2015

We Learned What?: Pre-service Teachers as Developmental Writers in the Writing Methods Class

Christina Saidy
Arizona State University at the Tempe Campus, christina.saidy@asu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Rhetoric and Composition Commons, and the Secondary Education and Teaching Commons

We Learned What?: Pre-service Teachers as Developmental Writers in the Writing Methods Class

T/W

We Learned What?: Pre-service Teachers as Developmental Writers in the Writing Methods Class

Christina Saidy
Arizona State University

Each semester in my writing methods course, the class and I work our way through readings, participate in simulated lessons, and create teaching materials on the topic of teaching grammar in context. We discuss 'drill and kill' approaches to grammar and the students' experiences with this approach and posit grammar in context as a response. By the end of the semester, I typically feel as though my students are on board. They seem to understand grammar belongs within the teaching of writing, and their microteaching and writing units illustrate this understanding. Imagine my surprise then when Sarah, as student who had taken my writing methods course and was enrolled the following semester in my comprehensive methods course taught a mini-lesson in which grammar was covered completely out of context. Not only did Sarah teach this lesson, but also she seemed unaware of the discontinuities between what she'd learned, and demonstrated, in a previous class and what she was choosing to teach in the following class.

In this article, I employ a pedagogical reflection to delve into the grammar-out-of-context lesson Sarah taught in the second methods course in order to examine the way that teachers learn to teach writing via the writing methods course. While my experience of working with Sarah deals with what have come to be standard questions--How does teacher education impact pre-service and early career teachers? Why do writing teachers teach the way they were taught?--this example also shows us what we can learn specifically about teaching pre-service teachers of writing. Specifically, it calls on teacher educators to question how a teacher's knowledge of writing pedagogy and experiences as a writer impacts her early instruction. Furthermore, it challenges writing teacher educators to consider ways to use knowledge about teaching writing as guiding principles for the work done in the writing methods course and the ways pre-service teachers are asked to think of themselves as writers and writing teachers.

As I reflected on the experience with Sarah's out-of-context grammar lesson, I came to see that the way I constructed the curriculum in the writing methods course created a missed opportunity. My writing methods course

T/W

curriculum invited Sarah to think of herself as a teacher of writing but not to align that with the way she thought of herself as a writer in relation to other writers. This metaphor of 'teacher-as-writer' is a powerful one often employed by in-service teachers who write in writing groups, participate in teacher writing via local affiliates of the National Writing Project, publish teacher research and teaching articles, or who write professionally or in their communities. However, pre-service teachers come to the writing methods course as developing academic writers, who consistently write for coursework, certification documentation, social media, and a variety of other venues and purposes. Recasting the 'teacher-as-writer' metaphor as a 'teaching as developing writer' metaphor encourages pre-service teachers to see their teaching of writing as developmental, much in the way that we encourage writers to see their writing as developmental. Further, this metaphor of 'teacher-as-developing-writer' provides the opportunity to encourage pre-service teachers to see writing and writing pedagogy as ecological—relational and situated—and constantly developing (Cooper, 1986; Rivers and Weber, 2011), which frees them from the need to be writing experts. Pre-service teachers who are less focused on expertise, and more focused on writing development for themselves and their students, may be more willing to experiment with a variety of theories and practices learned in their writing methods courses, since they see this experimentation as part of their development rather than evidence of their expertise. In the following pages, I review relevant literature and examine the case of Sarah's out-of-context grammar lesson to illustrate ways her experience and the course curriculum could have been enhanced by the teacher as developing writer metaphor within an ecological view of writing pedagogy.

Literature Review
Teaching the Way They Were Taught
Sarah's case begs the question, was she, as a new Language Arts teacher, planning to teach secondary language arts in the same manner in which she was taught secondary language arts? There has been considerable investigation into this phenomenon in the broader field of teacher education. In her "The Role of Pre-service Teacher Education," (1999) Mary M. Kennedy grounds her discussion of the issue in sociologist Dan Lortie's apprenticeship model. Kennedy, summarizing Lortie's argument, states:

> …teachers go through a lengthy apprenticeship of observation in that they spend their entire childhoods observing teachers teach. Lortie suggested that the endurance of traditional teaching practice derives in part from the fact that teachers are highly likely to teach in the way they themselves were taught (55).

