What Do GTAs Transfer into Their Pedagogical Practices?: A Qualitative Study about PhD Graduate Teaching Associates and the Transferability of Writing Pedagogy Education

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kali Alexis Mobley Finn
August 2018

Copyright © 2018 by Kali Alexis Mobley Finn
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the many people who contributed to this project. First and foremost, I would like to thank the eight first-year PhD graduate teaching associates who participated in this study. Without their generosity, honesty, and courage, this dissertation would not have come to life. To those participants, thank you for being generous with your time during a busy transition into teaching at UTK for the first time, for being genuine, engaged and honest in your interviews and feedback, and for being brave to share your experiences and to allow me into your classrooms.

I would also like to thank the members of my doctoral committee: Dr. Jeffrey M. Ringer, Dr. Kirsten Benson, Dr. Tanita Saenkhum, and Dr. Susan Groenke. Without your encouragement and support, this process would have been daunting and difficult. I am especially thankful for the chair of this dissertation, Dr. Ringer, whose unwavering support, generative feedback, and resolute patience pushed me to be a better academic, writer, and person. Without his guidance, I would not have been able to tackle the tough questions to push my ideas further; moreover, his confidence in my abilities and the significance of this work sustained my energy and passion to complete this project. Working with Dr. Ringer has inspired me to be a conscientious academic and a gracious mentor who encourages others to pursue their scholarly passions and interests. Next, I would like to thank Dr. Benson whose support and mentorship have contributed to my pedagogical and scholastic development. Her insight and motivation has encouraged me to continue pursuing this academic endeavor. I am also thankful for Dr. Saenkhum's

generative feedback that provided keen insight into this study's methodology and argument. I am very grateful for this committee, and my gratitude expressed here barely scratches the surface for conveying how influential everyone was to my personal development and this scholastic achievement.

I owe many thanks to my kind, patient husband, Michael Finn. To him, thank you for patiently listening to me as I worked out my ideas and concerns. Thank you for supporting my chai tea latte habits and rewarding me with doughnuts, hugs, and high fives with each hit milestone. Thank you for encouraging me to write every day, to put ideas onto the screen, and to also be kind to myself. I could not have accomplished this achievement without your love and support, and I am eternally grateful to have you in my life as a best friend and partner.

I would also like to thank my soon-to-be son, Cooper. Your kicks, rolls, and hiccups inspired me to continue working towards a completed dissertation. You have been my constant companion throughout this process.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends, particularly those who have participated in the online dissertation writing group. Thank you all for creating a community of writers and thinkers who have inspired to me write every day. You all have held me accountable for pushing through tough writing times and supported me in pursuing this project. Without your supportive comments and memes, this project would have been more stressful.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to provide rich data about the extent to which experienced, first-year PhD graduate teaching associates (GTAs) reused or adapted their prior teaching experiences and writing pedagogy education (WPE) into their pedagogical practices for a new teaching context. This study occurred throughout the Fall 2016 semester at University of Tennessee, Knoxville, with eight experienced, first-year PhD GTAs as participants. Data was collected from three interviews that explored participants' prior histories and current experiences as well as encouraged participants to reflect on their overall experience. Data was also collected from two classroom observations per participant and submitted instructional materials, such as syllabi and assignment sheets. Adapted from Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model of transferring writing expertise, I developed a conceptual model for identifying participants' pedagogical knowledge, which consists of five knowledge domains: curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge. To measure the extent to which participants reused or adapted learning from past or current contexts, I used Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's (1999) "five degrees of appropriation." Data revealed that experienced, first-year PhD GTAs enter new teaching contexts with complex prior histories. Their prior WPE experiences were diverse, idiosyncratic, and localized to the institution that provided it. Moreover, participants prioritized pragmatic pedagogical tools and advice to inform their pedagogical practices more than composition theory. When they entered into a new teaching context, they experienced familiarity with ongoing WPE, such as a pre-service orientation, and

identified pragmatic pedagogical tools and advice to inform how they adapted their pedagogical practices for a new context. Participants struggled to identify the underlying theoretical structure that informed curricula objectives, practices, and values, and they detected similar surface features among their prior and current learning experiences, leading to a maintenance of insufficiently theorized pedagogical practices. Participants reused or adapted prior experiences to help them survive teaching in a new context, and they did not examine the differences of teaching contexts when applying those prior experiences. This dissertation recommends that WPE should be recalibrated to consider GTAs' prior experiences and pedagogical needs to develop their theoretical knowledge, academic discourse, and pedagogical practices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One Introduction 1
Research Questions 6
Brief Description of Study 7
Delimitations and Limitations 11
Definitions 12
Pedagogical Knowledge 12
Appropriation 15
Transfer 15
Organization of Dissertation 18
Chapter Two Literature Review 23
Writing Pedagogy Education: A History of GTA Preparation 24
Conversion, Dissonance, and Resistance: Exploring GTAs' Experiences in the Practicum 42
Connecting Writing Pedagogy Education with Dissonance, Resistance, and Transfer Theory 56
Chapter Three Methods and Procedures 71
Research Design 71
Site 75
Population 78
Sources of Data 80
Procedures 85
Data Management and Analysis 92
Trustworthiness and Dependability 100
Credibility 101
Dependability and Confirmability 106
Transferability 108
Chapter Four Findings 1: Who Are First-Year PhD GTAs, and What Are Their Prior Experiences in Writing, Writing Pedagogy Education, and Teaching? 109
Participants and Their Contexts 110
The Participants: Who Are They? 111
PhD GTAs' Prior Experiences in Writing, WPE, and Teaching 117
First-Year Composition as Undergraduates 120
Prior WPE Experiences 124
Reuse or Adaptation of WPE Experiences 133
Prior Teaching Experiences 136
Conclusion 146
Chapter Five Findings 2: First-Year PhD GTAs' Immediate Recollections of UTK's Pre-Service Orientation and Current Teaching Experiences at UTK 148
Recollections and Impressions of UTK's Pre-Service Orientation 150
Participants' Degree of Appropriation of UTK's Writing Program's Instructional Materials 160
Curriculum Knowledge 167

Interview 1 168
Interview 2 174
Rhetorical Knowledge 193
Comfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory 194
Discomfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory 196
Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory 200
Rhetorical Theory in Pedagogical Practices 203
Genre Knowledge 209
Assigned Genres for Major Writing Assignments and Rationales for Assigning Genres 210
Reported Comfort in Teaching Genres 214
Discomfort in Teaching Genres 221
Pedagogical Practices Knowledge 224
Reported Comfort and Discomfort in Teaching Writing as a Process 225
Teaching Writing as a Process in the Classroom 229
Discourse Community Knowledge 238
Interview 1 239
Interview 2 248
Conclusion 260
Chapter Six Findings 3: PhD GTAs' Reflections on Teaching at UTK 263
Curriculum Knowledge 266
Participants' Perceived Curriculum Objectives and Values for UTK's Writing Program 267
Participants' Reported Challenges in Teaching Curriculum Objectives and Values 270
Concepts Participants Learned and Still Need to Learn about the Curriculum 273
Rhetorical Knowledge 277
Comfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory 278
Discomfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory 281
Perceived Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory 286
Genre Knowledge 290
Reflections on Overall Experiences with Teaching Genres at UTK 291
Reported Comfort in Teaching Genres 295
Reported Discomfort in Teaching Genres 299
Pedagogical Practices Knowledge 302
Reported Comfort and Discomfort in Teaching Writing as a Process 303
Reflections on Scaffolding Pedagogical Practices 306
Discourse Community Knowledge 311
Defining Transfer 312
Participants' Primary Objectives for Teaching First FYC Sequence 318
Conclusion 326
Chapter Seven Discussion and Conclusions 330
Filling the Blank Slate: Exploring and Recognizing GTAs' Prior Histories 332

Encountering a New Teaching Context: Negotiating Prior Experiences and New Curriculum Objectives 339
Conversion or Adaptation: To What Extent Did GTAs' Prior Experiences and Current WPE Inform Their Pedagogical Practices? 350
Curriculum Knowledge 350
Rhetorical Knowledge 356
Genre Knowledge 363
Pedagogical Practices Knowledge 370
Discourse Community Knowledge 378
Implications for the Conceptual Model for Pedagogical Knowledge 389
Recommendations for WPE 390
References 400
Appendices 418
Appendix A Invitation to Participate 419
Appendix B Informed Consent Statement 420
Appendix C Demographic Information Sheet 423
Appendix D Interview Protocols 424
Appendix E Sample Field Notes 434
Appendix F Chapter Six Table 19 442
Vita 443

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Interview and Classroom Observation Timetable 81
Table 2 "Five Degrees of Appropriation": Degrees to which GTAs Adapt Pedagogical Tools and Formal WPE 97
Table 3 Pedagogical Knowledge Conceptual Model 98
Table 4 Participants and Their Contexts 118
Table 5 Participants' FYC Experiences as Undergraduates 123
Table 6 WPE from Which Participants Reused or Adapted Teaching Observations or Instructional Materials for Prior Teaching Experiences 133
Table 7 Types of Workshops Recalled from UTK's Pre-Service Orientation 151
Table 8 Curriculum Knowledge: The Degree to Which the Theoretical Concepts Were Appropriated 169
Table 9 Participants' Reported Objectives of UTK's Writing Program's Curriculum 171
Table 10 Curriculum Knowledge: Comparative Findings from Interview 1 and Interview 2 about Participants' Reported Curriculum Objectives and the Degree of Appropriation 176
Table 11 Curriculum Knowledge: The Degree to Which the Theoretical Concepts Were Appropriated 193
Table 12 Participants' Documented, Observed, and/or Reported Pedagogical Practices for Teaching Writing as a Process 231
Table 13 Interview 1: Participants' Definitions of Rhetoric 245
Table 14 Interview 1: Participants' Definitions of Transfer 248
Table 15 Interview 2: Participants' Definitions of Transfer 252
Table 16 Comparison of Participants' Definitions of Transfer 253
Table 17 Comparison of Participants' Perceived Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory 287
Table 18 Interview 3: Participants' Definitions of Transfer 313
Table 20 Comparison of Participants' Primary Teaching Objectives 319
Table 19 Comparison of Participants' Definitions of Transfer 442

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

> I think this is actually probably what your dissertation is supposed to be about, right? There's these things that are popping up that things that I didn't anticipate because the curriculum… Like, the things were being provided to me, I'm just taking them, and I'm giving them to my students.
>
> —Clara, Interview 2

> I thought it was a good syllabus. I just don't like being told what to do, you know? Don't tell me how to live. Like, I've taught for two years already; like, I know things.
>
> —Ava, Interview 1

When I was a first-year PhD GTA at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK), I, like Clara, experienced the anxiety of not comprehending the curriculum fully, and I feared being an imposter who would be caught not implementing the curriculum. Throughout that first year, I returned to pedagogical practices in which I felt comfortable and knowledgeable teaching. I reduced assignments in terms of what I had previously assigned, and I learned about the curriculum through teaching it. While the writing program provided a master syllabus, I, like Ava, had prior teaching experiences. I had been teaching for three years prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program, and I felt, as Ava stated in the epigraph, "I know things." For this reason, I reused prior pedagogical experiences as I adapted the master syllabus, and upon review of my instructional documents, I was called into the Composition Office to learn more about the curriculum and to explain my changes. In that moment, I feared being perceived as "resistant."

In writing pedagogy education (WPE) scholarship, GTAs have been labeled resistant for not converting to or adapting a writing program's ideology, identity, or

practices (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Welch, 1993; Rankin, 1994; Powell et al., 2002; Farris, 2002; Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). Because GTAs need to be quickly prepared to teach FYC courses, the structure of the WPE they receive is based on the local, material needs of the writing program (Yancey, 2002; Hardin, 2005). This top-down approach to WPE ensures that GTAs develop the "nuts and bolts" (Newkirk, 1993) of how to teach the curriculum, and they are typically provided "pedagogical affordances" (Qualley, 2017), such as a standardized syllabus and assignment sheets, to guide their implementation of the curriculum. These affordances embody values and practices that may be foreign or new to GTAs, and when they encounter these teaching materials, they may encounter dissonance or feel resistance, as seen in the above epigraphs. These materials do not consider *who* GTAs are—their prior teaching and WPE experiences, theoretical knowledge, pedagogical values, and teacher personae—and they require GTAs to assume "someone else's theory and pedagogy" (Neeley, 2000, p. 20).

Composition scholars have criticized this top-down, conversion approach to WPE (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Neeley, 2000; Farris, 2002; Yancey, 2002; Stenberg, 2005). Some scholars have proposed heuristics to develop and reshape WPE to meet the needs of GTAs (Weiser, 1990; Yancey, 2002), while other scholars have argued for extended WPE (Graham & David, 1996; Ebest, 2005; Stenberg, 2005; Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). Additionally, scholars have analyzed GTAs' relationship with academic writing and instruction (Ebest, 2005; Fischer, 2005; Reid, 2009; Dryer, 2012) as well as the extent to which GTAs' pedagogical practices are informed by intrinsic values (Graham & David, 1996; Fischer, 2005) and formal WPE (Estrem & Reid, 2012;

Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). From this vast array of research, scholars have argued that GTAs value lore and personal experiences in informing their pedagogical values and that their formal WPE holds a "limited and sometimes peripheral position in their daily thoughts and practices" (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012, pp. 48-49). While scholars have come to this conclusion, they continue to remind writing pedagogy educators that GTAs are still *students*, and their pedagogical ideologies, identities, and practices are burgeoning as they gain teaching experience and progress in their education. It is for this reason that compositionists have called for extended WPE or a delayed introduction to instruction, as Jessica Restaino (2012) proposed.

While extended WPE would be beneficial, albeit crucial, for GTAs' development and socialization into the field, this solution is not sufficient enough. No matter how well-defined the WPE is, the problem lies in GTAs' learning processes (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). Writing pedagogy educators need to assess how GTAs' "existing, inherited models" (Restaino, 2012, p. 103) can inform the development of WPE, particularly how those prior experiences connect to new learning. For pedagogical development and growth, GTAs need to detect similarities among prior and current learning contexts, explore those dis/similarities theoretically, and connect the learning by adapting prior experiences to align with the underlying structure of the new context (Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012). To guide GTAs in assessing and integrating their learning into their pedagogical practices, WPE needs to include guided supervision as well as be extended throughout the duration of GTAs' education. Moreover, that WPE needs to convey explicitly the importance of developing theorized

practices. Because GTAs rely on lore and prior experiences (Estrem & Reid, 2012), their pedagogies are insufficiently theorized, and extended WPE cannot address this issue without addressing GTAs' learning processes, particularly how they transfer their learning and thus pedagogies.

While transfer theory has been mostly limited to understanding and teaching writing transfer, two scholars, Dana Lynn Driscoll (2013) and Donna Qualley (2017) have broadened the scope by applying the theory to GTAs and WPE. Driscoll (2013) examined eight GTAs' comprehension of transfer theory as well as how those "beliefs impact their practices in FYC" (p. 57). While the GTAs in her study aimed to teach for transfer, their beliefs affected how they taught for transfer. GTAs demonstrated either connected or non-connected pedagogies. Those with connected pedagogies purposefully scaffolded and explicitly connected assignments to facilitate transfer, whereas those with non-connected pedagogies presumed that transfer of learning occurs naturally without explicit connections (Driscoll, 2013). Driscoll concluded that WPE should address connected and non-connected pedagogies as well as consider who GTAs are and their prior WPE. While Driscoll examined GTAs' pedagogical practices, Qualley (2017) examined MA-level GTAs' critical transitions as they learned to teach FYC, and she mapped this learning onto a conceptual map from *The Elon Statement*. Qualley demonstrated GTAs' types of movement (e.g., boundary-crossing, consequential transition, remix, etc.) as they negotiated their prior knowledge and experiences in teaching FYC. She contended that their transitions were more likely to occur if prompted by pedagogical affordances or curricular interventions. While this map begins to address

GTAs' prior knowledges in relation to theories of transfer, it is only a first step towards understanding GTAs' learning processes (Qualley, 2017). Driscoll (2013) and Qualley (2017) have broadened the scope of transfer theory in composition studies by applying it to GTAs' pedagogical development and practices. However, there is still much to learn about how GTAs transfer their pedagogical experience and knowledge into their classrooms. For example, how do experienced GTAs negotiate their prior knowledge when entering a new teaching context? To what extent are their prior WPE and teaching experiences adapted into their pedagogical practices for the new context? And how do these adaptations fit a new writing program's curriculum objectives and values?

The purpose of this dissertation is to present a qualitative study that examines first-year PhD GTAs' experiences as they transition into a new teaching context. This study describes the extent to which GTAs reuse and adapt their prior knowledge into their current pedagogical practices, which are informed by the expectations and requirements of a new teaching context (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013). To investigate GTAs' reuse and adaptation of prior experiences, I identified five pedagogical knowledge domains (i.e., curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge, and discourse community knowledge) that inform how GTAs implement curriculum objectives, practices, and values. This pedagogical knowledge conceptual model was adapted from Anne Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model for transferring writing expertise. Similar to Beaufort's model, these knowledge domains overlap and shape teachers' pedagogical practices. For writing pedagogy educators to assess WPE critically and develop GTAs' pedagogical knowledge, they need to know

who GTAs are and what their prior teaching and WPE experiences are. Moreover, they need to understand how GTAs synthesize WPE to theorize their pedagogical practices. By assessing GTAs' pedagogical knowledge domains, writing pedagogy educators can identify the extent to which prior experiences and knowledge are reused and adapted in their pedagogical practices for the current teaching context. This study contributes to the field of composition by providing insight into how first-year PhD GTAs adaptively transfer (DePalma & Ringer, 2013) their prior knowledge into their practices for a new teaching context. With this insight, I provide writing pedagogy educators a method for recalibrating WPE to develop reflective practitioners who can detect, elect, and connect (Perkins & Salomon, 2012) prior experiences to new learning. This recalibration will benefit GTAs by developing their pedagogical practices, academic discourse, and theoretical knowledge; moreover, it will benefit writing programs by opening communication between writing program administrators (WPAs) and GTAs to discuss shared language, practices, and values to ensure curriculum comprehension and implementation.

Research Questions

To examine how first-year PhD GTAs negotiated and possibly adapted their prior knowledge and current WPE experiences in a new teaching context, I designed a qualitative study to answer the following questions:

1. What prior FYC writing and teaching experiences do first-year PhD GTAs have?
2. What kind of WPE did first-year PhD GTAs receive from their respective master's programs?

3. What did first-year PhD GTAs' recall from UTK's pre-service orientation within one semester after experiencing it?
4. How did first-year PhD GTAs construct their syllabi for teaching UTK's FYC? Did they adapt or reuse prior experiences? UTK's pre-service orientation and pedagogical affordances?
5. To what extent did first-year PhD GTAs' adapt, or appropriate, pedagogical knowledges valued by UTK's writing program?
6. To what extent did those pedagogical knowledges adaptively transfer into, or manifest in, their pedagogical practices?

Brief Description of Study

To understand how GTAs transitioned into a new teaching context that required them to negotiate prior and new pedagogical theories and practices, I conducted this IRB-approved qualitative study throughout the Fall 2016 semester. I recruited participants who were entering their first-year of UTK's English Department's PhD program. These participants were selected because they were not "blank slates" (Neeley, 2000; Reid, 2004; Stenberg, 2005), in that they had prior WPE and teaching experiences. These prior experiences were vital to investigating the extent to which GTAs adapted prior and current experiences in their pedagogical practices. I recruited first-year PhD GTAs via an email invitation and followed up with each potential participant on the first day of UTK's pre-service orientation, where I introduced myself and the project as well as answered any questions that they had. Participants confirmed participation in the study via email response.

