaching Writing*

Romano, Tom. *Wriitng with Passion*

Two books by a writer on writing, including one of the following:

Fletcher, Ralph. (1996) *Breathing In, Breathing Out: Keeping A Writer's Notebook*

Heard, Georgie. (1995) *Writing Towards Home: Tales and Lessons to Find Your Way*

Lamott, Anne. (1994) *bird by bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*

Course Schedule

September: 2, 9, 16, 23, 30*

October: 7, 14, 21, 28

November: 4, 11, 18, 26*

December: 2, 9, 16

* subject to change

On-going Assignments

Writer on writing. Select two books to read by writers on writing. Draft a 3-5 page response/presentation. Due on October 7th.

Keep a journal. If you don't already, begin a notebook/journal and write every day. Ralph Fletcher writes, "Keeping a notebook is the single best way I know to survive as a writer. It encourages you to pay attention to your world, inside and out. It serves as a container to keep together all the seeds you gather until your ready to plant them. It gives you a quiet place to catch your breath and begin to write" (1996: 1).

Making media matter. Each week through October 28th, read *The New Yorker*. Skim each issue: read one piece in each issue carefully. Response weekly in your notebook/journal to one particular piece, e.g. likes, noticings, wonderings, inspirations, criticisms, etceteras. Bring your issue notes to class each week.

Each week through October 28th, read *The New York Times* as often as you can. Try to read a variety of sections. Read the "magazine" on Sunday. Read a sports column on Monday. Read a piece from the "Science Times" on Tuesday. Read the "Op-ed" page, the editorials, the news summaries, etc. Keep a folder of the pieces that you like personally or that you might find useful in your classroom. Inside the cover of the folder, jot ideas for their use as they occur to you.

Observing, analyzing, and evaluating. Take notes on how writing is being taught in the school where you are student teaching or working. If possible, visit another classroom where a teacher is working with writing.

Requirements

Be on time (this goes without saying, right?)! Actively participate during discussions, small and large group. This includes active listening. Try not to monopolize air-time. I encourage everyone to help monitor this and will model my own way of opening up a discussion.

Please communicate if you are going to miss class. You may leave messages on my voice maile or email. Missing more than two classes will drop your grade. Use the buddy system to stay on top of discussions, readings, and assignments.

Grades for the two courses will be by portfolio, which will be due by December 16th. You should have in your portfolio:

Two finished pieces of writing including drafts and revisions on your own readings, those of your peers during writing workshops and/or my comments. The first of these will be due on November 11th and the second will be due on December 2nd.

A stamped envelope addressed to an appropriate place where you are going to send one of the above pieces of writing in hopes of seeing it published.

Five lesson plans and/or a mini-unit developed for a middle school and/or a high school classroom. We will spend class time discussing lesson and unit planning, specifically goals, objectives, do-nows, activities, and evaluation. This assignment will reflect classroom management strategies and a philosophy of teaching. You may work on this project individually or in a small group (2-3 members). All members must submit a copy of the project in their portfolios. Draft due October 28th.

Five photocopied entries from your journal/notebook representing a semester's work.

Your New York Times folder.

A 2-3 page introduction to your portfolio, synthesizing your thoughts on being a writer and becoming a teacher of writing.