T/W

Kennedy problematizes this apprenticeship model, however, in considering reform models of teacher preparation. She notes, "In fact, if teachers must draw on their apprenticeship of observation in order to learn to teach, then most reform proposals are doomed" (56). Specifically Kennedy notes that the impact of reform models grounded in Deweyian principles or social justice may be lost in light of the apprenticeship model since apprenticeship is not grounded in current educational practices. Kennedy's early description has the potential to invite readers to question -- if teachers are simply going to teach the way they were taught despite teacher education, then why bother with teacher education?

Of course, this is not Kennedy's approach, and is not the approach of most teacher educators. To continue doing the work they do, teacher educators must believe that their instruction makes a difference in some regard. To tease out this difference, Kennedy's study examines the difference between teacher ideals prior to teaching and teacher ideas or practices that occur in the actual classroom. While Kennedy's study is geared toward measuring the effectiveness of traditional university-based teacher education programs versus 'received wisdom,' or alternative preparation models, her findings are relevant to the larger argument of this piece. For example, in her examination of the teaching of writing Kennedy finds that, "As teachers move closer and closer to the action of teaching, their frame of reference turns more toward the traditional view of writing as requiring compliance with prescription" (66). Interestingly, even pre-service teachers who claimed to have fairly non-traditional views of writing instruction erred on the side of prescription as they entered the classroom. Kennedy's work seemingly suggests that as pre-service teachers get closer to becoming professionals and shift their focus to being experts on content, they draw less from their experiences as writers and more from their ideas of what teaching should be, which often lends to a more prescriptive approach.

This move toward more prescription is recorded in Smagorinsky, Wilson, and Moore's "Teaching Grammar and Writing" (2011) in which they follow a teacher through student teaching and into her first year of full time teaching. The authors provide evidence that illustrates the chasm between what the teacher knows and what she practices. They quote the teacher saying "'Even though I know all of the statistics that say direct grammar instruction does not work, that's what I'm doing, is direct grammar instruction'" (281). The authors report that the teacher's choice is based on her perception that her students' skills are "below grade level" (281) and even more so that she worried her students would not pass their standardized tests. The authors suggest that, in part, the teacher's choices were impacted by the fact that she was "Removed from any influence of the university" and did not "have a strong background in writing pedagogy, either from coursework or student teaching" (280). They conclude, therefore, that this situation, "…led her to refer to herself as the source of many of her teaching

decisions, and these decisions appeared to come in response to student problems rather than as a part of instructional planning" (280). In this case, the move toward prescription was part of the process of problem solving. There was certainly potential for the teacher to solve problems by using other resources, such as her university's teacher educators. However, in the absence of that type of influence the teacher and new teachers like her, often turn to their own limited experiences as teachers to make decisions. This limited experience is often grounded in their experiences as students and lead to pedagogical choices that err on the side of prescription as a way of maintaining control over the class and the curriculum. In this case, teaching grammar out of context is one of the many areas in which pre-service or in-service teachers show a disconnect in regards to their learning.

Whitney, Olan, and Fredricksen (2013) suggest this disconnect occurs in more areas than just the teaching of grammar. They note that pre-service and early in-service teachers typically "reach for--and deserve help in finding--concrete tools to use in their initial steps into teaching practice" (184). While being prepared with practical strategies is an important element of teaching, especially in writing, Whitney, Oland, and Fredricksen point out that this search for the practical is problematic in that early career teachers see theory and practice as disparate. Therefore, pre-service and early career teachers come to value classroom experience in sometimes unproductive ways that do not, necessarily, lead to more effective teaching. Read and Landon-Hays (2013) refer to this as the "knowing/doing gap" and argue that this gap, while due in part to a theory/practice gap, as noted above, is more grounded in the fact that methods instruction fails to realistically account for the demands of teaching and assessing writing within the constraints of today's secondary schools. It is important to note, however, that Read and Landon-Hays study takes place in a geographical area in which a specific writing methods course is not typically offered. Instead, students usually take only a comprehensive English methods course that addresses writing as a topic within the broader content area.