Data was collected through three sources: three interviews, two classroom observations, and collection of instructional materials (e.g., syllabi and assignment sheets). I designed the interviews to follow Irving Seidman's (2006) phenomenological interviewing process, which consisted of three interviews that focused on the beginning, middle, and end of experiencing phenomena. While he conducted these interviews over the span of two weeks, I extended the timeframe to span the entire Fall 2016 semester. This expansion better suited my research questions because it allotted participants time to familiarize themselves with the curriculum and the writing program's expectations and values. The first interview, which occurred 1-2 weeks after UTK's pre-service orientation, focused on participants' past writing, teaching, and WPE experiences. The second interview, which occurred approximately two months after Interview 1, focused on participants' current teaching experiences, particularly examining their pedagogical knowledge domains. The third and final interview, which occurred one month after Interview 2 and after the semester had concluded, encouraged participants to reflect on their previously reported experiences. Participants' responses provided rich data about how they negotiated their prior pedagogical experiences with a new teaching context.

In addition to interviews, I conducted two classroom observations to document participants' pedagogical practices as well as to contextualize their interview responses. In participants' classrooms, I was a passive observer and did not interact with either the participants or their students (Spradley, 1980), and I took descriptive and focused field notes about what occurred in the classroom, such as discussions and lessons. The first classroom observation took place approximately two months after Interview 1, and I

observed participants teaching the Position Paper for an Academic Audience.[1] The second classroom observation took place approximately one month after the first observation, and I observed participants teaching the Position Paper for a Public Audience.[2] I chose to observe participants when they were teaching these particular assignments because they addressed Beaufort's (2007) knowledge domains by requiring students to consider their knowledges in discourse community, rhetorical theory, genre, writing process, and subject matter. On the days I observed, participants planned to teach rhetorical, genre, and discourse community awareness, allowing me to observe their pedagogical practices and knowledge in these areas that are central to the FYC curriculum.

The remaining data were instructional materials, such as syllabi, course calendars, and assignment sheets. I requested these documents via email, and participants emailed me .zip files of their instructional materials. Not all participants shared their lesson plans and handouts; therefore, I used participants' syllabi, course calendars, and assignment sheets to triangulate the data from interviews and classroom observations. The instructional materials provided insight into the course design by documenting how participants scaffolded assignments and lessons and describing their daily agenda for each class, which allowed for a fuller picture of participants' pedagogical practices.

[1] The main sequence of the FYC program, there are four assignments. The Position Paper for an Academic Audience is the third assignment, and the purpose of this assignment is for FYC students to enter a debate and compose a persuasive argument for an academic audience.
[2] The Position Paper for a Public Audience is the fourth assignment, and the purpose of this assignment is for FYC students to adapt their academic arguments for a public audience and genre.

From these data sources, I analyzed data by first "open coding" interview transcripts, field notes, and collected instructional materials (Maxwell, 2013, p. 345). I paid attention to what was occurring and recurring in the data. I also developed participant profiles to construct rich narratives about their prior and current experiences (Seidman, 2006). Through these processes, I developed emergent codes for participants' experiences, perceptions, and actions. For example, I coded participants' identification of previous institutions' curricula objectives as "Unknown," "Writing Process," "Genre-Based," "Rhetoric-Based," and "Discourse Communities and Transfer." In addition to emergent codes, I also employed Pamela Grossman, Peter Smagorinsky and Sheila Valencia's (1999) "five degrees of appropriation": Lack of Appropriation, Appropriating a Label, Appropriating Surface Features, Appropriating Conceptual Underpinnings, and Achieving Mastery. This coding scheme has been used in educational scholarship to measure the extent to which teachers appropriated "pedagogical tools available for use in particular social environments" (Grossman, Smagorinsky & Valencia, 1999, p.15). Amending some of Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's definitions to fit GTAs and WPE (see Chapter Three), I employed these codes to measure the extent to which they reused or adapted pedagogical knowledges and affordances from prior and current experiences into their teaching. From emergent coding to this pre-existing coding scheme, I comparatively analyzed participant profiles and coding schemes to make meaning of GTAs' pedagogical experiences.

Delimitations and Limitations

Because I examined how experienced, first-year PhD GTAs transitioned into a new teaching context, the design of this study consisted of the following delimitations:

1. Population was limited to first-year PhD GTAs who had prior teaching and WPE experiences from their respective master's programs. These participants would need to negotiate their prior learning with the expectations and practices of a new teaching context.

2. The study was conducted throughout Fall 2016 term. To answer the research questions, I needed to examine how first-year PhD GTAs immediately negotiated their prior experiences when transitioning to a new teaching context.

3. The site of the study was limited to UTK's English Department, which is comprised of three subfields: English Literature, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric, Writing and Linguistics. Not only was I familiar with the department as a fourth-year PhD GTA, but I was also familiar with the writing program, which granted me access to participants and WPE.

The scope of this dissertation's research questions established these delimitations. To appropriately collect and manage data, I made these decisions to provide rich data about experienced, first-year PhD GTAs' experiences and investigate the extent to which GTAs reused and/or adapted prior and current pedagogical experiences into their teaching.

In addition to these delimitations, the scope of this study was limited in the following ways:

1. This study is an in-depth analysis of a localized community and population, and for this reason, it is not immediately generalizable to other GTAs, institutions or writing programs. While the data are from a localized community, it is "rich" with detailed descriptions from field notes and instructional materials. I have also included polyvocal narratives to show who the participants were and what they experienced. From this rich data, readers can determine if this study's findings connect with their personal experiences (Maxwell, 2013; Patton, 2015).

2. Throughout the duration of this study, I served as the Assistant Director of Composition, which entailed that I was part of designing and implementing UTK's pre-service orientation. Not only was I involved in the WPE for these

participants, but it was also possible that they perceived me to be a person in authority. However, I was not in an evaluative position for these participants. When they agreed to participate in the study, they were informed that the purpose of the study was not to evaluate their teaching. I also informed participants that this study was voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any time. To further protect participants' identities, either I provided or they selected pseudonyms, which I used when discussing data with my advisor, the Director of Composition. I also deidentified their instructional materials. Through these steps, participants' identities and actions were protected, thus providing a space for vulnerable, genuine sharing of experiences.

3. Another foreseeable limitation was any unknown or known biases I may have experienced throughout data collection and analysis. To identify and monitor any potential biases or assumptions, I kept a research journal to reflect about my experiences and interpretations. I also participated in bracketing interviews with my advisor. These interviews helped me identify and assess my assumptions and reactions. Lastly, to ensure credibility, I shared findings with participants, also known as "member checks" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Participants were encouraged to review and discuss findings with me to ensure a balanced representation of rich data.

Throughout this study, I have aimed to manage these limitations by presenting rich data that provide polyvocal narratives of participants' experiences. My objective was not to evaluate participants' pedagogical practices but to describe the extent to which they reused and/or adapted prior and current experiences into their teaching. To build credibility and validity, I included extrapolations and descriptions from the data, which helped me to triangulate findings. I also shared findings with participants to review and check. These steps were taken to present a credible, dependable, and valid examination of participants' experiences and learning processes.

Definitions

Pedagogical Knowledge

I created a conceptual model, inspired by Beaufort's (2007), to assess participants' pedagogical knowledge. The five pedagogical knowledge domains

presented in this dissertation align with Beaufort's (2007) writing knowledge domains as well as Pamela Grossman's (1990) four categories of pedagogical knowledge. These five pedagogical knowledges are curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge, and discourse community knowledge.

Curriculum knowledge is similar to what Beaufort (2007) identified as "specific subject matter considered within the purview of a discourse community" (p. 19). For GTAs to teach FYC, they need to be familiar with the subject matter, in this case, the curriculum of the writing program. The discourse community uses this subject matter to inform the theoretical underpinnings and structure FYC courses (Grossman, 1990). To teach effectively, GTAs need curriculum knowledge to implement the theory and to adapt the structure of the writing program.

Rhetorical and genre knowledges fall under Grossman's (1990) "pedagogical content knowledge" (p. 8), which consists of knowing "instructional strategies and representations for teaching particular topics" (p. 9). At UTK, the FYC curriculum is informed by Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model for transferring writing expertise, which means that freshmen need to possess rhetorical and genre awareness. GTAs need to be familiar with these theories, e.g., how genres serve as boundaries for discourse communities or how writers enter social, rhetorical situations (Beaufort, 2007). In addition to this expertise, they also need to have informed pedagogical practices for developing their students' awareness (Grossman, 1990). Since the instruction of rhetorical and genre theories are integral for implementing the curriculum, I have separated these concepts from curriculum knowledge.

Pedagogical Practices knowledge was inspired by Beaufort's (2007) writing process knowledge domain. She argued that writers needed procedural knowledge for transferring their writing expertise, and as was true for writers, GTAs also needed procedural knowledge for transferring their pedagogical expertise into their teaching. Grossman (1990) termed this knowledge as "general pedagogical knowledge" (p. 8), which was teachers' knowledge of classroom management, delivery of instruction, and knowledge of learning styles. In this dissertation, pedagogical knowledge needs to have informed pedagogical practices, particularly in how GTAs scaffold and manage their courses as well as teach writing as a process.

Lastly, and arguably most important, GTAs need to develop discourse community knowledge, which informs and shapes the other knowledge domains. Beaufort (2007) stated that activity systems, like a writing program, is comprised of shared values and goals. Similarly, Grossman (1990) contended that teachers should have "knowledge of context," (p. 9) which is the knowledge of the community and student body for which the teacher is a member. At UTK, this community of GTAs and faculty teach a standardized FYC curriculum, and to be a part of that discourse community, teachers need to share value systems, curriculum objectives, and academic discourse. These features define the theoretical underpinnings and shape the best practices of the FYC program.

For this dissertation, these knowledge domains inform GTAs' pedagogical knowledge, which I contend they must adapt to implement a curriculum successfully. Whenever I mention "pedagogical knowledge," I am referencing these interrelated knowledges that are theoretically informed and appropriately practiced.

Appropriation

To measure the extent of which GTAs adapted pedagogical knowledge or affordances, I employed Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's (1999) five degrees of appropriation. I used "appropriation" when referencing the coding scheme; however, I understand Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's use of appropriation as similar to Michael-John DePalma and Jeffrey M. Ringer's (2011, 2013) use of adaptation. For this reason, these terms are used interchangeably throughout the dissertation.

Transfer

One of the central investigative tenets of this dissertation is investigating and describing the extent to which first-year PhD GTAs transfer their prior knowledge and experiences into their current teaching context. The term transfer has been widely defined, refined, and expanded in educational psychology and composition studies.

"Transfer" is most commonly associated with educational psychologists D. N. Perkins and Gavriel Salomon's (1988) groundbreaking article "Teaching for Transfer." In this article, they identified two types of transfer: low-road and high-road. Low-road transfer "reflects the automatic triggering of well-practiced routines in circumstances where there is considerable perceptual similarity to the original learning context" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 25), whereas high-road transfer "depends on deliberate mindful abstraction of skill or knowledge from one context for application in another" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 25). Perkins and Salomon also described two modes of mindful abstraction: forward reaching or backward reaching. The former occurs when one uses current learned skills for future application, while the latter is recalling prior learned knowledge for the current context (p. 26). High road, essentially, cannot occur if

low road does not exist. This high road/low road transfer distinction is often cited as the foundational definition of transfer in composition studies, and though scholarship has played with this initial conceptual framing, high road and low road transfer, including their respective descriptors "near" and "far,"[3] are the prevailing measures and sites of inquiry in composition (see Nelms and Dively, 2007; Rounsaville, Goldberg and Bawarshi, 2008; Fishman and Reiff, 2008; James, 2010; DePalma and Ringer, 2011; Driscoll, 2011; Donahue, 2012; and Wardle, 2013). For the purposes of this dissertation, Perkins and Salomon's (1988) conception of transfer is echoed in some participants' definitions and descriptions of transfer.

Another common definition of transfer is general writing skills. In 1987, Nathaniel Teich claimed, "The behavioral operations of transfer, or generalization of knowledge, are at the core of all learning and thinking" (p. 193), and King Beach (2003) argued that learning can become "portable" or generalizable. If knowledge and learning can be generalized, then the teaching of writing skills can be applied generally to other contexts. In composition studies, this definition of transfer became known as general writing skills instruction (GWSI) (Petraglia, 1995). However, this notion that writing is generalizable was contested by compositionists who perceived writing as situated (McCarthy, 1987; Petraglia, 1995; Russell, 1997; Crowley, 1998). Even though GWSI has been widely contested in composition scholarship, this definition of transfer was employed by some participants.

[3] According to Perkins and Salomon, "near transfer" occurs when a skill is used in a similar but new context, e.g., driving, and "far transfer" occurs when knowledge is used in a completely new, different context, e.g., a chess player applies strategy to a war campaign ("Transfer of Learning" 4).

In addition to defining transfer as general writing skills, some compositionists have extended the definition to include recontextualization or adaptation. For example, Rebecca Nowacek (2011) defined transfer as "recontextualization." She posited that writers are "agents of integration" who must negotiate, connect and recontextualize their knowledge via meta-awareness. Writing is rhetorical and social, and writers must appraise the situation to determine how to transfer, or integrate, their expertise (Nowacek, 2011). While Nowacek defines transfer as recontextualization, DePalma and Ringer (2011, 2013) define it as "adaptive transfer." As "writers traverse rhetorical situations" (DePalma & Ringer, 2013, p. 466), they can reuse or adapt their prior knowledge to understand a new, unfamiliar context. DePalma and Ringer (2013) also broaden their definition of transfer to include its applicability to "research methods and writing pedagogy" (p. 469). And even more recently, Kathleen Blake Yancey, Liane Robertson and Kara Taczak (2014) created a conceptual "model of students' *use* of prior knowledge as they encounter new writing tasks" (p. 5). This model consisted of three categories: "assemblage," "remix," and "critical incident" (p. 5). Students who fall under "assemblage" patchwork their prior knowledge with limited connections to their current learning, which leads to unsuccessful transfer of writing. Students who "remix" adapt their prior knowledge with current learning to transfer writing successfully. Lastly, students who encountered dissonance could experience a "critical incident," in which writers critically assess and learn from the failed or negative transfer. In this dissertation, there were two participants who defined transfer as "adaptation," and they emphasized general characteristics, such as abstracting knowledge and reframing it for both familiar

and unfamiliar writing contexts. Their definitions aligned with surface features of Nowacek's recontextualization, DePalma and Ringer's adaptation, and Yancey, Robertson, and Taczak's remix.

Organization of Dissertation

This dissertation consists of seven chapters. In this first chapter, I have noted how WPE scholarship has addressed GTA preparation, particularly referencing the problem with top-down WPE that does not consider GTAs' prior experiences and knowledge. While writing pedagogy scholars have called for balanced, extended WPE, that is not enough to develop GTAs' pedagogical practices. Scholarship needs to delve further into how GTAs adaptively transfer their prior experiences as well as identify the types of pedagogical knowledge that they need to implement a curriculum successfully. In addition to addressing the problem and purpose of this dissertation, I have listed research questions, delimitations, and limitations. I have also provided a brief description of the study and included definitions for "pedagogical knowledge," "appropriation," and "transfer."

Chapter Two reviews literature associated with WPE and transfer theory. I first provide a history of the development and evolution of GTA preparation, focusing on the types of WPE that writing programs typically offer. Through WPE, GTAs are required to "reinvent the university" (Bartholomae, 1985) for themselves as students and teachers. When GTAs make this transition into teaching, they encounter dissonance. The findings from this review is that writing pedagogy educators need to inquire who GTAs are and what their prior experiences are. Then, they need to assess and extend WPE to develop

GTAs' pedagogical ideologies, identities, and practices. This section concludes by noting that GTAs' resistance may be more of a problem with learning and applying WPE as opposed to prioritizing their pedagogical preferences. To explore this finding, I review literature on transfer theory, particularly noting theories that aim to help writers transfer their expertise to new contexts. I apply this framework to GTA preparation to demonstrate that GTA resistance is a teaching-related transfer problem.

Chapter Three provides a detailed overview of this study's research methods and procedures. I first provide an overview of the research design, noting that I employed a phenomenological interview process as well conducted classroom observations and collected instructional materials. I then describe the context of the site, population, and procedures. I also provide my methodology and theoretical framework for managing and analyzing data. Lastly, because the data consists of rich, qualitative data, I conclude by noting the steps I have taken to ensure trustworthiness, dependability, and transferability of the results.

Chapter Four presents findings from Interview 1, which focused on participants' prior pedagogical experiences. I construct participant profiles about their prior FYC writing and teaching experiences. I also describe participants' diverse, idiosyncratic WPE that they received from their respective master's programs. I then report the degree to which participants recalled their prior teaching contexts' curriculum objectives and values. I conclude this chapter by noting the significance of these findings for understanding who GTAs are, what their preparation consisted of, and how they perceived prior curricula expectations. These narratives provide significant context for

identifying and measuring prior writing, teaching and WPE that they may have reused or adapted in their new teaching context.

Chapter Five presents findings about GTAs' current pedagogical experiences at UTK, which were triangulated from Interview 1, Interview 2, classroom observations, and collected instructional materials. I first describe participants' immediate recollections and impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation. These reports depict the theory and practices that they learned from their new teaching context as well as the extent to which they detected this new writing program's curriculum objectives and values. I then report participants' experiences in teaching the first FYC course at UTK, particularly focusing on five pedagogical knowledge domains: curriculum, rhetorical, genre, pedagogical practices, and discourse community values. I report participants' dis/comforts in teaching some of these domains (e.g., rhetorical, genre, and pedagogical practices), and I describe the extent to which their prior and current knowledge is reused or adapted into their pedagogical practices. I describe the extent to which they comprehend the curriculum and share discourse community values. I measure the extent of their adaptation of these five pedagogical knowledges with Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's (1999) five degrees of appropriation.

Chapter Six presents findings from Interview 3, where I asked participants to reflect on their previous interview responses. In this chapter, I report any dis/similarities in responses for each pedagogical knowledge domain. From these reflections, I describe participants' overall experiences in transitioning to a new writing program, particularly noting any stagnation or growth in pedagogical practices. I compare participants'

responses to describe and interpret their learning processes, which provides insight into how GTAs adapted prior experiences and what they learned from attending the pre-service orientation and teaching the first FYC course at UTK.

In Chapter Seven, I briefly summarize and discuss findings in the context of WPE and transfer scholarship, and then I offer conclusions and recommendations. I first review participants' prior histories, particularly noting the diversity and idiosyncrasy of participants' teaching and WPE experiences from their respective master's programs. I argue that participants' prior experiences were localized to their master's programs, and while they received specialized WPE for those teaching contexts, participants struggled to identify curricula values and objectives. Moreover, to survive teaching in those prior programs, they relied more on lore and best practices than theory, which led to insufficiently theorized pedagogies. I then describe how participants negotiated these prior experiences when they transitioned into teaching at UTK. Participants' pedagogical practices at UTK remained insufficiently theorized. They either reused prior pedagogical practices and instructional materials or adapted to the standardized syllabus to learn about the curriculum by teaching it. Participants were not resistant, as they expressed value in teaching a transfer-based FYC curriculum, and they generally aimed to teach the curriculum. However, I argue that their limited pedagogical knowledge inhibited them from implementing the curriculum fully. I then conclude that WPE needs to not only be extended beyond the master's program and pre-service orientation but should also be collaborative between WPAs and GTAs. Writing pedagogy educators need to consider GTAs' diverse backgrounds and pedagogical knowledge to design WPE that develops

GTAs' pedagogies and academic discourse. Through guided supervision, GTAs can learn the importance of applying composition theory to pedagogical practices; moreover, they can learn to detect, elect, and connect (Perkins & Salomon, 2012, p. 250) prior experiences with new learning via situated performances (Rose & Finders, 1998), reflection (Schön, 1983), and directive writing (Tremmel, 1994; McKinney & Chiseri-Strater, 2003; Winslow, 2005) opportunities. These recommendations aim to remind compositionists that GTAs are still students who are in the process of developing their pedagogical expertise, and for development to occur, WPE needs to be ongoing, collaborative, and dynamic.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature of two separate scholarly conversations: writing pedagogy education and transfer theory. I first provide a history of writing pedagogy education (WPE). This history explores the conversation and debates about how to adequately and successfully prepare graduate teaching associates (GTAs) for teaching first-year composition (FYC) courses. I next examine empirical studies about the effectiveness of WPE, specifically the practicum. From this examination, I review what is known about the dissonances that GTAs experience in the practicum and how those GTAs resist writing program's ideologies and best practices. As compositionists asses GTAs' resistance, they call for extended WPE to develop and theorize their pedagogical practices. Scholars, like Heidi Estrem and E. Shelley Reid (2012), contended that WPE should not only be extended but also consider GTAs' prior experiences and learning processes.