In her investigation of specific writing methods courses in Ohio, Christine Tulley (2013) finds that the theory and practice gap is alive and well. Tulley speculates that this gap is intensified by two particular challenges. First among the challenges is "lack of opportunities for concept development" (43). Tulley explains that while theories of teaching writing are covered in the writing class, the assignments in the class, for example the research paper, do not encourage students to see theory in practice. Tulley's second challenge is "Current writing methods course designs don't embrace the fluidity of rhetoric and composition as a discipline " (44) which may lead to fragmented concept development for pre-service teachers. Related to this challenge, Tulley notes that the majority of writing methods course instructors in her study (64.7%) hold degrees in rhetoric

and composition. Yet, Tulley argues that a tension exists between rhetoric and composition and English education that leads to a disconnect for students because of competing theoretical frames at work in the writing methods course. While these competing frames have the potential to be problematic, they also have the potential to broaden pre-service teachers' knowledge base for classroom teaching.

One particular example of a theoretical approach grounded in rhetoric and composition pedagogy is the idea of writing/rhetorical ecologies. Emerging in the late 1980s with Marilyn Cooper's, "The Ecology of Writing" (1986), this theoretical frame has gained steam in the years following that publication. Scholars have focused on various facets of writing ecologies (Syverson, 1999), rhetorical ecologies (Edbauer, 2005), and the relationship between writing ecologies and public rhetoric (Rivers and Weber, 2011). Despite different areas of emphasis, these pieces are tied to the notion that writing is ecological—relational, negotiated, and evolving. While this theoretical frame may be present in an undergraduate's instruction in first-year composition, it is largely absent in the writing methods course due to the competing theoretical frames between rhetoric and composition and English education that Tulley discusses. However, these competing theoretical frames, while posing challenges in the methods course, also have the potential to lend to a broader knowledge base combined with more opportunities for concept development. Further the articulation and exploration of these competing frames has the potential to help bridge the knowledge gap in and beyond the methods course.

Teacher-as-Writer

While pre-service and early career teachers are often quick to admit they are beginners, there is certainly a feeling that teacher education is an ending point. That is, teachers are expected to have obtained the knowledge that they need to be *expert enough* to effectively deliver instruction to students. Most educators acknowledge that two or three years in an upper division teacher education program are not nearly enough time for a teacher to become an expert in any area of teaching. Yet, teacher educators are often continually surprised when early career teachers displace the theoretical and practical foundational knowledge from their methods courses in honor of other approaches, which may derive from sources such as their experiences as students, Internet research, and modeling lessons they've observed.

Pre-service teachers come to the writing methods class as writers, but often fail to see themselves that way. This is partly due to the way that they tend to be future-focused and think of themselves as future teachers rather than as current student writers. However, they are shaped by their own K-12 writing instruction, writing courses in college, writing intensive college courses, and the writing they do to participate in their families, communities, and workplaces.

T/W

Daisey (2009) notes that teachers must begin with their own literacy and asserts, "The ability of a teacher to include writing-to-learn activities in a classroom with efficacy and success depends on the teacher's beliefs and attitudes about writing and his or her capacity to develop instructional activities" (158). Through her study of high writing enjoyment and low writing enjoyment pre-service teachers, Daisey found that teacher educators need to be aware of their students' levels of writing enjoyment, since these levels directly impact future instructional choices. However, even teachers who do not enjoy writing or who have struggled with writing can draw from their own experiences as developing writers.

Much of the past and current scholarship on practicing teachers identifying as teacher-writers focuses on teacher-writers writing alongside students so that students see the teacher as a model writer in the classroom (Kittle, 2008; Murray, 1968), teachers writing in supportive communities such as affiliate groups of the National Writing Project (Whitney, 2008), or teachers writing in school-based teacher writing groups or communities of practice (Brooks, 2007). Typically, teacher-as-writer is a term used for practicing teachers who aim to improve or enhance the teaching of writing in their classroom via their own writing practice. However, the teacher-as-writer metaphor may be re-appropriated for the writing methods course.

As I reflected on the experience with Sarah's out-of-context grammar lesson, I considered the way that Sarah constructed and reflected on her lesson together with what she told me about herself and her teaching both during the methods course and afterward when we met to discuss her student teaching. I used my pedagogical reflection of Sarah's lesson design, microteaching, and reflections from the general methods course as a catalyst to consider my own teaching of the writing methods course to encourage pre-service teachers to think of themselves as writers as they learned to see themselves as writing teachers. In the following pages, I argue that a methods course that focuses on the teacher-as-writer metaphor opens space for pre-service teachers to see writing as relational and situated and takes away some of the pressure to be writing experts that pre-service and early career teachers feel.

Sarah's Story
Developing Ethos
Sarah first delivered her lesson for a class microteaching assignment. The microteaching assignment in the general methods course provides pre-service teachers the opportunity to compose, deliver, and revise a lesson on any topic in the English Language Arts. Since this was not a writing methods course, which Sarah had taken the previous semester, Sarah was not required to teach a writing lesson for the microteaching assignment. Therefore, her choice of a grammar-based assignment was not influenced specifically by the content of the class or the

nature of the assignment.

As in most methods courses that incorporate microteaching, the assignment is beneficial since it meets a number of course goals. First, microteaching offers pre-service students the opportunity to generate lessons they may choose to use in their own classrooms, either in student teaching or in their in-service teaching experiences. Second, the microteaching assignment offers pre-service teachers the opportunity to practice teaching in a supportive group that offers constructive feedback. Because of this dual focus, the microteaching assignment requires pre-service teachers to both familiarize themselves with their audiences and develop their ethos, or credibility, with that audience. This is a complex task since the audience for the microteaching is not the imagined audience for the assignment. The audience for microteaching is fellow students in the methods course, while the imagined audience is students in a secondary English Language Arts class. Therefore, developing ethos for the microteaching requires the pre-service teacher to consider elements of credibility necessary for both audiences.

Sarah, like the majority of students in the university's teacher education program, participated in a cohorted program. Therefore, by her last semester in coursework Sarah was familiar with the majority of students in the class and had formed good friendships with a handful of these students. This familiarity increased the likelihood that Sarah would be willing to try something new for microteaching, rather than sticking to an assignment that she had seen before. Further, the microteaching assignment in this class required a revision to the lesson plan and a reflection on the lesson and the revisions. The revision and reflection are intended to model the process of good teaching for students in the methods courses. In order to revise, the pre-service teachers must observe the reactions and behaviors of the audience while teaching the lesson and listen to and process the comments after teaching the lesson. This process, therefore, conveys to pre-service teachers the process of seasoned and reflective educators who observe their students, or audience, learning and modify instruction to maintain ethos and better meet the needs of their students.

In the comprehensive methods course, Sarah struggled to choose a topic for her microteaching lesson. In part, this may be related to the expansiveness of the general methods class. That is, in a general methods class there are so many options for lesson topics, while in a more narrowly focused course, there may be fewer options. She originally narrowed in on teaching note taking as both a writing and listening lesson, which she proposed for the initial assignment check in. Yet, Sarah changed her mind a number of times before settling on grammar out of context lesson. In personal discussions, Sarah seemed to indicate that she could not decide what to teach because of the wide range of content available to her. However, in her reflection on the microteaching, she recounts a different

T/W

reason for her change:

> When thinking about the lesson that I wanted to teach I started out planning on doing some sort of note-taking activity so the students could learn how to better organize their thoughts and notes. I started looking on education websites for lesson plans having to do with notes so I could get some ideas but nothing was really catching my eye. Then I happened to see the 'every-day-edits' on educationworld.com and thought it was a really cool idea, so I decided to do that for my microteaching lesson. I thought this was going to be a fabulous lesson that everyone would love…

Sarah's reflection shows that she was more motivated by the reception of her lesson than, perhaps, by the soundness of the lesson. That is, she was shopping for lessons and looking for things that stuck out. While Sarah first began her lesson search with a goal – to find a good note-taking lesson she could make her own – she was lured away from that topic by a lesson that she perceived would engage the participants. Additionally, she was comfortable in the methods course and had developed her credibility with that particular audience, so she was willing to try something completely new since she believed she would receive feedback that was both constructive and respectful. More importantly, however, this choice illustrates an important element for many pre-service teachers. That is, pre-service teachers are concerned with what their students will *think of* the lesson and the degree to which students will be engaged while concurrently concerning themselves with developing their own credibility in the classroom. Furthermore, Sarah took sole responsibility for what her students would think of the assignment. She saw herself as creating the assignment on her own, despite the fact that she used a source for the assignment, and believed she was individually responsible for the way students would perceive her assignment.