Because learning is a messy process, GTAs' dissonances can serve as an impetus to discuss if or how pedagogical knowledge is being transferred into their teaching practices (Farris, 2002). To measure GTAs' transfer of learning, I noted in Chapter One that I employed DePalma and Ringer's (2011, 2012) "adaptive transfer" to identify and explore how GTAs reused or adapted prior knowledge and current WPE and instructional materials. However, this definition limits the scope of the study and does not address how transfer theory, even before its emergence as a paradigm, connects to WPE scholarship. Therefore, it is important to note that any references to "transfer" in this chapter aligns

with Michelene T. H. Chi and Kurt A. VanLehn's (2012) conception, which is "two sets of processes: initial learning followed by reusing or applying what was learned" (p.177). With this definition of transfer, I conclude this chapter by mapping connections between the theory and WPE scholarship. Because transfer theory has been applied to GTAs only recently, such connections are vital for recalibrating WPE to best develop GTAs' pedagogical knowledge and practices.

Writing Pedagogy Education: A History of GTA Preparation

Prior to the prevalence of English graduate programs that specialized in preparing GTAs to teach English courses, GTA preparation consisted of mimicry and anecdotes. GTA preparation, in general, was informed by two beliefs: 1) teachers learn to teach by teaching, and 2) if a teacher can write well, then s/he can teach writing (Pytlik, 2002). From late 1800s to early 1900s, graduate students were depicted to be proficient in reciting literature and mimicking teaching practices; however, such preparation did not adequately or automatically translate into effective pedagogical practices. Scholars determined that graduate students in English needed to be prepared to teach English courses beyond recitation and mimicry (Pytlik, 2002).

There were two English programs in which their approach to GTA preparation received significant attention. In 1912, Harvard's English 67 course introduced graduate students to graduate-level writing as well as writing pedagogy. Graduate students were required to compose and submit themes that freshmen were assigned. In addition to writing, GTAs graded freshmen themes, observed mentors' teaching, and composed mock lectures (Pytlik, 2002). This course not only addressed GTAs' poor writing skills

but also exposed them to pedagogical practices they would assume as instructor of record. However, similar to the issues with recitation and mimicry, GTAs' experiences in writing, observation, and modeling did not automatically transfer into effective teaching practices. While some universities followed Harvard's English 67 model, others resisted implementing GTA preparation programs. By the 1950s, prepared GTA English instructors were in dire need due to the increasing enrollment of WWII veterans who needed remedial education (Pytlik, 2002). One solution was Robert Hunting's (1951) proposed training program that "would permit all graduate students in English to take a one-year, non-credit, training-course" (p. 4). The course would require GTAs to be a teaching assistant in the fall term and then the instructor of record in the spring. In addition to mentorship and teaching experiences, GTAs were also required to attend a year-long seminar course, similar to a practicum, where GTAs examined freshmen themes and discussed problems as they arose (Hunting, 1951). The goal of the course was to guide graduate students as they began their roles as teachers.

Alongside Hunting's (1951) preparation program, Albert Kitzhaber (1955) introduced his "Rhetorical Background of Written English" training course to the University of Kansas. While Hunting's provided more pragmatic training, Kitzhaber's (1955) course provided more formal theoretical training in rhetoric, as the department "had no wish to standardize, to impose teaching methods or teaching philosophies" (p. 196). Graduate students earned a credit per semester, and the biweekly course spanned two semesters. The course was part lecture and part discussion, as a means "to avoid the unreality of the purely theoretical course" (Kitzhaber, 1955, p.196). While discussions

could presumably turn to pragmatic topics, the overall course design emphasized rhetorical theory, linguistics, and literary theory. Kitzhaber's (1955) training program became "one of which [that] may be considered a model for the 1960s and 1970s courses in which current rhetorical and pedagogical theories were introduced" (Pytlik, 2002, p.12). Indeed, his course did serve as a model, one that attempted to balance theory and practice but also one that, as Sidney Dobrin (2005) contended, prioritized theory to legitimize the course's intellectual undertakings.

The argument of legitimizing composition programs, first-year writing courses, and GTA preparation parallels the debate between theory and practice. If a writing—or say a teacher preparation—course, were not grounded in theory, then should it be counted for credit? Should it be considered as a subject that invokes critical dialogue? These questions demonstrate the vexing nature of composition studies, particularly that of GTA preparation. Hence, when the scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s brought forth empirical research[4] that theorized writing, there was, as Dobrin (2005) explained, a "shift to a more fully practical focus" (p. 17). However, Dobrin's (2005) understanding was not in congruence with other composition theorists, such as Stephen Wilhoit (2002), who found that training seminars emphasized theory more than practice. Arguably, Wilhoit's and Dobrin's conclusions can be justifiably correct, as there was no standardization of GTA preparation, and while scholars had varying reasons for making such calls, the issue remained the same: balance between theory and practice was needed.

[4] In the 1970s and 1980s, scholars, e.g, Janet Emig (1977), Shaughnessy (1977), Flower and Hayes (1981), and Bizzell (1982), examined the cognitive processing involved in students' writing.

Such calls for balance between practice and theory proliferated English departments by the 1970s. In 1977, Richard Gebhardt proposed a Writing for Teachers of Writing course that united rhetorical theory with practice. The course was a site where GTAs worked on their writing skills, encountered similar writing scenarios as their students, and explored such experiences to develop their rhetorical awareness and pedagogical practices. Similarly, Frank D'Angelo (1977) presented four strategies to foster GTAs' theoretical knowledge in rhetoric, form and structure, and writing pedagogy. Gebhardt and D'Angelo called for an increased presence of rhetorical training in conjunction with practical application. Similar to Gebhardt, John J. Ruszkiewicz (1987) proposed that WPE instruction should embody the theoretical grounding in which the course is taught. For example, as he taught the process movement, he integrated it into his pedagogical practices, thus exemplifying the theoretical integration that scholars were aiming to develop. Ruszkiewicz (1987) considered his approach as "dynamic and challenging" because it was "a process derived by theory, but emphasizing practice, one that surveys methods, but tests them by experience" (p. 464). Ruszkiewicz's (1987) argument further demonstrated the field's need for a balanced approach to and training of GTAs. While the 1982 Conference on College Communication (hereafter CCCCs) published the "Position Statement on the Preparation and Professional Development of Teachers of Writing,"[5] which ensured that GTAs will receive training in both theory and practice, the structure of and the degree to which theory and practice are balanced continues to vex composition scholars.

[5] It states, "College and university of English departments [are] to provide opportunities for the faculty to develop knowledge of theory and skill in the teaching of writing" (1.1).

Even with the recognized need of theory and practice, compositionists began inquiring into how GTAs acquire theory to put into practice. In 1982, Robert Parker argued that there should be "compatible connections" to bridge prior experiences and knowledges "to what is new and therefore unconstructed" in a pedagogy course (p. 412). These connections were made possible in a reflective, recursive process, which he diagramed as follows:

Experience ←→ theory ←→THEORY (Parker, 1982, p. 413)

Parker (1982) defined "theory" as "personal, concrete, context-bound, psychological," whereas "THEORY" is defined as "impersonal, abstract, context-free, logical" (p.413). In a pedagogy course, a student would connect prior teaching experiences with the formal THEORY presented in, say, a textbook, and these connections would then "transform" the student's pedagogical practices (Parker, 1982, pp. 416-417). For transformation to occur, THEORY needed to take root within the student. If development is external or superficial, then such changes, if any, were "merely adjustments" (Parker, 1982, p. 417). While Parker (1982) argued that WPE can provide opportunities to connect experiences to formal theory, Stephen North (1987) contended that such development was based in, and somewhat limited to, *lore*, which was experiential.

Lore consists of longstanding traditions, successful anecdotes, and failed experiences. North (1987) described *lore* as a "body of knowledge" that "is driven by pragmatic logic: It is concerned with what has worked, is working, or might work in teaching, doing, or writing" (p. 23). Teachers are quick to discuss and share such experiences as "best practices" and concrete knowledge. To return to Parker's (1982)

term, lore is "theory," and it is a concept that cannot be easily dismissed. In fact, such knowledge has been incorporated into communal documents, such as syllabi, assignment sheets, orientations, pedagogy courses, and theory seminars (North, 1987, p. 28). Lore is not informed by Parker's (1982) THEORY because the experiential knowledge is abundant and accessible. When a problem arises, teachers either turn to their peers' or their own experiences, thus limiting pedagogical development to mere adjustments. North (1987) captured this limitation in a house metaphor: a teacher constructed a house based on his/her experiences, and with each new experience, s/he added an addition; the house became an assemblage of experiences without theoretical grounding. Because the house consisted of only additions, not adaptations, there was a culmination of contradicting experiences (North, 1987). While a contradiction is presumably a "red flag," it is often not investigated by the teacher; rather, it is accepted and conserved as a pragmatic "management tool" (North, 1987, p.47). Because lore goes uninvestigated, there is no internal development, no transformation of pedagogical practices for GTAs. For such development and transformation, THEORY needs to explicitly and compatibly connect to teachers' experiences.

By the late 1980s and mid-1990s, scholars began surveying English Departments about the kinds of opportunities available for GTAs to connect composition theory with pedagogical practices. Wilhoit (2002) recalled Paul Puccio's survey findings, which were presented at the 1988 CCCCs. Puccio found that "most of the fifty departments surveyed required TAs to participate in pre-service workshops, take credit-bearing courses in composition theory and pedagogy, and have their classroom teaching evaluated by

faculty members" (Wilhoit, 2002, p. 17). These opportunities were not too dissimilar from those found in Catherine Latterell's (1996) survey. She requested documents from seventy-two English departments with graduate programs in Rhetoric and Composition, and thirty-six programs responded. Akin to Puccio's findings, Latterell (1996) found that "nearly all of the programs (32) reported that they require a fall orientation for all new GTAs" (p. 10). The length and structure of the orientation varied in each program, ranging from a one- to five-day pre-service orientation or a summer writing pedagogy course. Beyond requiring pre-service workshops, Latterell also reported that programs offered a wide array of WPE: one- or two-semester courses (e.g., theory seminars, practica, and/or methods courses), apprenticeships, and teaching portfolios. Some programs required new GTAs to participate in multiple preparation opportunities, whereas some programs' offerings were limited to a single course. Latterell noted that "23 [programs] locate their teacher preparation program in a single course, which may or may not be repeated throughout each term of a GTA's initial year of training" (p.10). This single course, or the practicum, provided program-specific (hereafter, localized) training. Localized training entailed GTAs being prepared in the writing program's curriculum, ideology, and best practices.

While localized approaches provided some quick guidance and standardization, Latterell (1996) criticized the practicum's "skills-based" approach because it conveyed that "teaching writing requires minimal expertise" (p. 19). Scholars, e.g., Kitzhaber (1955) and D'Angelo (1977), have contended that WPE is an intellectual endeavor and required education in composition theory. Echoing their arguments, Latterell argued that

the exposure to composition theory was beneficial for GTAs because it not only socialized them into the field but also provided them a discourse to describe their pedagogical practices. By having this vocabulary, GTAs could then theoretically ground their teaching as well as understand why certain assignments or activities succeed or fail. With this preparation, GTAs would become more flexible in their teaching and problem-solving, instead of relying on skills provided in the practicum (Latterell, 1996). For this reason, Latterell encouraged English departments to offer balanced, in theory and practice, WPE.

Most scholars agree with Gebhardt (1977), Ruszkiewicz (1987), and Latterell (1996) in that adequate GTA preparation should consist of exposure to a breadth of rhetorical and pedagogical theories as well as opportunities for practical application. As for such opportunities, compositionists have proposed and debated various instructional methods, such as collaborative or peer coaching, situated performance activities, reflective practices, and student-centered learning (i.e., teaching journals and writing portfolios).

In the early 1980s, Bruce R. Joyce and Beverly Showers implemented an instructional model known as “peer coaching” in educational studies. Joyce and Showers (1981) proposed this model because there was a lack thereof implementation of training. They wrote:

> We believe that a major problem in teacher training designs has been the assumption that a skill, once learned, can be "popped into place" in the classroom (transferred laterally). The situation is, rather, that transfer of teaching skill involves much new learning - when to use the skills, how to modulate them to the students, etc.- *learning which has to take place in the process of transfer.* (Joyce & Showers, 1981, p. 170)

As found with earlier kinds of WPE, such as mimicry and recitation, pedagogical knowledge and skills did not automatically translate, or what Joyce and Showers termed transfer, into pedagogical practices. A few years later, educational psychologists D. N. Perkins and Gavriel Salomon (1988) introduced their theory of transfer, which stated that learning and knowledge does not automatically occur or pop into place. Instead, they contended that learning and application was a complex process that required low road and high road transfer. The former relied on perceiving similarities between contexts, such as driving a car versus a truck, whereas high road required "deliberate mindful abstraction" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 25). Joyce and Showers (1981) contended that the lack thereof teacher preparation did not teach instructors how to mindfully abstract learning for classroom application. Instead, the assumption that the preparation would automatically transfer led to ineffective pedagogical practices. Joyce and Showers then proposed peer coaching to guide instructors in abstracting and applying pedagogical skills.

Joyce and Showers' (1981) findings showed that teachers were more likely to implement their training into pedagogical practices if they were paired with more experienced teachers, i.e., peer coaches. This model was successful because the coaching, or mentorship, created a feedback loop where ideas could be discussed and abstracted; curricula could be co-planned; and teaching could be practiced. In 1996, Joyce and Showers altered the direction of peer coaching to emphasize "planning and developing curriculum and instruction in pursuit of shared goals" (p. 15). The verbal feedback component was eliminated as it engendered evaluative responses from coaches, which

was not the purpose of peer coaching. This model inspired other education scholars, such as Robert J. Garmston (1983), to extend and thus categorize coaching models. Garmston (1983) created a coaching three-model taxonomy for education administrators: technical, collegial, and challenge. Technical coaching consisted of 15-20 observations, verbal feedback, and skills practice. He claimed that this model "is most effective for transferring teacher training to the classroom application" (Garmston, 1983, p. 22) but also warned that dialogue between coaching pairs should not be evaluative, as it "tends to intimidate novices who are working with veteran teachers" (Garmston, 1983, p. 19). As for the other two models, collegial coaching aimed to improve rapport and dialogue between teachers and administration, whereas challenge coaching aimed to problem-solve instructional methods. While these models were first introduced to the field of education, they were later adopted into GTA preparation programs.

The kinds of coaching that is most often found in composition GTA preparation fall under Garmston's (1983) technical and collegial coaching models. For example, Arizona State University's (ASU) English department implemented peer coaching, which followed the collegial coaching model, into their WPE. ASU faculty "hoped that by watching others teach, listening to comments about teaching, and reflecting on these experiences, the composition teachers would improve their teaching and their self-esteem as teachers" (Cooper & Kehl, 1991, p. 31). The ultimate purpose of this coaching model was to alleviate GTAs' feelings of isolation, and in that regard, the coaching was reported a success. While ASU's peer coaching was used to promote a healthier work environment, most implementations of peer coaching in GTA preparation programs are

more evaluative. Typically, novice GTAs were paired with either supervisors (see Nyquist & Wulff, 1996; Latterell, 1996) or more experienced GTAs (see Latterell, 1996; Weiser, 2002). As for supervision, GTAs were observed to ensure effective pedagogical practices and development (Nyquist & Wulff, 1996); however, with increasing enrollments, the mentorship responsibility shifted to peers. For Irvin Weiser's (2002) teacher preparation program at Purdue University, GTAs who had successfully completed qualifying exams were permitted to mentor novice GTAs. While such pairings were financially beneficial to the university, the effects were potentially harmful. Unlike faculty mentors, GTA mentors had not received "significant resources" (Weiser, 2002, p. 44), and their evaluations could unduly affect novice GTAs' apprenticeships. While mentorship professionalizes GTAs, a value that Nyquist and Wulff (1996) espoused is necessary for the development of GTAS, peer coaching (technical or collegial) relied upon GTAs' abilities to be cognizant of "advice," which could be evaluative or experiential, i.e., lore (North, 1987). Nevertheless, peer coaching was found to be beneficial, as ASU reported, in cultivating a collegial environment where GTAs were collaborative, not isolated. Moreover, GTAs ultimately benefited from discussing ideas, co-planning courses, and practicing instruction (Wilhoit, 2002).

In 1982, Gene Krupa proposed mirroring activities to further develop GTAs' pedagogical development. Such activities included peer visits and peer discussion groups, which were similar to the previously discussed peer coaching techniques. Additionally, Krupa (1982) proposed "simulation of teaching situations," which provided non-evaluative spaces to practice teaching. An example would be performing a lesson plan for

a small group, also called microteaching.[6] From this performance, GTAs would be able to reflect and thus "change and revise their teaching selves" (Krupa, 1982, p. 444). While Krupa suggested that simulated teaching situations should occur after GTAs begin teaching, Shirley Rose and Margaret Finders (1998) included simulations, or what they called "situated performances," in their respective department's pre-service orientations. Invoking John Dewey's (1910) notions that education relied on, and arguably could only take root in, experience, Rose and Finders (1998) implemented situated performances to provide experiences upon which GTAs could reflect. Since novice GTAs, typically, do not have prior teaching experiences, situated performances provided such situations in which GTAs could practice, ideally connecting theory with practice. Rose and Finders (1998) suggested, "In a theory-focused teacher preparation course, these activities can ground the theory by providing concrete examples and situations; in a practicum, situated performances provide a way to frame the concrete experience and bracket it for critical analysis" (p. 39). Such opportunities not only provided a balanced WPE but also the desired socialization into the profession. The simulated activities provided experiences in which GTAs could hone their pedagogical skills and encounter scenarios of which they were either unfamiliar or anxious. Through such encounters, GTAs were exposed to not

[6] David M. Shannon, Darla J. Twale, and Mathew S. Moore (1998) suggested microteaching as a simulated teaching activity: "One group activity, which has been very successful in preparing teachers for K-12 teaching settings, is microteaching (Cruickshank & Metcalf, 1993; MacLeod, 1987; McKeachie, 1994; Pauline, 1993; Perlberg, 1988). This technique allowed students to practice teaching in front of faculty and peers, gaining valuable experience and feedback, before being placed in front of more critical and demanding audiences" (Shannon, Twale, & Moore, p. 459).

only the expectations of the field but also the importance of developing a reflective practice (Shannon, Twale & Moore, 1998).