Theoretical Grounding
Notable, as well, was the source of Sarah's lesson. In the writing methods course, Sarah had been exposed to a variety of theoretical and practical texts on teaching grammar in context. In that course and in the comprehensive methods course, students were directed toward websites such as NCTE's *Read Write and Think* for lessons grounded in the field's literature. Yet, Sarah chose a broader web search and website to locate a lesson. Every Day Edits is a featured activity on this website, yet it contains no authorial information or citations. Though Sarah chose a source that was not necessarily theoretically grounded, it does show the extent to which pre-service and practicing teachers move beyond their own knowledge to plan for instruction. Further, Sarah's web search for the activity illustrates the potential for teaching to be connected and networked. Although Sarah reported

T/W

creating the lesson on her own, she clearly sought out an electronic teacher resource site for the source.

Prior to teaching, Sarah told our class that this lesson could be used in a competitive format in the classroom. She imagined that classes would compete against each other to see which class identified the most errors. The class that correctly identified the most errors over a period of time would win a prize. She explains in her reflection, "I think this is a great concept and one that the students would really enjoy throughout the duration of the semester, and would give them motivation to win with the competition with their peers, and the prize at the end." In part, this assignment was appealing to Sarah because it offered a classroom management strategy. On numerous occasions in the methods course, Sarah had discussed her anxiety about classroom management. She was worried about possibly being placed in a difficult classroom for student teaching where students would not listen to her. This apprehension is reflected in Sarah's perspective on this lesson as a way to maintain control, as is often the case for early career teachers who err on the side of prescriptive lessons when they perceive a need to gain or maintain control of a class (Smagorinsky, Wilson, and Moore, 2011; Hartwell, 1985).

This interest in controlling the class is also reflected in Sarah's perspective on assessment in both the original and revised lesson. Sarah notes that she will assess students both collaboratively and individually during the lesson. She comments:

> I will assess how students are learning from how well each student, and the team as a whole, identify the errors and explain the content of the article. It will be hard to assess students individually. I plan on walking around and listening to each group, hoping to get an idea of who is providing the answers and who is not.

Again, Sarah perceived this lesson as a way of maintaining control, viewing student writing as an individual act, and providing evidence of which students work harder than others. The assessment plan above does not reflect the values of collaborative learning that Sarah typically espoused in class. For example, Sarah and her colleagues had been taught in the writing methods class and other teacher preparation courses to think about ways that students learn together in collaborative settings. This was particularly central in the writing methods course which covered peer reviewing, peer composing, and writing workshops as effective methods for improving student writing. Like the grammar lesson itself, Sarah's deviation from the ideals of group composing that had been infused in the methods class, seemed less like a case of a student 'not getting it' and more a case of a pre-service teacher worried about maintaining class control by keeping

T/W

students active in the lesson. In this case, Sarah was planning to use her assessment strategy as a way of policing students, which reflects her classroom management insecurities far more than it reflects her pedagogical training.

Revision
I met with Sarah in the semester that followed this class. At the time of our meeting, Sarah was student teaching in a local high school under the supervision of a male teacher. Sarah reported that she had been teaching the grammar-out-of-context Everyday Edits for the few weeks prior to the meeting. She was excited because her most challenging class, with a disproportionate number of boys to girls, had earned their first pizza party. This was significant for Sarah since she reported struggling with the management of the boys in the class. Sarah was asked how the lesson was going and if it was helping the students improve their writing. She said the students were really 'into it,' fairly well managed during the activity, and excited about the pizza party, but she did not think the assignment was improving their writing. She was unsure what to do at that point. The assignment was working to manage a difficult class, the students were excited about the pizza, but Sarah had begun to realize the limitations of the activity.

At this point, I asked Sarah if she remembered the readings about grammar in context we had read and discussed in the writing methods class (Weaver, 1996; Rosen, 1987; Lindblom and Dunn, 2006; Sams, 2003). She reported remembering that grammar exercises should be contextual. I encouraged her to think about ways to make this activity, which worked for her as a management strategy, a more meaningful pedagogical activity by drawing the exercises from the students' own writing and then encouraging the students to go back to their writing after the activity. She questioned, "I can do that?" Sarah responded to the invitation much in the same way that beginning writers respond to a teacher's invitation to bend a writing 'rule' that the student writer has internalized. She asked if the activity was 'allowed' and then excitedly moved on to planning how to make the editing activity more meaningful. Sarah planned to talk with her supervising teacher about going through student drafts and looking for common errors prior to the next Everyday Edits activity.

Beginning Teacher-as-Writer
The grammar-out-of context lesson that Sarah taught offered an opportunity to consider ways to enhance the writing methods course to more effectively prepare pre-service teachers to be writing teachers. Through the examination of Sarah's class materials and conversations I had with her about this activity, it became apparent that Sarah approached the pedagogical assignments for the class in much the same way that student writers approach tasks in the writing class. That is, Sarah considered her audience, attempted to develop an ethos, identified sources,

T/W

and, eventually and with some encouragement, revised her teaching activity. Moreover, Sarah approached each of these composing tasks with the trepidation that writers experience as they attempt new writing tasks. Most importantly, like a developing writer, Sarah made mistakes. She displaced her knowledge about rhetorical grammar in the interest of her audience concerns and developing ethos, and like developing writers often do in these situations, she did not even realize that she had done this.

Revising the Writing Methods Syllabus for the Ways Real Writers Write
Although the syllabus for the writing methods course invited students to act as writers—all assignments had opportunities for drafting, composing, and revising—Sarah's example encouraged a consideration of the explicit moves that may help pre-service teachers see that they come to the methods class and to teaching as continually developing writers and teachers. This approach has the potential to downplay the intense pressure that pre-service teachers feel to gain expertise in one short semester. Instead, using the metaphor of the developing writer offers students the opportunities to consider the ways that real writers write and see writing as an activity within a community of practice that can then be taken to the classroom and into professional opportunities.

Since pre-service teachers are typically in an aspirational position, aspiring to be professional educators with the pedagogical knowledge and confidence of veteran teachers, the focus of the writing methods class tends to focus on teacherly practice rather than on the pre-service teachers as writers. Furthermore, by time pre-service teachers reach the writing methods course, they are often long removed from thinking and practices of their college writing courses typically taken in the first year of undergraduate education. Therefore, pre-service teachers may come to the writing methods class without reflecting on or interrogating their own writing development. A teacher-as-developmental-writer approach to writing methods offers pre-service teachers a way to explore theories and practices related to the teaching of writing from the perspective of a developmental writer.

While Sarah's writing methods course began with a reflection journal prompt about her writing development and growth, there were not opportunities to return to this introspective and developmental view of writing. Sarah may have benefitted from opportunities to focus on her own writing development and growth through the course as a way to make connections to the writing development of prospective students. For example, rather than simply assuming students enrolled in internships are observing writers and making connections to their readings, the pre-service teacher might do a case study of a student writer and tie that case study into the pedagogical and theoretical readings of the methods class and to the pre-service teachers own experience of writing. This

practice helps the pre-service teacher to observe and document his/her own writing growth alongside the student to see the range of writing practices in school settings. Furthermore, if students in the methods course share their case study findings, the pre-service teachers will have an expansive understanding of this range of writing practices observed. This enables pre-service teachers to understand the diversity of writing practices, abilities, and challenges in typical school settings. The sharing of 'real writers' practices also enhances pedagogical planning in the writing methods class since the class is focused on actual writers rather than hypothetical writers. This type of practice would have given Sarah a more grounded sense of writing pedagogy after the writing methods course. While she may still have wanted to identify lessons the students might enjoy, she would have had a breadth of examples, practices and theoretical frames from which to pull.

Writing Ecologies and Writing Methods

Beyond these assignment shifts, this particular writing methods course may have benefitted from a theoretical shift. Currently, writing at the K-12 level, and often the college level, subscribes strictly to a process-based model. In a process-based model, invention, drafting, and revision are often the work of solitary authors. While an exception *may* be made for revision activities (Early and Saidy, 2014), writers and writing teachers in schools often go it alone. Students in writing methods courses could benefit from more ecological view of writing pedagogy that:

> ...encompasses much more than the individual writer and her immediate context...all the characteristics of any individual writer or piece of writing both determine and are determined by the characteristics of all the other writers writing in the systems. An important characteristic of ecological systems is that they are inherently dynamic...they are constantly changing, limited only by parameters that are themselves subject to change over long spans of time" (Cooper, 1986, p. 368).