Inspired by Donald A. Schön's (1983) *A Reflective Practitioner*, Rhetoric and Composition scholars began integrating reflection into WPE, with the aim of developing reflective practitioners, in the early 1990s. As discussed earlier, WPE models were based on the beliefs that GTAs could apply theoretical, specialized knowledge to teaching practices, a linear process that Schön (1983) termed "Technical Rationality." This rote approach was deemed insufficient and thus new training models evolved. Schön (1983), too, recognized the limits of this positivist application as "after the fact" and thus as a "limited utility in practice" (pp. 48-49). Challenging the linearity and proposing a more recursive model, he proposed "reflection-in-action which is central to the 'art' by which practitioners sometimes deal well with situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict" (Schön, 1983, p. 50). For Schön, practitioners had tacit knowledge embedded in their actions, and to understand the uncertainty or value conflict of an experience, practitioners intuitively reflected by challenging or criticizing their tacit knowledge (i.e., theories-in-use). Then, if that knowledge had not addressed the problem, the practitioners needed to "construct a new description of it" and then "test the new description by an on-the-spot experiment," thus creating a "theory-in-action" to better understand the experience (Schön, 1983, pp. 62-63). While some practitioners were habitually reflective, consciously or not, other practitioners were either unaware of opportunities for reflection or upheld the Technical Rationality approach, which made reflection-in-action all the more important (Schön, 1983). He argued that reflection-in-

action “links the art of practice in uncertainty and uniqueness to the scientist’s art of research” (Schön, 1983, p. 69). And when it comes to WPE, compositionists have been contemplating not only the balance of theory and practice but also on how to link these two concepts together to socialize GTAs into the profession.

Invoking Schön’s (1983) *Reflective Practitioner*, Sprague and Nyquist (1991) presented three developmental models for socializing GTAs into the profession: Developmental Models of Personal Competence, Professional Developmental Models, and Teacher Developmental Models. Reflection was a significant component of each model because development was complex and recursive. They contended, “No single behavior of a TA can be understood without placing it in the context of the steps that have come before” (Sprague & Nyquist, 1991, p. 304). Schön’s reflection-in-action facilitated GTAs’ understanding of those behaviors and practices. However, as R. R. Allen (1991) posited, reflection needed to be explicitly guided and supervised by mentors. GTAs do not have the experience to identify and adjust their theories-in-use, and without guidance, GTAs may resort to what some scholars perceived as resistance to theory (Hesse, 1993). However, with keen supervision, GTAs could develop this reflective habit to further inform and develop their pedagogical practices (Allen, 1991; Hesse, 1993).

One means of developing reflective habits is to assign guided reflection assignments. Robert Tremmel (1994) suggested that WPE should include writing prompts that encouraged GTAs to reflect about their students and themselves, or as Hesse (1993) hoped, “see their students in themselves” (p. 226). The two-prompt writing

assignment encouraged GTAs to pay close attention to their anxieties, fears, or confusion. In the first part, GTAs narrated a problem, and in the second part, they reflected upon the experience by noting any "thoughts, feelings, and speculations that arise" (Tremmel, 1994, pp. 58-59). Another means is through situated performances. Rose and Finders (1998) posited that simulated teaching experiences provided GTAs with opportunities to try an approach, critically reflect on it, and then revise it based on feedback. This "learner-centered" approach modeled the habitual reflective practice that teachers were expected to inhabit. As Christine Farris (2002) explained, "From an administrative perspective, we want confident, *reflective* teachers whom we know will grow and change in interesting ways" (p. 102, emphasis added). Therefore, to develop such reflective teachers, WPE needed to provide opportunities such as writing or situated performances to cultivate a learning space where novice GTAs could practice reflection-in-action and thus further socialize into the profession. Not only did GTAs need opportunities, but they also needed peer coaching or mentorship to explicitly guide or model the practice (Bamberg 2002; Stenberg, 2005; Stancliff & Goggin, 2007; Reid, 2009; Hillocks, 2009; Rivera-Mueller, 2014). Moreover, GTAs needed the space to question their assumptions, ideologies, and identities (Reid, 2004; Rivera-Mueller, 2014). With critical-awareness and a reflective habit of mind, GTAs could identify prior experiences and theories-in-use that influenced their pedagogical practices and thus, in Schön's (1983) terms, reframed those experiences to make sense of anxieties, confusions, or dissonances.

While GTAs were expected to be reflective practitioners, they were also expected to embrace themselves as student writers. Prior to the late 1970s, GTAs' writing skills

were mostly addressed individually via feedback to seminar papers, theses, or dissertations. By 1977, scholars encouraged WPE programs to incorporate student-centered writing opportunities, such as teaching journals and writing portfolios (Pytlik, 2002). For example, Gebhardt (1977) listed four components of a well-balanced WPE, and three of those specifically addressed writing opportunities, ranging from writing about teaching to peer reviewing writing assignments required in writing pedagogy courses (e.g., freshmen themes). Similarly, Nancy Comley (1986) advised, "In the graduate teaching seminar, a writing approach should be used as well" (p. 55). Comley (1986) argued that GTAs should not only embrace themselves as student writers but also "keep a journal of one's classroom experience" for reflection and thus pedagogical development (p. 55). Teaching journals proposed a means for reflecting about experiences, fears, and anxieties (McBroom, 1992). Compositionists continued to support the role that teaching journals play in GTAs' respective developments in pedagogy, ideology, and identity. Such developments emerged from critical discussions that occur either internally or externally (i.e., between WPE educator and GTA) (McKinney & Chiseri-Strater, 2003; Stenberg, 2005; Reid, 2009). Jackie Grutsch McKinney and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater (2003) asserted that teaching journals provided partial representations of who GTAs are and how they teach, and because the journals did not fully represent who GTAs are, then their teaching should not be evaluated by these journals. They warned writing pedagogy educators to remember that GTAs' pedagogies, ideologies, and identities are in flux as they undergo teaching for the first time in conjunction with teaching and composition theory seminars (McKinney & Chiseri-

Strater, 2003). These teaching journals provided a space for reflection, a space that GTAs could inhabit to become socialized into the profession.

Writing in WPE may provide more than reflection; arguably, writing assignments that are linked to FYC curriculum are also purported to encourage empathy. In 2005, Rosemary Winslow examined how the inclusion of writing portfolios affected doctoral GTAs. She noted that they "learned *how* writing happens—how chaotic and messy it is at first, how to find significance, how to shape and keep shaping, how to get good feedback, how to write for an audience, how to assess and evaluate from word-level to whole" (Winslow, 2005 p. 328). By learning about their writing processes and how "messy" it could be, GTAs also developed empathy as their assumptions about students were not too different from their own writing experiences, which may have consisted of fear, anxiety, and/or difficulty. In fact, E. Shelley Reid (2009) recommended that WPE should provide difficult writing assignments; she explained, "It is therefore important for us to help pedagogy students not just to name difficulty but to see how even 'dead ends' or 'failures' in their writing can *increase* their ability to teach writing well" (Reid, 2009, p. W208). While Reid theorized that such experiences would easily transfer into pedagogical practices, Dylan Dryer (2012) found that GTAs' frustrations, fears, and anxieties were projected upon their FYC students' writing. In his study, GTAs did not make use of these experienced dissonances to inform their pedagogical practices. Instead, to Dryer's (2012) surprise, GTAs were ambivalent in emphasizing with their students' writing experiences. He found that GTAs shifted genres—or mental positions (e.g., from student to teacher)— as they analyzed their students' writing, and with that shift, GTAs

effaced the relationship that they had with academic writing (pp. 432-433). While he noted a few exceptions, Dryer (2012) encouraged writing pedagogy educators to help GTAs make sense of such dissonances, to use that productive tension in their teaching, and to guide GTAs to become better "*learners* and teachers" (p.441). While writing may or may not develop GTAs' empathy, it can be used for critical reflection as well as pedagogical and ideological development. Writing in WPE provides GTAs the discursive space to explore, engage, and evaluate their assumptions and beliefs about writing and teaching.

From developing GTAs as writers to reflective practitioners, compositionists continue examining and developing WPE that advances GTAs' pedagogical skills, theoretical knowledge, and professional socialization. Scholars are in agreement that GTAs benefit from a WPE that balances composition theory and pedagogical application. Yet the structure of WPE continues to be explored and thus debated. Over the past century, WPE has evolved from mimicry and memorization to multifaceted approaches that consist of (to varying degrees) orientation workshops, theory seminars, pedagogy methods courses, apprenticeships, and practica. Scholars have concluded that GTAs should be reflective practitioners who have explicit guidance and ample opportunities to practice theorizing and teaching, whether that is through writing assignments, situated performances, or peer coaching. While such opportunities are important, WPE is not standardized among universities, and the localized nature of preparation programs presents additional problems to the development of GTAs.

Conversion, Dissonance, and Resistance: Exploring GTAs' Experiences in the Practicum

Compositionists generally agree that WPE should be balanced in theoretical coverage and practical application; however, the great composition "theory wars" were foundational for understanding how GTAs applied WPE to their teaching practices. The debates about theory and practice not only served as a means to legitimize composition studies but also contributed to theorizing how GTAs use their prior experiences to inform their teaching and writing practices. Such debates led to empirical studies about the effectiveness of the practicum, which has become a "'universally' offered course" (Dobrin, 2005, p. 2). The practicum, a widely contested course, has been criticized for propagating localized preparation and limiting GTAs' agency. Some writing programs prescribe teaching objectives and thus identities and ideologies to their GTAs, which may lead to dissonances. When GTAs struggle to negotiate these dissonances, they are often understood as resistant. Scholars have examined this relationship between WPE and GTAs' identities and values, and from those findings, a consistent theme of understanding who GTAs are was unveiled.

As compositionists argued about the integration of theory or practice into WPE, Irwin Weiser (1990) turned to GTAs to inform the design of WPE. For Weiser, previous discussions about WPE assumed who GTAs were and what they needed to learn. He found this assumption problematic as "it can only address the generic new teacher" (Weiser, 1990, p. 63), so he developed a survey for incoming GTAs about their prior teaching and WPE experiences and what they desired to learn in the upcoming pre-service orientation. Based on the responses, he noticed a dissonance among what

compositionists believed GTAs should learn, what GTAs already knew, and what GTAs wanted to learn. He argued that this dissonance could inhibit GTAs from "absorbing the information" covered in WPE (Weiser, 1990, p. 63). Weiser learned that experienced and novice GTAs' desires did not align. The former desired more workshops about planning and managing in-class peer review, whereas novice GTAs wanted to learn more about grading and "first day concerns" (Weiser, 1990, p. 66). With this knowledge, he revised the orientation to comprise more small group meetings. These group meetings would be homogenous in prior experiences, and the discussions would be tailored to the group's survey responses. While Weiser's redesign took into consideration *who* GTAs are, other approaches to WPE continued to cover what writing pedagogy educators believed GTAs should know.

In the early 1990s, scholars began criticizing approaches to WPE that aimed to convert GTAs to the best practices for the program in which GTAs were being trained to teach. Both Wendy Bishop's (1990) study and Nancy Welch's (1993) personal account uncovered such conversion experiences. Bishop's (1990) study examined experienced GTAs' (i.e., PhD students who have prior teaching experiences) implementation of a Teaching Basic Writing (TBW) course into their pedagogical practices. Bishop (1990) reported that Dr. Bridges's TBW course aimed to convert GTAs from a Current-Traditionalist paradigm to a process, student-centered model. Bishop (1990) presented five case studies of GTAs who varied in the degree to which the TBW course influenced their teaching practices. She discovered that GTAs' identities were affected by preconceptions about teaching, prior teaching experiences, and the TBW course

experience. Three GTAs were more resistant to the pedagogy recommended in the TBW course, whereas the other two GTAs converted, or altered, their pedagogies to fit the TBW model (Bishop, 1990). The three GTAs who resisted reflect Welch's (1993) own experience.

For Welch (1993), her experiences at University A and University B contrasted each other, particularly in the ideological framework of each program. At University B, her prior knowledge had become taboo, and she struggled to adapt to the language of the new program. Welch found that University A embodied Bishop's (1990) "convergent" model, i.e., it brought "opposing viewpoints into contact so that richer, fuller, more provocative viewpoints might be imagined" (Welch, 1993, p. 400), whereas University B encouraged conversion, as what Dr. Bridges desired for his TBW course in Bishop's study. Both scholars proposed the convergent approach to WPE and problematized the conversion tactic, as GTAs' identities were at stake. Bishop (1990) suggested that WPE should consider how GTAs "retheorize" (p. 139) theory based on their prior experiences. However, Welch (1993) warned that such "retheorization" cannot take place if GTAs are "stalled and silenced" (p. 400). While both Bishop and Welch criticized the conversion approach to WPE, their work brought forth GTAs' experiences, in particular their experiences with dissonance in ideology and identity, a subject further explored by Elizabeth Rankin (1994).

In *Seeing Yourself as a Teacher*, Rankin (1994) recalled teaching "Seminar on Teaching College English," a composition pedagogy course where she presumed her graduate students "resist[ed] almost everything" (p. ix). After reading her students'

reflective narratives, she discovered that her students were productively reflecting about their teaching experiences. Of this group, five novice[7] GTAs agreed to participate in her study. Rankin (1994) found that her participants struggled to manage their dual identities (as teacher and student) and negotiate theory. As teachers, GTAs encountered uncertainty in their relationships with students. Some participants, similar to the findings in Brian Bly's (2000) study, reported conflict in managing authority as a teacher. Age, gender, economic status, and familial experiences affected GTAs' construction of their teacher identities, and being authoritative conflicted with the GTAs' positions as graduate students. The shifting boundary between teacher and student, or the professional and the personal, became blurred as GTAs projected their experiences and fears onto their students (Rankin, 1994; Bly, 2000). While there is no prescriptive, ideal balance to managing identities, these dissonances informed GTAs' learning and understanding of teaching as well as their attitudes toward teaching.

Rankin's (1994) presumption that GTAs were resistant to pedagogical theory was partially correct. GTAs, in general, were resistant to using the term "theory," but they were not resistant to theory itself. That is, Rankin (1994) found that GTAs were "theorizing constantly" (p. 45). The same influences that affected GTAs' teaching identities informed their theories about teaching. Additional factors such as the writing program's theoretical paradigm, textbooks, and graduate courses shaped their teaching philosophy and practices. Dissonances occurred when prior experiences conflicted with the theories of the writing program and/or graduate coursework. When GTAs

[7] Four participants were novices. The fifth participant, Meredith, had some experience as a GTA in another discipline (Rankin, 1994, p. xvi).

experienced dissonance, they criticized the textbook or expressed dissatisfaction with the writing program. Rankin (1994) recommended dissonance and the "presence of a dialogic Other" as the two key criteria for "thinking theoretically" (pp. 80-81). The dialogic Other can occur internally or externally. For example, Mike, a participant in her study, found the dialogic other in his reflective writing, whereas participants Keith or Meredith found it in a peer or mentor. In these examples, the dialogic Other helped GTAs understand and thus make meaning of their dissonant experiences, particularly their assumptions, beliefs, and values (Rankin, 1994).

For Rankin (1994), GTAs must also have a comprehensible understanding of the "academic discourse" and community of which they are a part to make meaning from these experiences (p. 81). If GTAs do not possess either the language or the understanding of the community, then they will struggle to identify the dissonance and question their implicit theories, thus resisting any adaptation or criticism of pedagogical theories. Rankin (1994) reported that participants Alex and Peter struggled with academic discourse, which led to them resisting socialization into the community. While Rankin (1994) conceded that GTAs can (re)theorize without academic language, GTAs needed to inhabit reflective practices, either internally or externally, to understand those dissonant moments. Through reflection, GTAs' could transform their assumptions and values, which heavily influenced their teaching practices.

Other empirical research has presented similar case studies to Rankin's (1994) participants of GTAs resisting writing program's values. Margaret Baker Graham and Carol David (1996) conducted a two-year study with nine GTAs who were in a MA

program. Graham and David (1996) assumed "that a well-defined training program will ensure consistency in the teaching of freshmen English" (p. 59). However, they discovered that GTAs were teaching what they believed, i.e., what they valued and what they assumed a teacher should accomplish in the classroom. Three GTAs valued students' authenticity and personal experiences, so they approached teaching via Expressivism. Three other GTAs saw themselves as gatekeepers who were tasked with teaching good, correct writing, thus embodying the Current-Traditionalist paradigm. The last three GTAs taught the writing program's paradigm, which was rhetoric-based. These GTAs' values aligned with the program's, i.e., that writing is an audience-driven dialogue. Graham and David speculated that GTAs' implicit theories and prior experiences affected their implementation of the curriculum values. They proposed additional rhetorical training to develop academic discourse and expertise in the subject matter, but they conceded that such preparation may encourage GTAs' resistance (Graham & David,1996), as was the case for Welch (1993).

Instead of implementing a standard approach to WPE, as suggested by Graham and David (1996), Wendy Bishop (1997) suggested that writing programs should recalibrate the curriculum to reflect the theories of its teachers. Bishop came to this conclusion after conducting a series of interviews with a graduate student named Dennis. Dennis, a Current-Traditionalist, experienced theoretical dissonance, e.g., his "tacit theories of learning, classrooms, and teaching roles" conflicted with theoretical readings and his professors' pedagogies (Bishop, 1997, p. 207). Dennis suppressed the theoretical dissonance and developed "strategies for survival" which stemmed from what he knew

and/or previously experienced (Bishop, 1997). Dennis, similar to Rankin's (1994) participants Alex and Peter, was perceived as resistant because he was unable to make meaning of the dissonance. Stacia Neeley (2000), a GTA contributor in Tina Lovonne Good and Leanne B. Warshauer's (2000) *In Our Own Voice: Graduate Students Teach Writing*, recalled a similar dissonance that involved the learning of conflicting theories and the developing of her teacher persona. Neeley (2000) described her WPE as the Freire's (1921/1996) "banking model," or what Bishop (1990) and Welch (1993) called the conversion model. Through this WPE model, GTAs were perceived as "blank slates," (Neeley, 2000; Reid, 2004; Stenberg, 2005) ready to be indoctrinated into the "theorizing professor" (Neeley, 2000). However, as case studies about conversion models pointed out, they neither uprooted nor compatibly connected to GTAs' lore (Parker, 1982; North, 1987). For Neeley (2000), her teaching persona and theoretical approach was "someone else's theory and pedagogy" (p. 20). The writing program's model did not connect to her experiences with teachers and theory, thus leading to confusion, rejection of theory, and a desire for survival tools (Rankin, 1994; Bishop, 1997; Neeley, 2000). However, Neeley (2000), like Rankin (1994), suggested that Schön's (1983) reflection-in-action would help GTAs make sense of dissonances. Through reflection, GTAs had the opportunity to be *students*, i.e., to learn from dissonant experiences and to transform their assumptions, beliefs, and values as educators. Neeley (2000) advised that writing pedagogy educators take a "bottom up" approach to WPE, an approach that worked from GTAs' prior experiences and knowledge.

During the early- to mid-2000s, scholars began inquiring into GTAs' experiences, and such inquiries aimed to critically examine and theorize the practicum. Christine Farris (2002), Kathleen Blake Yancey (2002), and Shari J. Stenberg (2005) challenged the top-down approach where compositionists, or administrators, constructed a curriculum in which GTAs were supposed to pick up, consume, or be filled with curriculum knowledge and then implement it efficiently. Yancey (2002) attributed this top-down approach to the localized nature of writing programs. Because writing programs needed to train GTAs to teach multiple FYC sections quickly, WPE focused on "nuts and bolts" (Newkirk, 1993) of teaching, the curriculum's overall design, and the writing program's ideology (Hardin, 2005; Belanger & Gruber, 2005). GTAs were not included in those conversations, which Farris (2002) opposed, and GTAs' experiences, identities, and knowledges remained unconsidered (Yancey, 2002; Stenberg, 2005). And because the curriculum is "someone else's theory and pedagogy" (Neeley, 2000, p. 20), GTAs deviated from the master syllabus and thus the program's theoretical paradigm. In essence, they resisted the conversion (Powell et al., 2002). Farris (2002) proposed that moments of deviation or resistance "can be the impetus" for critical discussions and reflection about pedagogical practice for both the writing program and the GTA (p.122). Yancey (2002) recommended a heuristic for curriculum design of WPE. The heuristic encouraged Writing pedagogy educators to discover who GTAs are, i.e., what their teaching experiences and theoretical ideologies are, and to critically assess the effectiveness of WPE (Yancey, 2002; Powell et al., 2002; Stenberg, 2005). As Stenberg (2005) reminded compositionists, WPE is a collaborative, recursive endeavor, and

"pedagogy cannot be finished" (p. xviii). She recommended ongoing WPE that is dynamic and learner-centered. These revisions to WPE aimed to remove the conversion practices and to develop GTAs' ideologies and pedagogies.

Stenberg's (2005) emphasis on learner-centered approaches to WPE was supported by compositionists such as Sally Barr Ebest (2005), E. Shelley Reid (2009), and Dylan Dryer (2012). Agreeing with other compositionists in that WPE should consider GTAs' experiences and needs, Ebest, Reid, and Dryer, respectively, examined GTAs' experiences with familiar and unfamiliar writing situations as well as their attitudes toward learning pedagogy theory and academic writing (Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012; Dryer, 2012). When it comes to pedagogical theory, Ebest (2005) argued that GTAs "find themselves on unfamiliar ground" (p.43). They were unfamiliar with pedagogical theory because some GTAs "are generally unaware of how they were taught" (Ebest, 2005, p. 43) and may have not experienced a FYC course, as they tested out of it during their undergraduate education (Ebest, 2005; Fischer, 2005; Reid, 2009). However, Dryer's (2012) study found that those who had experienced FYC courses felt neither more familiar with nor confident in the course than those who had not experienced it. In both situations, resistance stemmed from this dissonance of learning pedagogical theory and failing to connect that theory with past experiences. GTAs relied on personal experiences and lore to inform their pedagogical practices, and when there were contradictions, contrary to North's (1987) argument, GTAs were more likely to resist the new information or practice (Reid, Estrem, & Belcheir, 2012). These moments of dissonance significantly impacted GTAs' reception

of composition theory and their attitudes toward teaching (Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Dryer, 2012). Ebest, Reid, and Dryer supported Farris's (2002) recommendation of reflective writing. Ebest recommended reflective response journals, and Reid proposed assigning difficult writing assignments, of which she categorized as schematic (unfamiliar), relational (rhetorical), and exploratory (expressive/reflective). Similar to Reid, Dryer (2012) suggested that GTAs compose difficult writing assignments from contrary points of view and to reflect about how particular arguments "transfer between systems" (p. 442-443). This tactic to use writing, which was a presumed strength of graduate students, served as a space to develop GTAs' self-efficacy, explore connections between pedagogical practices and composition theory, and develop empathy towards undergraduate student writers. These approaches to WPE aimed to develop GTAs as *learners* of the field who are conscientious and reflective (Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Dryer, 2012).

While Ebest (2005), Reid (2009), and Dryer (2012) contended that writing could be a space for GTA development, Jessica Restaino (2012) argued that Hannah Arendt's theories about labor and action could provide a middle space for preparing GTAs. Employing Arendt for the theoretical framework, Restaino conducted a study with four participants—2 MAs and 2 PhDs, and the purpose of the study was to explore the participants' laboring, work, and action. Restaino contended that understanding the middle ground between theory and practice will show how GTAs learn, as that was projected onto pedagogical practices. As for labor, Restaino examined how GTAs teach writing as a process. Participants either had a "cursory knowledge of process theory" or

employed a commodified version of the theory as means for survival (Restaino, 2012, pp. 26-30). Restaino argued that this lack of knowledge about the theory stems from under-theorized WPE and an uncritical reliance on standardized teaching materials, leading to a thoughtless, endless cycle of laboring to survive teaching. She suggested a "middle space"[8] for GTAs to experiment with theory and practice (Restaino, 2012, pp.58-59). Restaino's participant, Nancy, became a prime example of the benefits of providing a middle space. Nancy experienced a dissonance between her prior experiences and the curriculum and expressed frustration and dissatisfaction with the curriculum. She was able to experiment in a middle space with teaching and grading practices, and from this middle space, she augmented, or adapted, her pedagogical practices as well as managed her dual identity. However, the other participants were not as successful, and they failed to augment instructional materials because they did not have a mediated space to experiment. In light of this failure, Restaino (2012) probed, "How might the practicum course serve as a mediating space between graduate students' double role as student/teacher, inviting experimentation and the transfer of their new adaptations, sketched in pencil, perhaps into the real space of their first writing classroom?" (p. 72). Not wanting to eliminate the practicum, Restaino (2012) responded to her probe by proposing to delay GTAs' teaching assignments to develop their "fuller picture" (p. 112) of the field. Moreover, GTAs should be provided a space to experiment and augment theory and practice in their WPE. GTAs are thrusted into teaching FYC before they are

[8] Restaino (2012) borrowed the term "middle space" from Higgins, an Arendtian scholar. Because Arendt's model neither addressed nor fit education, Restaino (2012) turned to Higgins's reformulation of the theory, as it created the "middle space" (pp. 58-59).

ready, which affected their attitudes toward teaching and their comprehension (and thus implementation) of the FYC curriculum (Restaino, 2012). To adequately prepare GTAs, Writing pedagogy educators should remember that GTAs are learners, students (Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Restaino, 2012).

While these writing assignments and middle spaces are steps toward preparing GTAs, many concluded that a single pedagogy course is not enough to develop their theoretical knowledge and pedagogical practices (Stenberg, 2005; Ebest, 2005; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012; Estrem& Reid, 2012). In 2012, Heidi Estrem and E. Shelley Reid collaborated on a multisite, multimodal study that spanned three years. The purpose of the study was twofold: 1) to determine the extent to which formal WPE influenced GTAs' teaching practices, and 2) to examine how GTAs constructed narratives about teaching. They found that WPE needed to be recursive and extended beyond the first year. GTAs who had no prior teaching experiences employed generalized or undertheorized language to describe teaching; however, their overall responses were considered by the authors to be "thoughtful, engaged" (Estrem & Reid, 2012, p. 68). Estrem and Reid attempted to correlate GTAs' responses with where it originated from, but they could not make strong correlations. Overall, GTAs' principles originated from multiple sources, such as formal WPE, personal experience, teaching experience, and community (i.e., peers and mentors) (Estrem & Reid, 2012).

Formal WPE and personal experiences informed most GTAs' approaches to pedagogy, and as for pedagogical content, GTAs were influenced more by personal experiences than formal WPE (Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012).

Reid, Estrem, and Belcheir (2012) explained that information from formal WPE held a "limited and sometimes peripheral position in [GTAs'] daily thoughts and practices" (pp. 48-49). With this data in mind, they warned Writing pedagogy educators to not overlook GTAs' prior experiences and knowledge, which could neither be removed nor replaced. Reid, Estrem, and Belcheir (2012) contended that GTAs "must appraise and integrate new knowledge themselves" (p. 55). If GTAs experienced dissonance in attempting to bridge together knowledge with experiences, then that experience should not be identified as resistance. Instead, it should be "productively reframed as a normal stage of TAs' learning processes" (Estrem & Reid, 2012, p. 462). GTAs are students, first and foremost, and their responses to dissonances are on a messy continuum of learning. Resistance "may be more inertial than consciously directed" (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012, p. 55). These findings were similar across all three sites despite the localized approaches to WPE. To facilitate GTAs' learning, the authors recommended extended WPE that goes into the second or even third year of graduate studies (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). They concluded that WPE should directly connect to GTAs' experiences in order to take root (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012), or in Parker's (1982) terms, to internally transform GTAs' pedagogical practices.

While Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012) began examining GTAs' learning processes, this area of WPE research is still considered as underexamined. In 2014, Carolyn Wisniewski addressed this gap by conducting a qualitative study about novice GTAs' learning processes. Specifically, she examined how these GTAs reflected upon and reacted to teaching challenges, and she found that they experienced dissonance but

responded by reflecting superficially, which rarely led to pedagogical change and growth. Based on their limited reflective practices, participants' pedagogical development fell into one of four outcomes that Wisniewski provided: inertia, self-approbation, rejection/replacement, or flexibility/experimentation. Similar to Reid, Estrem and Belcheir's (2012) findings, some of Wisniewski's (2014) participants demonstrated inertial learning processes, which entailed that they identified a need for pedagogical change but were "uncertain of what to modify or how to implement a change" (p. 230). These participants were not actively resisting development; instead, they did not possess the knowledge to inform their pedagogical growth. As for self-approbation, these participants did not change their pedagogical practices because they identified the cause of dissonance as stemming from either their students or the writing program, which is similar to reported findings from Rankin (1994). Some participants attempted to change their pedagogies in response to dissonance by rejecting or replacing practices "despite an awareness that it contradicted the FYC program guidelines" (Wisniewski, 2014, p. 230). Lastly, some participants "experimented with teaching practices" (Wisniewski, 2014, p. 230) to address the experienced dissonance and to support their students' learning. Based on these outcomes, novice GTAs did not problem-solve the dissonances that they experienced, leading to recurring pedagogical problems Agreeing with Restaino (2012), Wisniewski (2014) noted that these novice GTAs had "little time for reflection in the day-to-day struggle" (p. 243) of learning how to teach. She called for writing pedagogy educators to intervene and guide novice GTAs' reflective practices to prompt pedagogical development to prevent one of these four outcomes. If these GTAs possessed

a more sufficient theoretical framework to inform their pedagogies as well as more deliberate, critical reflective practices, they could address these recurring dissonances and thus develop pedagogically.

Since the 1990s, compositionists have begun examining the role GTAs' learning has on teaching practices. Conclusively, researchers have reported that GTAs experienced dissonances as they attempted to negotiate their prior experiences, knowledge, or identities with their new dual roles as a graduate students and teachers. Scholars have often framed these dissonant moments as resistance, but as scholarship advances, resistance is becoming more associated with GTAs' learning processes, particularly how they do or do not transfer their learning, as seen by the research presented by Restaino (2012), Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012), and Wisniewski (2014).

Connecting Writing Pedagogy Education with Dissonance, Resistance, and Transfer Theory

As Estrem and Reid (2012) argued, resistance should be productively reframed to capture GTAs' learning processes. In WPE scholarship, such examination of GTAs' learning processes has been underexplored, whereas the examination of undergraduate writers' learning and writing processes has been oversaturated with empirical research, particularly in the area of transfer theory. Scholars have examined student writers' abilities to abstract and transfer their learning and writing expertise to future contexts; they have debated about the extent to which writing skills are generalizable (Petraglia, 1995; Russell, 1997) or adaptable (Nowacek, 2011; DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013; Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014). Some scholars have proposed offering students

"real world" (Beaufort, 1999) writing contexts, whereas some compositionists have emphasized metacognition and explicit instruction (Wardle, 2007; Nelms & Dively, 2007; Rounsaville, Goldberg & Bawarshi, 2008). These examinations and recommendations aim to develop students' writing expertise and skills for transfer of learning; that is, students' ability to abstract prior knowledge to make sense or connect to a new context where they must integrate or adapt their knowledge (Nowacek, 2011; DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013; Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014). Similar to these student writers, GTAs need to connect prior knowledge from formal WPE and personal experiences to their pedagogical practices. As previously discussed, scholars have noted that GTAs do not automatically translate WPE into their practices, and when they encounter dissonances, it possibly stems from a failure to connect learning, as Estrem and Reid contended. However, scholars have begun applying transfer theory to theorizing GTAs' pedagogical practices only recently.

In 2013, Dana Driscoll noted the "national pressure to demonstrate learning" (p. 53), which led to a transfer-based FYC curricula, which emphasizes learning and its future application to contexts like other courses or the workplace. With this increased demand to offer a transfer-based FYC, scholars have conducted empirical research to examine undergraduate writers' learning to theorize the transferability of such learning; however, this research has been limited to undergraduate writers. Driscoll, aiming to address this gap, conducted a study about eight PhD graduate instructors' attitudes towards transfer and their classroom practices. She contended that transfer-based curricula emphasized pedagogical practices that were developed in content and delivery.

Curricula content emphasized "discourse-communities, real-life genres, writing about writing, and types of knowledge" (p. 56), whereas instructors' delivery of curricula consisted of "building connections, encouraging certain kinds of thinking, and modeling mindfulness and reflection" (p. 56). In addition to measuring the extent to which instructors "perceived a need" (Wardle, 2007) to teach transfer, Driscoll also analyzed her participants' pedagogical practices to determine if their content and delivery was transfer-focused. She found that all eight PhD GTAs perceived a need for teaching transfer, but they all taught for transfer differently (Driscoll, 2013).

Driscoll (2013) found that GTAs' pedagogical approaches to teaching transfer felling into one of two categories: connected or non-connected pedagogies. GTAs, who taught in learning communities and questioned the generalizability of writing skills, demonstrated connected pedagogies. These particular participants explicitly built connections among writing assignments and across contexts, and their connected pedagogies emphasized Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward reaching transfer, which is applying currently learned knowledge and skills to future contexts. Driscoll theorized that these participants were more familiar with transfer theory from Rhetoric and Composition coursework, and their learning community classrooms provided a context that was conducive to building connections. Participants with non-connected pedagogies ranged in familiarity with disciplinary writing and in experience with Rhetoric and Composition coursework. These participants, whether they perceived transfer as an automatic application of general writing skills (Petraglia, 1995) or questioned that generalizability, demonstrated non-connected pedagogies when teaching FYC courses.

Even though these instructors perceived a need to teach the transfer of learning and writing, their pedagogical practices neither consisted of explicitly connecting learning to other contexts or encouraged metacognition and reflection. Driscoll concluded that GTAs needed WPE that addressed transfer theory and transfer-based pedagogical practices.

In addition to Driscoll's (2013) empirical research, Qualley (2017) also applied transfer theory scholarship to GTAs' pedagogical experiences. Specifically, she created a conceptual topography by mapping theories of transfer onto MA-level GTAs' experiences of becoming instructors. She first noted that these novice GTAs were "boundary crossing" (Tuomi-Gröhn, Engeström & Young, 2003, p. 4) into new, unfamiliar territory, which was the writing program for which they would teach. Qualley (2017) contended, like McKinney & Chiseri-Strater (2003), that GTAs' identities and practices were in flux, and as they crossed into the new, unfamiliar context of the writing program, they examined and negotiated their identities, values, and practices, which either aligned or conflicted with the writing program. To guide GTAs' development, Qualley (2017) noted how writing programs provided "curriculum and programmatic interventions and pedagogical affordances" to "support (or 'drive') the development of [GTAs'] practice and to acclimatize them to the discourse" (p. 73). Curriculum and programmatic interventions consisted of textbooks and instructional resources (e.g., workshops and sample assignments) that introduced GTAs to the community's values and expectations, whereas pedagogical affordances provide GTAs with best practices for teaching within the community, such as an annotated standardized syllabus.

Qualley (2017) contended these interventions and affordances should be "dismantled, adapted, or redesigned" (p. 74) to develop GTAs' pedagogical knowledge and practices. This advice draws from transfer theory, as this encouragement echoes notions of integrating (Nowacek, 2011), adaptively transferring (DePalma & Ringer, 2011), and remixing (Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014) prior knowledge with new learning. While not explicitly making these connections, Qualley noted the importance of bridging prior knowledge and experiences with a new context's interventions, affordances, and expectations. If GTAs only passively drew from prior experiences, then their pedagogical development would become static, leading to pedagogical challenges. Qualley (2017) contended that GTAs needed to not only negotiate these experiences but also possess appropriate "dispositions and motivations" (p. 75) towards developing and transforming their pedagogical knowledge and practices. Drawing from transfer scholarship, Qualley described these characteristics as "problem-solving" or "answer-getting" (Wardle, 2012); "boundary-guarding" or "boundary-crossing" (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2011); and "motivation, self-efficacy, theories of attribution, and self-regulatory strategies" (Driscoll & Wells, 2012). These characteristics shaped how GTAs internalized, abstracted, and transferred their learning into their teaching practices. Depending on their dispositions and how they connected prior and new knowledge, GTAs' pedagogical development fell onto a learning continuum (Qualley, 2017). It was up to these GTAs as to whether they "conceptually broke" (Qualley, 2017, p. 78) from prior experiences or a writing program's values and practices as well as how they

bridged, transferred, and thus developed their pedagogical identities and practices (Qualley, 2017, p. 80).

While the scope of transfer theory has been narrowly focused on undergraduate writers, Driscoll (2013) and Qualley (2017) broadened that scope to examine GTAs' pedagogical practices, learning processes, and critical transitions. While these scholars have begun examining GTAs through the lens of transfer theory, writing pedagogy education has not been connected to transfer theory. In the previous sections, I noted development of WPE as well as empirical research about GTAs' pedagogical development. Throughout those reviews, scholars presented problems that aligned with transfer theory scholarship, even prior to its emergence as a paradigm. To inform the recalibration of WPE that Bishop (1997) suggested, such examination of WPE within the lens of transfer theory is vital.

As WPE emerged, compositionists understood that there was a disconnection between GTA preparation and their pedagogical practices. In the early 1900s, compositionists noticed that recitation and mimicry approaches to GTAs' pedagogical development did not automatically translate into effective teaching practices (Pytlik, 2002). This problem of translation is arguably an issue of transfer of learning. GTAs were not taking their initial learning and reusing it or applying it to their teaching appropriately (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). Compositionists in the early 1900s to present day have identified problems with GTAs' inabilities to pop into place, pick up, or be filled with initial learning that automatically transfers it into their pedagogical practices (Joyce & Showers, 1981; Pytlik, 2002; Yancey, 2002; Farris, 2002; Stenberg, 2005). Though

transfer scholarship did not emerge until the mid- to late-1980s, Perkins and Salomon (1988) posited that such learning required high road transfer, i.e., the mindful abstraction of knowledge from one context to be applied to another. Even though writing pedagogy educators developed formal WPE courses, like Harvard's English 67 (1912) and Kitzhaber's (1955) "Rhetorical Background in Written English" prep course (Pytlik, 2002; Dobrin, 2005), they did not have this conceptual framework for understanding GTAs' learning processes. Nevertheless, they understood that GTAs' pedagogical practices needed development in both theory and practice.

Perkins and Salomon (2012) recently noted that current trends in transfer scholarship have emphasized "*under what conditions of learning"* (p. 248) affect the transfer of learning and "not *whether* significant transfer of learning can occur" (p. 248). However, both of these trends have influenced the development of formal WPE. Compositionists knew, possibly from their own experiences, that learning could be applied to pedagogical practices, but they did not know under what conditions GTAs needed to develop that pedagogical expertise. While it was becoming more common for GTAs to enroll into pedagogy methods courses, compositionists debated the structure of those courses. Should the course prioritize composition theory or practical opportunities? Scholars came to an agreement that GTAs benefited from a balanced, in theory and practice, WPE. It was not until 2012 that Chi and VanLehn contended that learners needed to understand the "deep structure" or the underlying concepts that cue successful application of initial learning. In WPE scholarship, however, Parker (1982) made a similar claim in arguing for GTAs to compatibly connect THEORY, or the deep structure

of composition theory, with their prior experiences and knowledge. Parker contended that these connections could "transform" GTAs' pedagogical practices, and in transfer scholarship, Perkins and Salomon (2012) emphasized this need for such connections, too, as they served the basis for transfer of learning. Learners need to be able to identify surface-level and deep connections to successfully abstract and apply learning.