For pre-service writing teachers, an ecological approach to writing instruction offers the opportunity to see writing as a dynamic and interactive activity impacted by all participants as well as institutional and cultural constraints. This approach also provides students in the writing methods course an opportunity to see the ways that student writers write in a community that includes the teacher, so they see the shift to writing teacher as an extension of their experience as writing students. In an ecological approach, the teacher is as much a writer in flux or in development as are her students. While an ecological approach is often context dependent, certain modifications to the writing methods course may aid pre-service teachers in seeing the ecological nature of writing and viewing

T/W

themselves as writers in an ecology system rather than experts in isolation.

The first modification is to make transparent the teacher as developing writer and writing ecology metaphors by expanding the theoretical readings in the course to include readings on this topic. This does not require a complete overhaul of the course readings. Instead, incorporating a reading such as Marilyn Coopers "The Ecology of Writing" at the beginning of the course would give the pre-service teachers a frame for thinking about the ways that writing and writing instruction are relational and situated. Furthermore, this might invite pre-service teachers to consider ways that their teaching development and their students writing development are concurrent and quell some of the anxiety pre-service teachers face as they move from student to teacher.

If pre-service teachers are being asked to see writing as contextual, relational, and situated, the writing methods course must see writing this way as well. As such, the course would benefit from a modification of the microteaching assignment. Part of the challenge for Sarah was that the lessons she taught in both the writing methods and comprehensive methods course were completely out of context. She was asked to choose a topic for a lesson, develop that lesson, and give the lesson for students in her cohort. Her struggle to do this assignment is understandable. Therefore, the microteaching assignment would benefit from a theoretical and practical redesign in which the idea for the assignment is directly tied to the pre-service teacher's internship that semester. The pre-service teacher should identify a need in the classroom in which he/she is an observer and design a specific lesson around that need. This offers the opportunity not only to have a contextually grounded lesson, but also to discuss the complexities and politics of teaching in schools.

Finally, it is important that pre-service teachers in the writing methods course see themselves as writers and the instructor as a writer. This is significant since one of the goals of the ecological approach is that pre-service teachers see themselves as writers alongside their students. This might include the instructor participating in in-class writing assignments, which many instructors do already. However, it also means making the teaching of writing transparent to pre-service teachers in the methods course. For example, discussing how assignment feedback is constructed, how it is positioned in the course, and how it is audience focused is important for pre-service teachers who will soon be doing this type of writing in their own classrooms. Additionally, it is important that instructors in the writing methods course share their own professional writing and discuss ways their writing has developed over time, especially over the course of the semester. If the goal of the ecological approach is that pre-service teachers see themselves as writers in order to be able to tap in to the needs of their own students as writers, the instructor in the methods course can act as a model of this type of writing development and activity.

Finally, this communal, contextual, and situated view of writing may be expanded if the methods course offers more opportunities to share writing and receive feedback from the instructor and from peers. In Sarah's writing methods class the pre-service teachers used peer response opportunities to focus primarily on teaching ideas. To more effectively help pre-service teachers see themselves as writers alongside other writers, it would beneficial to expand opportunities and expectations for peer response. Rather than focusing simply on the quality of the pedagogical idea, pre-service teachers might be encouraged to consider the many elements of each other's work, such as: the integration of appropriate theoretical lenses, the anticipation or understanding of political or institutional constraints, and the ways in which composing is a communal experience in the classroom. Furthermore, while students had opportunities to compose collaboratively in the methods class, they tended to simply separate the work and compose individually. Opportunities for, and instruction in, collaborative composing of written work in the writing methods course would help to give pre-service teachers more experience with writing abilities and behaviors and to see the way that writing develops.