While these connections were needed for successful transfer, they did not mean that learners would transfer their learning and transform their practices. Parker (1982) warned that connections needed to take root within the learner. If it did not, then the learner would make external or superficial changes to his or her knowledge and practices. Similarly, Perkins and Salomon (2012) echoed Chi and VanLehn's (2012) argument that learners' connections varied based on how they detected similarities in contexts and deep structures. Learners may be able detect surface features of dis/similar contexts; however, if their deep structure is not informed and developed theoretically, then their application would be superficial (Chi & Van Lehn, 2012) or "merely adjustments" (Parker, 1982, p. 417). For this reason, transfer scholars encourage explicit teaching of such connections to develop students' deep structures as well as their motivation for applying learning (Chi & VanLehn, 2012; Perkins and Salomon, 2012). Without such instruction, learners will not develop their expertise, and their knowledge and practices will be misguided.

In WPE scholarship, such misguided practices have been associated with North's (1987) lore, which is comprised of anecdotal advice and pragmatic practices. North noted how GTAs did not investigate lore's deep structure. Instead, they assembled best practices or pedagogical tools, such as lesson plans and assignment sheets, to "carry out

teaching practices" (Grossman, Smagorinsky & Valencia, 1999, p. 13). GTAs' pedagogical development became static as lore provided routinized, trusted pedagogical approaches. Perkins and Salomon (1988) contended that low road transfer was the "automatic triggering of well-practiced routines in circumstances where there is considerable perceptual similarity to the original learning context" (p. 25). This problem of GTAs relying on lore stems from GTAs' misguided assumption that classrooms and writing program curricula are perceptually similar. GTAs who rely on lore to inform their pedagogical practices possibly perceive similarities in the surface features of a classroom or curricula, but they do not detect the structural, rhetorical differences that underlie those contexts (Chi & VanLehn, 2012; Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Driscoll, 2013). Without this identification of deep structural differences, the reuse and application of lore functions as low road transfer. The pedagogical tools or advice become well-practiced routines that go unexamined and are automatically, albeit superficially, applied through the laboring of teaching. If WPE is not balanced with composition theory, then GTAs could continue transferring generalizable surface features that lore provides and reinforces into their pedagogical practices. Without explicit instruction and development of GTAs' deep structural knowledge, then, as David Smit (2004) candidly remarked on writing-related transfer, "we get what we teach for" (p.134).

To combat this problem of lore, writing pedagogy educators did extend formal WPE beyond pedagogy methods courses to provide opportunities, such as mentorships and microteaching, to connect composition theory with pedagogical practices. While these opportunities were not grounded in transfer theory, these educational experiences

encouraged the transfer of pedagogical practices. In writing-related transfer studies, scholars have contended that student writers need real situations and audiences. John Bransford and Daniel Schwartz (1999) called for "a sufficient degree of original learning" (p. 63). Such original learning could provide students "real world" writing scenarios, where they explored discourse communities, rhetorical situations, and genres (Beaufort, 1999). These scholars contended that students' engagement with original learning would facilitate forward reaching transfer, i.e., the application of learning to a future context (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). In WPE, mentorship and microteaching provide original learning and "real world" teaching experiences. For example, Joyce and Showers (1981) and Garmston (1983) contended that peer, collegial, technical, or challenge coaching would guide teacher-learners in developing their pedagogical practices. These opportunities provided GTAs a "middle space" (Restaino, 2012) to observe experienced teachers, experiment teaching lessons, and receive generative supervision (Cooper & Kehl, 1991; Nyquist & Wulff, 1996; Latterell, 1996; Weiser, 20002). Similar to coaching, microteaching (Krupa, 1982) or "situated performances" (Rose & Finders, 1998) also provided GTAs opportunities to practice, ideally, delivering theoretically informed lessons. However, for these connections to take root, GTAs were required to reflect on their experiences with either mentors or microteaching.

Reflection and metacognition continue to be important tenets of WPE and transfer theory. Perkins and Salomon (1988) contended that mindful abstraction was needed for high road transfer of learning. In writing-related transfer scholarship, scholars have echoed the need for metacognitive opportunities to facilitate students' transfer of writing

expertise and skills (Nelms & Dively, 2007; Wardle, 2007; Rounsaville, Goldberg & Bawarshi, 2008). Metacognition has not only been vital to shaping FYC curricula but has also informed approaches to WPE. To help GTAs transfer their learning into practice, writing pedagogy educators encouraged GTAs to reflect about their tacit knowledge and pedagogical practices. Through reflection, they could develop or adjust their theories-in-use by questioning their anxieties, assumptions, fears, or ideologies (Schön, 1983; Allen, 1991; Hesse, 1993; Reid, 2004; Rivera-Mueller, 2014; Wisniewski, 2014). Moreover, as Perkins and Salomon (2012) argued, "Patterns of instruction that encourage reflective mindful processing (high-road processing as we called it before) not just in the classroom but beyond can be expected to increase rates of detection" (p. 256). Specifically, GTAs can learn through reflection to detect how situations, concepts, and practices are dis/similar and then examine critically how those features connect to the underlying structure of the curriculum or practices (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). Through this process, connections can take root and thus transform pedagogical ideologies and practices (Parker, 1982). It is for this reason that the field desires "confident, *reflective* teachers" (Farris, 2002, p. 102, emphasis added).

These WPE opportunities have provided conditions for encouraging transfer of learning, and while Perkins and Salomon (2012) contended that the examination whether transfer of learning was occurring was not a trend, it has been an implicit trend in WPE scholarship. Since the early 1990s, scholars have been examining GTAs' experiences with WPE, particularly whether their preparation was transferring into their pedagogical practices. As writing programs became more prescriptive in providing pedagogical

affordances like standardized syllabi, (Qualley, 2017), GTAs began experiencing dissonances and even responded by resisting such affordances. Scholars like Bishop (1990, 1997), Welch (1993), and Neeley (2000) criticized writing programs that aimed to convert GTAs to a program's ideology and best practices. They noted how GTAs felt disconnected from the program's values, particularly because their prior experiences, identities, and values went unconsidered. As a result of these dissonant experiences, GTAs have become perceived as resistant, but as Rankin (1994) pointed out, they were not resistant to the theory or practices. Their resistance was symptomatic of their struggles in negotiating their dual identities of student and teacher and in developing an academic discourse to comprehend the procedures and expectations of the teaching context. These dissonances point to a problem with their ability to transfer learning. Even though they were reflecting and retheorizing their experiences (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014), GTAs had difficulty in detecting and connecting prior with current learning (Perkins & Salomon, 2012); moreover, they did not possess the academic discourse or knowledge to identify the deep structure of the writing program's curriculum, expectations, and values to problem-solve their experienced dissonances. While these GTAs could identify dis/similarities among their experiences or concepts, they struggled to compatibly connect these identifications to transform their pedagogical practices (Parker, 1982). For this reason, some GTAs were perceived to be resistant.

These moments of resistance, however, can be perceived as moments of negative transfer (Perkins and Salomon, 1988) or critical incidents (Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014). Perkins and Salomon (1988) define negative transfer as a moment or experience

"where knowledge or skill from one context interferes with another" (p. 22). In WPE scholarship, Welch (1993) shared her experience where WPE from University B conflicted with what she had learned from University A, and Rankin (1994) discussed how GTAs criticized textbooks or writing programs when their tacit theories interfered with the theories of professors or the writing program. These examples demonstrate that GTAs' dissonances were possibly a result of negative transfer. Farris (2002) was correct in noting that these moments of resistance or deviation could serve as an impetus for critical discussions and reflection about "failed" pedagogical practices. These moments can become what Yancey, Robertson and Taczak (2014) termed "critical incidents" (p. 112). Within the lens of transfer theory, a critical incident can be a setback for a GTA's pedagogical development, but this setback can serve as the impetus for a writing program to develop the GTA's academic, theoretical discourse and guide his/her re-examination of prior and current learning to form compatible connections. This re-examination is critical for informing and thus transforming a GTA's pedagogical practices. As Stenberg (2005) contended, WPE is a collaborative, recursive endeavor, and these GTAs need collaboration with pedagogical experts to help them detect and connect prior and current learning. They are, after all, still students who are developing their pedagogical expertise. It is for this reason that Estrem and Reid (2012) were correct in calling for resistance to be "reframed as a normal stage in TAs' learning processes" (p. 462). Because GTAs are constantly reflecting and retheorizing, as suggested by Rankin (1994), they are attempting to transfer their learning from WPE to the classroom, but that learning process is messy and complex (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012).

As Qualley (2017) contended, pedagogical development falls onto a learning continuum, and it requires bridges, connections, and even conceptual breaks for that learning to transfer and transform GTAs' pedagogies. To facilitate GTAs' transfer of learning, Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012) recommended extended WPE as well as explicit instruction to help GTAs connect prior knowledge to new learning or future contexts. Not only would GTAs benefit from this directive instruction, but extended WPE would also develop GTAs' academic discourse, which would help them comprehend and identify the deep structure of pedagogical theory and practices (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). Moreover, this extended WPE could also guide GTAs in developing a "detect—elect—connect framework" (Perkins & Salomon, 2012, p. 252). Perkins and Salomon (2012) define this framework as sequential bridges. Learners detect surface dis/similarities of concepts or practices, elect to explore those relationships, and connect initial learning to new learning or a new context. However, such research in WPE has not yet explored how GTAs detect similarities between prior knowledge and current learning or how they elect to explore those connections to transfer their learning. While WPE scholarship has explored GTAs' transfer of learning without the lens of transfer, there is a need to further explore GTAs' learning processes through the explicit lens of transfer theory. The purpose of this dissertation is to provide an empirical examination of how GTAs detect similarities between past and current WPE, teaching experiences, and curricula expectations. Moreover, it explores the extent to which GTAs connect these experiences through their reuse or adaptation of pedagogical tools or knowledges. Through such examination, writing pedagogy educators can recalibrate WPE (Bishop, 1997) to identify,

guide, and connect GTAs' tacit theories and prior experiences for successful transfer in new contexts.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine how experienced first-year PhD GTAs negotiated current and prior experiences with writing, teaching, and writing pedagogy education (WPE), particularly how they connected, reused, and/or adapted pedagogical knowledge for a new teaching context. Specifically, this study aimed to explore the following research questions:

1. What prior FYC writing and teaching experiences do first-year PhD GTAs have?
2. What kind of WPE did first-year PhD GTAs receive from their respective master's programs?
3. What did first-year PhD GTAs' recall from UTK's pre-service orientation within one semester after experiencing it?
4. How did first-year PhD GTAs construct their syllabi for teaching UTK's FYC? Did they adapt or reuse prior experiences? UTK's pre-service orientation and pedagogical affordances?
5. To what extent did first-year PhD GTAs' adapt, or appropriate, pedagogical knowledges valued by UTK's writing program?
6. To what extent did those pedagogical knowledges adaptively transfer into, or manifest in, their pedagogical practices?

In this chapter, I provide an overview of how I designed the research to answer these questions. After discussing the design, I then provide detailed information about who the participants were, how data was collected, and how data was analyzed. Lastly, I describe how I triangulated my data to ensure reliable, trustworthy results.

Research Design

The research questions for this qualitative study sought to explore GTAs' prior and current experiences with WPE, particularly how they connected, reused, and/or adapted prior learning for a new teaching context. The questions also aimed to describe

the learning contexts of GTAs. For example, what did their prior WPE entail? What did they recall from UTK's pre-service orientation? How might those experiences have affected their pedagogical practices? To answer these questions, I designed a qualitative study that consisted of a phenomenological interviewing process (Seidman, 2006), and I used classroom observations and instructional materials (e.g., syllabi and assignment sheets) to triangulate the interview data. Because I wanted to examine the immediate impact of pre-service orientation on teaching practices, I designed the study to occur throughout the Fall 2016 semester only.

Throughout Fall 2016, I conducted three 60-minute interviews with each participant. The first interview occurred within 1-2 weeks after UTK's pre-service orientation. The purpose of the interview was to learn more about PhD GTAs' prior experiences in writing, teaching, and WPE from their previous institutions. The second interview occurred in November, and its purpose was to learn about PhD GTAs' current teaching experiences at UTK, particularly how they negotiated prior experiences with UTK's standardized syllabus and inquired about their pedagogical knowledge. The third occurred after the fall semester concluded, which was in December. The interview protocols encouraged participants to reflect on their prior responses and overall experiences with teaching FYC at UTK. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

As for classroom observations, there were two classroom observations per participant, and these were designed to provide field notes about what was occurring in each participant's classroom. Specifically, I observed each participant's teaching of

rhetoric, genre, and writing process in his/her respective classroom. The first observation occurred in late October to early November during the Position Paper for an Academic Audience assignment. For this assignment, FYC students were asked to write an academic argument that stemmed from the debate analysis they had completed in the previous unit. The second classroom observation occurred late November to early December during the Position Paper for a Public Audience. FYC students were encouraged to transfer their academic arguments into an argument intended for a public audience. This unit varied per participant because they could choose the genre. Genres ranged from an Op-Ed to an open letter or a poster.

After the third interview, I emailed participants with a request to submit a .zip file of instructional materials, specifically syllabi, assignment sheets, worksheets, and lesson plans.

Because I wanted to examine how PhD GTAs navigated and understood a new FYC curriculum in light of their prior experiences, I found that this research design aimed "to develop new insights, new knowledge" about GTAs' preparation by providing a "holistic view" with "rich detail" (MacNealy, 1998, p. 197-199). From the interviews, participants' responses created insightful narratives about their pedagogical experiences. Seidman (2006) contended that narratives were valuable cognitive tools because they provided insight into how the storyteller made meaning of an experience. He posited, "It is this process of selecting constitutive details of experience, reflecting on them, giving them order, and thereby making sense of them that makes telling stories a meaning-making experience" (Seidman, 2006, p. 7). Indeed, the research design encouraged

participants to share with me their prior teaching and writing histories, their current teaching philosophies and methods, and their reflections about their overall experiences of teaching after UTK's pre-service orientation. While self-reports can affect the validity of such narratives, the classroom observations and collection of instructional materials contextualized those experiences, thus triangulating data to provide rich accounts of participants' teaching practices.

While participants' self-reports are not generalizable, such data have informed the field of Rhetoric and Composition (see Bomotti, 1994; Latterell, 1996; Weiser, 2002; Ebest, 2005; Beaufort, 2007; Fishman & Reiff, 2008, and Restaino, 2012). Researchers like Beaufort (2007), Wardle (2007), and Yancey, Robertson and Taczak (2014) have conducted case studies that provide insight into the extent of which FYC students did or did not transfer prior writing knowledge to new writing contexts. In WPE scholarship, scholars, e.g., Ebest (2005), Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012), and Restaino (2012), have examined GTAs' experiences and resistances toward teaching composition. In both avenues of empirical research, scholars have made insightful claims from examining small groups of participants (MacNealy, 1998). These scholars' findings moved, as Newkirk (1992) contended, "beyond the particular or 'idiographic,' and come to embody a set of cultural beliefs" (p. 136). Because research has aligned with the experiences of other scholars, teachers, and students within the field, these studies have come to embody how the field understands transfer theory and WPE. My dissertation continues this tradition through its qualitative research design and triangulated analysis.

Site

This study was conducted at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, a land-grant institution, during the Fall 2016 term. For the 2016-2017 academic year, the university enrolled 22,139 undergraduates and 5,913 graduate students. Of the 22,139 undergraduates, about 87% were in-state residents. As for demographics, the university reported that 24% of undergraduates identified as non-white and that the male/female gender ratio was 50/50. The freshmen population consisted of 6,098 students, and the average ACT Composite score for first-time freshmen (4, 581) was a 27.1 (*Office of Institutional Research and Assessment*).

While the overall site was at UTK, the study focused on the graduate students of the English Department. Within the department, there were three concentrations: Literature, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric, Writing and Linguistics (RWL). The department accepted graduate students in all three concentrations, and the department enrolled, on average, 10 PhD, 11 MA, and 5 MFA graduate students per academic year. Most graduate students received funding through either a teaching associateship (PhD) or assistantship (MA/MFA). Recipients of these fellowships were required to teach first-year composition courses. PhD GTAs teach FYC courses until they complete their qualifying exams, which occur in year three. In years four and five, they were allowed to teach at least one upper division English course in their field of study pending availability (Department of English, 2017b).

At UTK, there were two tracks of FYC: mainstream and multilingual. Because participants teach mainstream FYC, this study focuses on the mainstream track. This track featured a two-course sequence. In the first FYC course, students were required to

compose four paper assignments: Rhetorical Analysis, Debate Analysis, Position Paper for an Academic Audience, and Position Paper for a Public Audience. Because the assignments were grounded in rhetoric and transfer theories, they encouraged students to think analytically, critically, and rhetorically and then apply those skills to argumentative writing. In the second FYC course, students composed three paper assignments: Qualitative Research, Archival Research, and Secondary Research. These assignments centered on a theme of the instructor of record's choosing. The purpose of this course was to provide FYC students the opportunity to conduct primary research and to compose in research genres that were common across a variety of disciplines. This course design of the UTK's FYC program was recognized by the Conference on College Composition and Communication and received the national award, the Writing Program Certificate for Excellence, in the academic year 2011-2012 (Department of English, 2017a).

To prepare graduate student instructors, the Composition Office, which consisted of a Director, Associate Director, and Assistant Director of Composition, provided a three-day pre-service orientation prior to the start of term, which required attendance for all new PhD and MA/MFA graduate students. Beyond orientation, PhD and MA/MFA graduate students received vastly different writing pedagogy preparation. The MA/MFA assistantship required graduate students to work five hours in the university's writing center and attend tutor training courses, which met weekly throughout the Fall term and then biweekly in the Spring term. Along with the writing center training, a MA/MFA graduate student served as a mentee for an experienced graduate student or lecturer. Mentorship required MA/MFA GTAs to observe classes, grade assignments, and teach

lessons. In the spring term, these graduate students enrolled into English 505: Composition Pedagogy. The purpose of this course was to introduce GTAs to a variety of pedagogical methods and compositional theories about grading practices, rhetorical theory, and transfer theory. This course required students to compose and peer review English 101 assignments, conduct qualitative research, and present findings at a simulated conference. GTAs in English 505 also designed lesson plans for microteaching, and from this experience, GTAs would receive feedback about their pedagogical practices. For PhD students, they began teaching FYC a week after pre-service orientation and then attended a one-day winter workshop, which introduced them to the archival and qualitative research assignments in the second FYC course.

At UTK, MA/MFA graduate students received extensive WPE because they have never taught, presumably, FYC courses before entering the program. Through this training, they were prepared to teach FYC courses in their second year. PhD GTAs, on the other hand, were presumed to be experienced FYC instructors who have been prepared during their respective MA/MFA programs prior to enrolling into the program. UTK's pre-service orientation and winter workshop provided quick training to prepare experienced GTAs to teach in their first year. This limited exposure presents two problems. The first problem is that the pre-service orientation and winter workshop cannot adequately prepare a GTA who has never taken a pedagogy course. At UTK, a PhD student without formal WPE cannot enroll into English 505 until the spring term of his/her first year. By delaying formal pedagogy education, the question arises, to what extent are GTAs and their students being negatively affected? As for GTAs with formal

WPE, they are not required to take English 505. Presumably, these GTAs will apply their prior teaching experiences and formal WPE to their teaching of UTK's FYC curriculum, which may or may not align with their previous institution's curriculum.

Population

The research questions explored the relationship among new experienced graduate teaching associates, their prior WPE, and their knowledge acquisition of a new curriculum. To answer these questions, the study was designed for a specific population—first-year PhD graduate students. The study was limited to this population because the research questions examined incoming PhD GTAs' immediate experiences with a new curriculum. For the 2016-2017 academic year, nine first-year PhD students were enrolled, and of the nine, eight PhD students consented to participate in the study. I later discuss how these participants were recruited in the "Procedures" section. Of these eight participants, four participants were males, and the other four were females. The participants go by the following pseudonyms (in alphabetical order): Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer.

As previously discussed, UTK's PhD program was comprised of three concentrations: Literature, Creative Writing, and RWL. Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Mike, and Mandy were enrolled into the PhD program for Literature. Prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program, Clara received both her BA and MA in English from a public R3[9] university in the Midwest. Clara was a white, female, who was in her early thirties. In his

[9] Participants provided their institutions for all earned degrees when they filled out the demographic information sheet (see Appendix D). To protect my participants' identities, I refer to each institution's Carnegie Classification and its U.S. region.

late thirties, Cornelius, a white male, received both his bachelor's and master's in English from a public R1 university in the Southeast. Joseph, a white male in his late twenties, received both of his degrees in English from a public R3 university in the West. From the Southeast, Mandy, a white female in her mid-twenties, attended two different institutions. She received a bachelor's in English from a private, not-for-profit M1 university, and for her MA in English, she attended a public R2 university. Both universities were located in the Southeast. Mike, a white male who was in his mid-twenties, double-majored in English and History from a public liberal arts college. From the same institution, he received his MA in English.

Ava and Spencer were enrolled into the PhD program for Creative Writing. Ava, a white female in her mid-twenties, received both her BA and MA in English from a public R2 university in the West. As for Spencer, he was a white male in his early forties. He received a BS in Civil Engineering from a public M1 university in the Midwest. Ten years later, he returned for Certificate Major in English from a public R1 university in the Midwest. After receiving his certificate in English, he received an MFA in Creative Writing from a public R1 university in the Southeast.

As for Liz, she was the only participant enrolled into the PhD program for RWL. She was a white female in her early forties. She received her bachelor's in English from a private, not-for-profit R2 university in the Southwest. As for graduate degrees, she earned a Master in Education from a public R1 university in the Southwest, and nine years after that degree, she earned an MFA in Creative Writing from a private, not-for-profit M1 university.

Sources of Data

This case study had three sources of data: interviews, observations, and instructional materials. Because the research questions examined experienced, first-year PhD GTAs' prior and current teaching experiences, I used these three data sources to describe how participants experienced teaching and UTK's pre-service orientation. Data depicted what was occurring in participants' respective classrooms within the context of their reported experiences, thus providing integral information for meaning-making (Seidman, 2006, p. 16-17). These data sources provided insight into the participants' prior histories in writing and teaching, prior WPE experiences, recollection of UTK's pre-service orientation, and current pedagogical practices. Table 1 illustrates the timeline and purpose of each interview and classroom observation.

Interviews. To learn more about who GTAs were, what their prior teaching and writing experiences were, and how they perceived the new curriculum, I conducted three semi-structured interviews with each participant throughout the Fall 2016 term. Seidman (2006) suggested a phenomenological interviewing process, which could uncover participants' experiences, particularly how they made sense of a phenomenon. Seidman's process consisted of three separate interviews over the span of two weeks. Since my research questions focused on GTAs' learning and application of WPE, two weeks would have been too constraining by not providing GTAs the time to teach the assignments. Therefore, I maintained Seidman's three-part interview structure, but I extended the duration to occur over one semester.

Table 1

Interview and Classroom Observation Timetable

	Timeline	**Location**	**Purpose**
Interview 1	August 2016 No later than 2-3 weeks after Orientation.	Private Study Room in UTK's Library.	Focus on past experiences as student and teacher. Collect information that will contextualize their experiences in the UTK program. Ask questions about how they designed their UTK FYC course (syllabi/assignment sheets).
Observation 1	October/November 2016 Unit 3: Academic Argument	Classroom	Observe pedagogical practices, instructor's knowledge domains.
Interview 2	November 2016 1-2 weeks after observation.	Private Study Room in UTK's Library.	Focus on the current experiences with teaching UTK's curricula. Collect information about teaching and mentoring relationships with students, peers, and/or faculty. Ask questions about professionalization workshops, assignments, handouts, etc.

Table 1. Continued.

	Timeline	**Location**	**Purpose**
Observation 2	November/December 2016 Unit 4: Public Argument	Classroom	Observe pedagogical practices, instructor's knowledge domains.
Interview 3	December 2016 During final exams or after the semester concludes.	Private Study Room in UTK's Library.	Focus on reflecting about the semester and how the participant has experienced teaching EN 101 as well as any mentoring received from peers or faculty. Ask questions that help make meaning of their overall first semester at UTK.

I selected Seidman's (2006) phenomenological interviewing approach for two reasons: 1. The structure provided a procedure for uncovering PhD GTAs' prior and current teaching experiences; and 2. The three interviews constructed a beginning, middle, and end of participants' pedagogical experiences and transitions. This structure also encouraged reflection to "look at how the factors in [participants'] lives interacted to bring them to their present situation" (Seidman, 2006, p.8). The first interview asked participants to recall past writing and teaching experiences. Through recollection, participants provided personal histories and thus insight into their teaching identities, ideologies, and practices. The second interview's purpose asked participants about

experiences with UTK's pre-service orientation, mentorship opportunities, and pedagogical practices. Participants' responses provided details about their experiences in a new teaching curriculum. These details would provide insight into any assignments, ideologies, and/or practices that either connected or conflicted with participants' prior teaching and writing experiences. Lastly, the third interview was designed for reflection. It occurred at the end of the semester, and the questions encouraged participants to reflect upon and make meaning of their teaching and writing experiences pre- and post-enrolling into UTK's PhD program. Participants encountered their responses from previous interviews or descriptions from their classroom observations. Upon hearing these accounts, participants then described and explained the extent to which their initial responses or actions remained unchanged, altered, or transformed. This phenomenological approach to interviewing provided insight into participants' personal histories and current experiences; moreover, it encouraged participants to make meaning of those experiences to explain their current teaching identities, ideologies, and practices. This approach increased the validity of participants' responses, as the structure "places participants' comments in context" (Seidman, 2006, p. 24).

Observations. To contextualize the interview responses, I observed each participant twice. The first observation took place during the Position Paper for an Academic Audience assignment, and the second observation occurred during the Position Paper for a Public Audience assignment. I selected these particular assignments because they addressed Anne Beaufort's (2007) five knowledge domains. That is, these particular units, typically, are argumentative assignments about a shared topic, or subject matter

knowledge. For example, a student would make an argument about graffiti as art for an academic audience but would then transform that argument into an Op-Ed for a public audience. While the subject matter is shared, the rhetorical situations, genres, and discourse communities shift per audience, and depending on the genre, the writing process may shift, too. By observing these units, I was able to juxtapose GTAs' knowledges and teaching practices in these five knowledge domains, which informed the overall structure of both assignments. These observations provided insight into the extent to which UTK's pre-service orientation manifested into their classroom practices.

For these classroom observations, I was a passive observer, meaning I neither participated in classroom activities nor interacted with participants or their students (Spradley, 1980). I took descriptive field notes about what was occurring in the classroom. I noted the actions and/or discussions that occurred in the participants' respective classrooms. In addition to field notes, I also kept a detailed research journal to record my personal experiences, reactions, and confusions. I also ruminated on those experiences and reactions to identify and understand my motives, biases, and emotions, thus safeguarding my *ethos* (Spradley, 1980). While the research journal safeguards validity and trustworthiness in data analysis, the entries also provided insightful records of reactions to actions that may have been forgotten at the time of data analysis. I used the rich details from both the research journal and observation field notes to contextualize and inform interview data analysis.

Collection of Instructional Materials. The last data source consists of participants' instructional materials, such as syllabi, assignment sheets, course calendars,

handouts, and lesson plans. Because I only observed two classroom sessions, I needed additional information to contextualize further what occurs in the classroom. Course calendars provided lesson details, readings, and homework. In addition to the course calendar, the syllabi and assignment sheets depicted the scope and expectation of the course. Additional instructional materials varied per participant's willingness to share. Some participants submitted individual lesson plans, worksheets, and/or PowerPoints. After obtaining the course calendars, syllabi, and assignment sheets from all participants, I compared these materials to the standardized instructional materials provided by the Office of Composition. Noting similarities and deviations among the documents, I pinpointed moments of reuse or adaptation of prior instructional materials or noted a conversion to UTK's writing program's materials and practices. This comparison provided insight into the degree to which the UTK's FYC program's objectives were being implemented.

Procedures

On July 21, 2016, this study's communications, methods, and procedures were approved by UTK's Institutional Review Board. After receiving approval, I discussed with my faculty advisor, who was also the Director of Composition, about ethical approaches to soliciting research participants. At the time of this study, I was the Assistant Director of Composition, which meant that I was involved in the development and delivery of the pre-service orientation. I will further discuss how I negotiated this role in a later section of this chapter, but it is significant to note how this meeting served to bracket my position as both researcher and administrator. My advisor encouraged me

to send an email to the nine incoming PhD GTAs prior to orientation. This email outlined who I was, the purpose of the research, the call for participants, what participation entailed, and how participants would be compensated (see Appendix A). I received two replies, one consenting and one denying participation. In addition to this email, I participated in the Graduate Students of English (GSE) informal discussion about PhD essentials and subsequently attended a social event at a local establishment. I wanted potential participants to meet me as a graduate student prior to encountering me as Assistant Director of Composition. I reintroduced myself to the incoming PhD students, explained my research, and answered questions. The remaining potential participants expressed interest in participating in the study. After orientation training, I followed up with the eight participants via email. I thanked them for agreeing to participate, scheduled the first interview, and sent them a copy of the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix B). All interviews were scheduled to take place in private study rooms within UTK's library; the room assignment varied based on availability.

The first interview occurred in mid-August, which was approximately 1-2 weeks after UTK's pre-service orientation. Prior to beginning each interview, I reviewed the informed consent form, which informed participants about the research objectives, foreseeable risks and benefits, maintenance of confidentiality, audio-recording and transcription of interviews, and prorated compensation. Participants were informed that the study was voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw at any time. If they chose to withdraw from the study prior to compensation, then they were informed that all data collected would be either returned or destroyed. However, if participants received partial

compensation, then the data from the compensated period would be retained and used. After reviewing the informed consent form, I encouraged each participant to read through it carefully and to ask any questions that s/he may have regarding the study. All eight participants agreed to participate in the study and signed the Informed Consent Form.

After consenting to participate, each participant completed a brief demographic information sheet (see Appendix C). The demographic information sheet asked each participant to select a pseudonym to ensure his or her confidentiality. There were four participants who asked me to designate a pseudonym. The sheet also asked each participant to report his or her age, race, former institutional affiliation, academic history, teaching history, and writing pedagogy education history. Each participant's demographic information sheet was labeled by pseudonym and secured in a locked storage facility.

After each participant completed demographic information sheet, I set up individual interviews with each participant. The first interview began and lasted approximately 60 minutes. The purpose of this interview was to learn about GTAs' previous writing and teaching experiences as well as their understanding of UTK's FYC curriculum. The interview protocol included questions, such as "Did you take a first-year composition (FYC) course?"; "Can you think of a particular interaction with a teacher that changed your writing/changed you as a writer?"; and "I'm interested in your previous teaching experiences. Tell me briefly about the kinds of courses you have taught." Other questions asked participants to recall writing and teaching experiences that were positive and difficult in nature. I asked participants about pedagogy courses and

mentors who may have influenced their teaching and/or writing as well as their overall impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation. In addition to these questions, I asked participants about their instructional materials, particularly if they were using the standardized documents provided by the department or if they had amended those documents (see Appendix D for Interview 1 Protocol).

The first classroom observations mostly occurred in mid-October; Mike was the one exception, and I observed his course on November 3, 2016. This observation was designed to occur during the first week of the Unit 3 assignment (Position Paper for an Academic Audience), which was when (according to the submitted syllabi) GTAs planned to review the rhetorical situation and discourse community of the assignment. In an email exchange with Mike, the proposed dates were not "really great" for him as the class session would not be representative of his teaching but more of a "catch all day." We agreed to meet at a later date.

Prior to the classroom observation, each participant emailed a lesson plan or PowerPoint of the class session. I used these instructional materials as well as my laptop[10] to record field notes, which were labeled by respective pseudonym. Participants could inform their students about my presence and purpose. I reminded participants that the observation was not intended for evaluation and that the purpose of the observation was to construct a broader, richer understanding of how they teach. For classroom observations, I sat in the back of the classroom because I did not want to interfere with the natural classroom environment by distracting students. I observed the overall

[10] All materials were stored on my password protected laptop.

scaffolding and timing of the class session as well as their approaches to teaching the subject matter, responses to students' questions, uses of interactive and/or individual activities, and assignments of in-class writing. In the field notes, I have a detailed timeline of events, marking when class begins and ends as well as the timing of assigned activities or class discussions. For example, in Cornelius's first classroom observation, I noted: "1:25 PM Begins class with roll call question: What is your favorite season? He begins with his answer: Fall because of the cool weather and childhood memories of jumping into the giant leaf piles." Each note contains a summative description of class activity or discussion. Some notes provide more detail, such as dialogue or lecture, as that information provided insight into the participant's curriculum or subject matter knowledge and pedagogical practices (see Appendix E for Sample Field Notes of Classroom Observations). After taking field notes, I wrote journal entries about each observation experience, noting moments where I felt confused or ideas that appeared to be recurring.

The second interviews occurred within 1-2 weeks after the first classroom observations. The scheduled interview dates were mostly conducted in mid-to-late October, with Mike as the exception.[11] The purpose of the 60-minute interview was to learn about the GTAs' current teaching experiences, mentoring and peer relationships, and professional workshop(s) experiences. The interview protocol included questions, such as "Please describe your understanding of UTK's first-year composition values."; "What rhetorical knowledge do you feel comfortable/uncomfortable teaching?"; and

[11] Mike's interview was conducted on November 11, 2016.

"What about genres do you feel comfortable/uncomfortable teaching?" Other questions asked participants to convey their understanding of transfer theory and to identify any workshop presentations or materials that have been incorporated into their teaching thus far into the semester. In addition to these questions, I asked GTAs about any peers or mentors who they have sought out for advice or assistance. These questions explored the degree to which participants understood and implemented the curriculum as well as sought guidance from either colleagues or faculty (see Appendix D for Interview 2 Protocol).

The second classroom observations occurred mid-to-late November, with Mike as the exception.[12] Similar to the first classroom observation, the second observation was designed to occur during the first week of the Unit 4 assignment (Position Paper for a Public Audience), which was when (according to the submitted syllabi) GTAs planned to review the rhetorical situation and discourse community of the assignment. GTAs submitted instructional materials prior to the observation, and I used these materials along with my laptop to take field notes. Field notes detailed the timeline of the class's scaffolding of discussions, activities, and in-class writing. Field notes contained summative descriptions of what occurred in the classroom as well as detailed observations to note specific directions, discussions, or answers (see Appendix E for Sample Field Notes of Classroom Observations). After taking field notes, I wrote entries into my research journal that reflected upon my experiences in each participant's classroom.

[12] Mike's second classroom occurred on December 1, 2016.

The third 60-minute interview occurred in mid-December, which gave participants time to submit their final grades and coursework. The purpose of the third interview was for participants to reflect on their prior responses as well as their overall teaching experiences at UTK. The interview protocol included questions, such as "Last time you said x. Has your view of UTK's FYC values changed since then?"; "Last time we talked about how you scaffolded the units and daily assignments. How do you think the scaffolding of the units and daily assignments went?"; and "Last time you said x was your primary goal for teaching UTK's ENGL 101. How did that go?" Other questions asked participants to reflect on teaching particular knowledge domains, such as genre and rhetoric (Beaufort, 2007). I also asked participants about any peers or mentors who may have helped them throughout the semester. In addition to these questions, I asked participants to recall any workshops or materials from pre-service orientation. These questions were designed to mirror the second interview, which would allow for end-of-term reflection. Some of the follow-up questions presented prior interview responses, prompting participants to reflect and respond to whether the experience or perception was still fitting or not (see Appendix D for Interview 3 Protocol).

After the third interview, I emailed each participant to request a .zip file of his or her instructional materials, specifically the syllabus, assignment sheets, worksheets, handouts, and lesson plans. Each participant emailed me a .zip file containing, at the very least, instructional documents, such as a syllabus, course calendar, and assignment sheets.

Data Management and Analysis

After collecting data, I transcribed three audio-recorded interviews from Interview 1 with Ava, Clara, and Cornelius. The rest of the recordings were transcribed by a transcription service, Rev. All identifying markers were omitted from the audio files to protect participants' confidentiality. I provided Rev the respective pseudonyms associated with each file, and they used the pseudonym to mark the participant and "interviewer" to mark the speaker. When I received the transcripts, I listened to each audio file and compared it to the Rev-produced transcription to check for accuracy and consistency. Then, I uploaded the transcriptions and field notes into NVivo for data analysis. All transcriptions, field notes, and instructional materials were labeled and filed by the respective pseudonym and stored in either a locked storage facility or my personal, password-protected laptop.

Throughout the data collection process, I was consistently reading and listening to the data sources, and as I interacted with the data, I developed participant profiles, drew comparisons among the participants, and noted recurring patterns or themes. As a qualitative researcher and data analyst, I was, as Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (2008) described, a *bricoleur*[13], a researcher who pieces together data sources and coding schemes to answer this study's research questions. While I had existing coding schemes in mind, the initial analysis process was inductive; i.e., I was "open coding" about what was happening in the data (Maxwell, 2013, p. 345). I summarized

[13] According to Denzin and Lincoln (2008), "The *bricoleur* is adept at performing a large number of diverse tasks, ranging from interviewing to observing, to interpreting personal and historical documents, to intensive self-reflection and introspection" (p. 4).

prior writing and teaching experiences, looking for negative and positive responses and noting how the participant respond to those situations. I would then ask questions, e.g., "Why did the participant feel embarrassed?" or "Why did the participant keep the standard syllabi and assignment sheets?" The answers to these questions provided not only snapshots of who the participants were, such as their interests and dispositions (Driscoll & Wells, 2012), but also how they learned and processed information and experiences. This process of open coding and questioning led to a more comprehensive understanding of "the problem from the participant's perspective" (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 70).

To make sense of what was occurring in the data, I constructed participant profiles, as Seidman (2006) suggested, for each of my participants' prior histories. These profiles were "an effective way of sharing interview data and opening up one's interview material to analysis and interpretation" (Seidman, 2006, p.119). By writing these brief profiles (see Chapter Four), I developed a stronger understanding of who these participants were and what comprised their prior experiences. After comparing participants' profiles, I began noticing recurring experiences like similar WPE experiences and then developed emergent coding schemes. Examples of such codes are "Pre-Service Orientation," "Pedagogy Course(s)," "Practicum," "Tutor Training," "Mentorship," and "Conferences and Workshops" for participants' identification of the kinds of WPE opportunities they participated in at their prior institutions. Going beyond the brief participant profiles of their prior experiences, I continued this process of open-coding with the interview data about current and reflective pedagogical experiences. I

systematically noted recurring themes and experiences in my research journal. These themes and experiences emerged from each participant's response to each interview question. Based on similarities and differences of these responses, I developed emergent codes to describe participants' experiences. Examples of such codes are "Transfer Theory," "Writing across Modes and Courses," "Rhetoric," and "Did Not Respond/Did Not Know" for participants' identification of curriculum objectives for their current teaching context. By employing open-coding, I developed schemes that captured participants' prior and current pedagogical experiences as well as their familiarity with three of five pedagogical knowledge domains (rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, and pedagogical practices knowledge).