Communities of Practice

Sarah and other pre-service teachers would benefit if the writing methods course were modified to give pre-service teachers the opportunity to see themselves as developmental writers composing in an ecological system, rather than as simply new teachers in isolation. Writing and teaching are both ecological practices that develop over time, and training teachers as writers encourages them to see their teaching and writing as ecological and developmental. With an ecological focus, pre-service teachers will be more likely to see their teaching of writing as developmental and communal, much in the way they were encouraged to see their own writing as developmental and communal. This ecological approach has implications beyond the writing methods course as well. Teachers who come to see teaching writing and writing as ecological may be more willing to seek out existing communities of practice in their teaching community, such as their local affiliates of the National Writing Project or their state or local level NCTE affiliates, and to replicate these communities of practice in their classrooms. Therefore, these changes to the writing methods course encourage teacher practices that influence pre-service and early career teachers and their students, but also invite teachers to see their teaching of writing as part of a larger community of practice that may have the potential to sustain their teaching beyond the early years.

Works Cited

Brooks, Gregory W. "Teachers as Readers and Writers and as Teachers of

T/W

Reading and Writing." *The Journal of Educational Research* 100.3 (2007): 177-191. Print.

Cooper, Marilyn. "The Ecology of Writing." *College English* 48.4 (1986): 364-375. Print.

Daisey, Peggy. "The Writing Experiences and Beliefs of Secondary Teacher Candidates." *Teacher Education Quarterly* 36.4 (2009): 157-172. Web.

Dean, Deborah. "Shifting Perspectives About Grammar: Changing What and How We Teach." *English Journal* 100.4 (2011): 20-6. Print.

Early, Jessica and Christina Saidy. "Uncovering Substance: Teaching Revision in High School Classrooms." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 58.3 (2014): 209-218. Print.

Edbauer, Jenny. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (2005): 5-24. Print.

Grossman, Pamela L. et al. "Transitions into Teaching: Learning to Teach Writing in Teacher Education and Beyond. *Journal of Literacy Research* 32.4 (2000): 631-62. Print.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47.2 (1985): 105-127.

Kennedy, Mary M. "Chapter Three: The Role of Pre-service Teacher Education." *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Teaching and Policy.* Eds. Linda Darling-Hammond and Gary Sykes. San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1999. 54-86. Print.

Kittle, Penny. *Write Beside Them: Risk, Voice, and Clarity in High School Writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2008. Print.

Lindblom, Kenneth and Patricia A. Dunn. "Analyzing Grammar Rants: An Alternative to Traditional Grammar Instruction." *English Journal* 95.5 (2006): 71-77.

McCann, Thomas M. "Mentoring Matters." *English Journal* 100.4 (2011): 83-85. Print.

Murray, Donald. *A Writer Teaches Writing: A Practical Method of Teaching Composition.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968. Print.

Read, Sylvia and Melanie M. Landon-Hays. "The Knowing/Doing Gap: Challenges of Effective Writing Instruction in High School." *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education* 2.2 (2013): 6-15. Web.

Rivers, Nathanial and Ryan Weber. "Ecological, Pedagogical, Public Rhetoric." *CCC* 63.2 (2011): 187-218. Print.

Rosen, Lois Matz. "Developing Correctness in Student Writing: Alternatives to the Error-Hunt." *English Journal* 76.3 (1987): 62-69.

Sams, Lynn. "How to Teach Grammar, Analytical Thinking, and Writing: A

T/W

Method That Works." *English Journal* 92.3 (2003): 57-65. Print.

Smagorinsky, Peter, Wilson, Amy Alexandra, and Cynthia Moore. "Teaching Grammar and Writing: A Beginning Teacher's Dilemma." *English Education* 43.3 (2011): 262-292. Print.

Syverson, Margaret. *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.

Tulley, Christine E. "What are Pre-service Teachers Taught About the Teaching of Writing?: A Survey of Ohio's Undergraduate Writing Methods Course." *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education* 2.1 (2013): 38-48. Web.

T/W

Weaver, Constance. "Teaching Grammar in the Context of Writing." *English Journal* 85.7 (1996): 15-24. Print.

Whitney, Anne E. "Teacher transformation in the National Writing Project." *Research in the Teaching of English* 43.2 (2008): 144-187. Print.

Whitney, Anne E., Olan, Elsie L. and James E. Fredricksen. "Extending the Conversation: Experience Over All: Pre-service Teachers and the Prizing of the Practical." *English Education* 45.2 (2013): 184-200. Print.