To identify participants' familiarity with these three pedagogical knowledge domains, I asked participants about their experienced comfort and discomfort in teaching particular subject matters or practices in relation to the pedagogical knowledge domains I constructed. For example, I asked participants, "What about the writing process do you feel comfortable teaching?" and "What about the writing process do you feel uncomfortable teaching?" These questions were designed to assess participants' familiarity with the subject matter and potentially provide insight into their teaching within that pedagogical knowledge domain. A comfort continuum emerged from participants' responses to these questions. This continuum ranged from no comfort to comfortable to great comfort, and the same occurred for reported discomfort. The assignment of these codes depended on participants' body language and excitement or apprehension when they answered these types of questions. For example, when Clara was

asked about her comfort in teaching writing as a process, she responded, “Oh, that's like me forte. So that's easy-peasy.” Based on this response, she experienced great comfort when teaching writing as a process. In comparison, Cornelius responded, “I feel comfortable with most of it, at least my understanding of it.” This response was coded as comfortable in teaching writing as a process, and he went on to provide an explanation about the parts of teaching writing as a process that he was comfortable teaching, such as scaffolding smaller assignments to get to the writing of the larger assignment, as well as what he found discomforting, such as reflection, in teaching writing as a process. Participants typically explained their degree of dis/comfort, and the coding of these responses based on this dis/comfort continuum provided insight into their familiarity or unfamiliarity with teaching subject matter like rhetoric, genre, and process writing.

In addition to emergent coding schemes, I adapted two sets of codes to measure resistance and knowledge acquisition. The first coding scheme was from Pamela Grossman, Peter Smagorinsky and Sheila Valencia (1999). They developed “five degrees of appropriation” to measure how English teachers reused or adapted “pedagogical tools available for use in particular social environments” (Grossman, Smagorinsky & Valencia, 1999, p.15). For my study, I amended Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia’s (1999) five-degree continuum to describe the extent to which GTAs reused or adapted pedagogical tools in a new teaching context (see Table 2). With this scheme, researchers can identify appropriation or adaption processes on a learning spectrum. For my study, I was able to identify the extent to which GTAs were resisting or adapting WPE and prior experiences into their pedagogical practices. This continuum provided a scheme that

allowed me to describe any manifestation of formal WPE in teaching practices, and such findings could inform compositionists about the effectiveness of WPE.

As for the *kinds* of knowledge that may be adapted or reused, I employed a variation of Beaufort's (2007) five knowledge domains (rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, writing process knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and discourse community knowledge) as the second coding scheme. In her conceptual model, undergraduate writers needed to be able to identify a discourse community's values and practices, and with this knowledge, writers would then need to be familiar with the subject matter in which the community participated. In addition to developing subject matter knowledge, writers need to become familiar with genres that are associated with the community. Writers also need to be aware of rhetorical situations (e.g., audiences and exigence) and writing processes (i.e., appropriate approaches to writing assignments) found within the community (Beaufort, 2007). Beaufort contended that these knowledge domains overlapped and interacted, and while this conceptual model applied to undergraduate writers, it did not examine the extent to which writing instructors inhabited these domains. For such an examination, I amended her names and definitions of the domains to fit teaching practices. Table 3 demonstrates the conceptual model I created for examining GTAs' pedagogical knowledge, and the table includes heuristics for each pedagogical knowledge domain.

Table 2

"Five Degrees of Appropriation": Degrees to which GTAs Adapt Pedagogical Tools and Formal WPE

Degree of Appropriation	**Description**
Lack of Appropriation	Learners may or may not appropriate WPE due to the complexity or foreignness of a concept. Or there's a personal or cultural conflict between prior learned and new concepts. Lastly, the learner may altogether dismiss a concept (p. 16).
Appropriating a Label	Learners know "the name of a tool but knows none of its features" (p. 17).
Appropriating Surface Features	Learners know "some or most of the features of a tool, yet does not understand how those features contribute to the conceptual whole" (p.17).
Appropriating Conceptual Underpinnings	Learners "gras[p] the theoretical basis that informs and motivates the use of a tool. Teachers who grasp the conceptual underpinnings of a tool are likely able to make use of it in new contexts and for solving new problems" (p.17).
Achieving Mastery	Learners have appropriated and applied conceptual underpinnings and pedagogical tools to classroom procedures. For this classification, I looked for the flexibility and multivariate appropriation of theory and praxis (p.18).

Note. Out of all the definitions, "Achieving Mastery" deviates the most from the original authors' definition. In Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's (1999) study, English teachers had not begun teaching. In my study, participants because their participants had not begun teaching whereas my participants were teaching.

Table 3

Pedagogical Knowledge Conceptual Model

Pedagogical Knowledge Domain	**Heuristics**
Curriculum Knowledge	How does the instructor interpret the curriculum's objectives? How does the instructor implement those objectives?
Rhetorical Knowledge	Is rhetorical knowledge a guiding pedagogical practice for new writing situations? To what extent does the instructor effectively teach rhetorical knowledge?
Genre Knowledge	To what extent does the instructor understand the genres of the assigned writing tasks? To what extent does the instructor effectively teach genre?
Pedagogical Practices	How does the instructor scaffold units and lessons? How does the instructor teach writing, e.g., is there a process to get students to complete writing assignments?
Discourse Community Knowledge	To what extent does the instructor value transfer and rhetoric, which informs UTK's FYC program? To what extent does the instructor share curriculum objectives with the writing program?

These codes describe types of pedagogical knowledge acquisition, and the questions were used to determine if the data fit the code. With this scheme, I was able to determine the extent to which GTAs were familiar with the five domains as well as the extent to which they acquired it in past and/or current learning experiences. Moreover, this scheme represented the degree to which GTAs implemented or adaptively transferred (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013) such knowledges into their pedagogical practices. In "Connected Pedagogy and Transfer," Driscoll (2013) contended that Beaufort's (2007) five knowledge domains were "a common rubric for examining transfer-focused content" (p.61), and she used the domains to analyze GTA's assignment sheets (p. 66). Because Driscoll (2013) did not present any amended definitions in her article, I presumed that she maintained Beaufort's (2007) definitions in her data analysis. While Beaufort's (2007) knowledge domains have been used in subsequent studies like Driscoll's (2013) to identify moments of transfer, the definitions did not fit the examination of teaching practices. For this reason, I amended the definitions to reflect how such pedagogical knowledges occur in teaching practices. Additionally, this alteration also limited the data analysis to specialized knowledge about WPE.

To move from analysis to interpretation, I was faced with making sense of both participant profiles and the comparative analysis found within the emergent codes. I was unsure as to what constituted the central theme of the findings, even though I *knew* something was happening. For this reason, I reported the major findings (participant profiles and emergent codes) from the interview data in Chapters Four, Five, and Six, and I included participants' voices to capture their experiences (Chiseri-Strater, 1996). I

triangulated this data with field notes from classroom observations and documentation from collected instructional materials. To make sense of what was occurring in the data, I asked myself, "What prior experiences were recurring?"; "How did they define transfer and rhetoric?"; "What knowledge domains did they understand and implement into their classrooms?"; "What knowledge domains did they struggle with?"; "To what degree did they appropriate the FYC program's instructional materials?"; and "How are these experiences connected, either explicitly or implicitly?" By answering these questions, I noted central themes or experiences that answered the research questions. I then interpreted these themes in relation to other scholarly findings and literature, which helped me refine interpretations of what these participants were experiencing (Corbin and Strauss, 2008).

I shared these interpretations with participants, as I wanted to verify my analysis. Newkirk (1996) suggested sharing preliminary findings during the coding process because it provides participants "an opportunity to offer counterinterpretations [*sic*] or provide mitigating information" (p. 13). Indeed, participants' responses were integral to shaping and refining of themes, and while I encountered some ethical dilemmas, which will be discussed in the following section, the compilation of data provides reliable accounts of participants' experiences.

Trustworthiness and Dependability

This study's research questions aimed to develop a richer understanding of GTAs' learning and teaching experiences. Such experiences—while we want them to be valid and reliable—are embedded in subjective narratives that can only be measured by

constructed credibility and dependability. For this reason, some scholars have adopted. Lincoln and Guba's (1985) constructivist criteria—*credibility, transferability, dependability,* and *confirmability*—to measure a study's trustworthiness. In what follows, I describe how the procedures undertaken to construct this study's credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Credibility

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) reminded researchers that qualitative data is never a static, objective representation of "reality." Data cannot be measured for validity due to its relative nature (Maxwell, 2013), but it can be perceived as credible. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) provided four strategies—triangulation, member checks, adequate engagement in data collection, and reflexivity—to measure a study's credibility. If a researcher employed these four strategies, then s/he can develop a closer understanding of the participants' complex realities, thus proffering credible data. Since my study aimed to understand participants' experiences, I employed these strategies to ensure credible data.

Triangulation. Earlier in this chapter, I described my *bricoleur* approach to designing this qualitative study. This approach meant that I employed multiple methodologies, collected from multiple data sources, drew upon multiple voices, and applied multiple theories. This approach not only provided rich data but also optimized validity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This study was designed to consist of three interviews, two classroom observations, and a collection of instructional materials. Seidman's (2006) phenomenological interviewing structure elevated the credibility of

participants' self-reports by contextualizing those responses by moving from past to present and then to reflection. While this structure was designed to ameliorate this "validity threat," i.e., participants' potentially biased self-reports, the inclusion of other methodologies such as observations and instructional materials further contextualized, or verified, the participants' responses (Maxwell, 2013). These multiple data collections encouraged a rich, or "thick," description of experiences, which will be further discussed in the "Transferability" subsection, and such descriptions provided a holistic, complex narrative that brought me closer toward understanding what was occurring in the phenomenon.

This complex narrative drew upon more than multiple methodologies and data collections, it also drew upon multiple voices, or polyvocality. I was mindful of my role in this study, and I did not want to diminish the credibility by inhabiting an omniscient stance. For this reason, I included participants' voices alongside my data analysis and theoretical discussion. It was my hope that this inclusion would not only fairly represent my participants but also further triangulate the data by providing a "textual validity" to my findings (Chiseri-Strater, 1996, p. 129).

In addition to the polyvocal approach, I also drew upon multiple coding schemes. In data analysis, I not only used open-coding practices but also coding schemes adapted from Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia (1999) and Beaufort (2007)—the latter of which has been used in other field-specific studies (e.g., Driscoll, 2013). The open-coding process deterred a top-down approach to data analysis, i.e., not forcing codes to determine the findings and thus allowing the data to speak for itself. The two adapted

coding schemes further triangulated data analysis by categorizing transferrable teaching practices and assessing the degree to which GTAs implemented those practices. While formal WPE has evolved from mimicry and recitation, the assumption about GTAs' teaching practices remains the same: If a GTA is taught pedagogical methods and composition theory, then s/he can teach writing—any kind of writing at any kind of institution in any kind of writing program curriculum. By combining Grossman, Smagorinsky and Valencia's (1999) five-degrees of appropriation and the amended knowledge domains, I examined the extent of GTAs' writing pedagogy knowledge and the extent to which that education was adapted, reused, or resisted in teaching practices. The culmination of these coding schemes assured that my data analysis was consistent—in method and in definition—and verifiable.

Member Checks. Throughout data management and collection, I conducted member checks, which is a "second common strategy for ensuring internal validity or credibility" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 246). Member checking is a process in which a researcher solicits feedback from his/her participants to verify the validity of findings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Because of the polyvocal approach to writing up the data analysis, I wanted to ensure that participants were accurately represented and that I had not misinterpreted any actions or responses (Maxwell, 2013). Participants were first informed about the sharing of results via the Informed Consent Form, which stated: "Each participant will be allowed to review and discuss the findings, thus ensuring that the information is an accurate depiction of what is being done in the classroom" (see

Appendix B). I upheld this promise by sharing participant profiles and major findings with my participants.

Prior to sharing the findings, I understood the risk of potentially delivering participants "bad news," (Newkirk, 1996), as they could interpret the write up as unkind, unrepresentative, or humiliating (Williams, 1996). I attempted to mitigate the bad news effects by incorporating positive portrayals or explanations that provided a constructive interpretation (Newkirk, 1996; Lamos, 2012). Such balanced reports possibly limited the chances of alienating or offending participants and thus encouraged "respondent validation." On the other hand, respondent validation required a generative rapport, a relationship that Ann M. Blakeslee, Caroline M. Cole and Theresa Conefrey (1996) described as "open-minded, engaged, and willing to learn from each other" (p. 146). Therefore, these member checks provided me opportunities for reflection and insight, opportunities where I needed to be willing to learn and adjust my understandings. In addition to insight, I also learned how to negotiate conflictual interpretations. At times, I had to negotiate the inclusion and representation of participants' voices, particularly in cases where the data corresponded with other studies' findings or were central to the overall argument. Throughout this process, I began learning with my participants. These member checks provided me the opportunity to reflect upon not only my disposition but also my ethical duty to accurately represent my participants and their experiences.

Adequate Engagement. Not only did I take great lengths to ensure adequate care of my participants' representations in my study, but I also took an appropriate amount of time to engage with the research from data collection and analysis to the write up of this

dissertation. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described "adequate engagement" as the amount of time invested in the research and analysis process. While this case study was conducted over the course of one semester, the duration was appropriate for the purpose, which was to gain an understanding of GTAs' immediate experiences with a new curriculum and WPE. In fact, I collected more than enough data to examine that particular experience. As previously discussed, data sources came from three 60-minute interviews, two classroom observations, and collected instructional materials (syllabi, assignment sheets, and course calendars). I have also devoted a year-and-a-half to data analysis, which was a recursive process. I have analyzed data for recurring themes, patterns, and key terms (whether those emerged or applied to the adapted codes), ruled out "spurious associations" (Maxwell, 2013), and tested the plausibility of those findings. I have also optimized credibility by analyzing "discrepant" or "negative" evidence (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). And because data analysis has been a recursive process, I have ensured that I have taken the adequate amount of time to reflect about my positionality and research process.

Reflexivity. Another credibility concern is uncovering and understanding any underlying biases that I may have toward the subject matter, participants, or data. Merriam (2002) encouraged researchers to embrace biases by becoming cognizant of when and why they occur. Such experiences should be reflected upon as they affect data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2002). For my study, reflexivity played a significant role throughout my research process. I identified and monitored my assumptions, biases, and feelings by participating in bracketing interviews and keeping a research journal.

A bracketing interview is a common practice in phenomenological research. This process encourages researchers to examine their experiences throughout the study, particularly their assumptions, biases, and conclusions (Merriam, 2002). Throughout my study, I met with my dissertation chair, and I discussed particular feelings (e.g., frustration) and insights (e.g., the participants' not wanting to be discovered as an imposter) with my chair. These conversations helped me center my thinking and purge my initial reactions; these conversations also helped me become aware of any underlying assumptions, attitudes, or biases that I held prior to conducting subsequent interviews or observations or interpreting rich data. Through this process, I minimized how my experiences and assumptions influenced any interactions with participants as well as my analysis of the data.

In addition to the bracketing interviews, I kept a research journal to hold myself accountable, as MacNealy (1998) suggested. In the journal, I recorded experiences with participants as well as outlined any assumptions I had about those interactions. All journal entries were dated, and I would reread these entries prior to conducting interviews, observations, or data analysis. Essentially, this research journal served as another form of bracketing my assumptions, feelings, and values, and it was also a concrete record of my reflexivity, thus corroborating that my actions did not affect the credibility of this study.

Dependability and Confirmability

As demonstrated above, I have taken several steps to establish the credibility of my qualitative study, and as with credibility, I have taken additional steps to ensure the

dependability of my data. "Dependability," according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), is synonymous with "consistency." How consistent were my methods and findings? As for my methods, I was rigorous in the planning and executing of when and where to conduct interviews and observations. Interviews, with the one exception (see "Procedures" section), followed the predetermined timeline that I had proposed, and each interview was held in a quiet, private library study room. This consistency ensured that data was collected around the same time frame, and it provided a familiar space in which participants could participate comfortably in the study. As for the consistency of findings, the triangulation of data "reduces the risk of chance associations and of systematic biases due to a specific method, and allows a better assessment of the generality of the explanations that one develops" (Maxwell, 2013, p. 313). Because the methods operated as a checks-and-balances system, I was able to assess the data to identify consistent, recurring codes. Moreover, I checked my analysis and write up with my participants to verify the dependability of the findings.

To further ensure the consistency of data, I kept a research journal, which was "a detailed account of how the study was conducted and how the data were analyzed" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 253). As previously discussed, this research journal provided an introspective space, but it was also a place where I documented any interactions or issues with participants, my transcription process, data analysis process, the development of participant profiles, and the sketches of core category narratives. Overall, my research journal functioned as, what Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described, an "audit trail" (pp. 252-253).

Transferability

When I was designing this qualitative study, I understood that transferability, or generalizability, would be a concern for the trustworthiness and dependability of my findings. Within composition studies, qualitative research has been widely accepted because readers have found those findings applicable to either themselves or their students, programs, or institutions. This applicability is found in the rich details and idiographic nature of the reported data, which resonated with readers (Newkirk, 1992). This qualitative study did not aim to provide a general understanding of all GTAs' experiences. Instead, it was an in-depth analysis of a localized community and population, and in the following chapters, I provide rich data and extrapolations for readers, who can determine if this study's findings resonate with their experiences or cultural myths (Newkirk, 1992; Maxwell, 2013; Patton, 2015). Rich data, as Maxwell (2013) explained, is "data that are detailed and varied enough that they provide a full and revealing picture of what is going on" (p. 323). Throughout this dissertation, I have provided detailed transcriptions and field notes. From those data sources, I incorporated my participants' voices into a polyvocal narrative, a narrative that informs readers who these participants were and describes what they have experienced. This approach to data analysis and discussion provides data that extend the field's understanding of GTAs' learning, resistance, and teaching. I hope that this polyvocal report provides writing program administrators (WPAs) insight into the design and transferability of WPE as well as the significance for discovering who GTAs are. Lastly, I hope readers will find, at the very least, an extrapolation that confirms their experiences so that we can further develop or theorize learning and teaching processes.

CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS 1:
WHO ARE FIRST-YEAR PHD GTAS, AND WHAT ARE THEIR PRIOR EXPERIENCES IN WRITING, WRITING PEDAGOGY EDUCATION, AND TEACHING?

The purpose of this chapter is to present findings that provide rich data about experienced, first-year PhD graduate teaching associates' (GTAs') prior experiences with freshman composition courses (FYC) as undergraduates, their prior writing pedagogy education (WPE) from their respective master's programs, and their prior teaching experiences. Throughout the Fall 2016 semester, I conducted phenomenological interviews (Seidman, 2006), performed classroom observations, and reviewed instructional materials (e.g., syllabi and assignment sheets). The data provided in this chapter comes from participants' responses on the Demographic Information Sheet (see Appendix C) and Interview 1 (see Appendix D), which focused on participants' histories in writing, teaching, and WPE prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program. To understand how first-year PhD GTAs reuse or adapt their prior knowledge into a new teaching context, I examined participants' past histories, creating profiles of their pedagogical experiences and knowledge. By learning who GTAs are, writing pedagogy educators can assess GTAs' pedagogical knowledge and experiences to recalibrate WPE to fit GTAs' needs and learning processes.

In this chapter, I first introduce who the participants were by providing demographic data. Additionally, I provide brief overviews of participants' prior histories,

such as teaching experiences, and their position in UTK's PhD program. To further develop their prior experiences, I report findings about participants' prior experiences with FYC as undergraduates, which establishes the extent to which they were familiar with the course they currently teach. Then, I report their prior WPE, if any, that they received during their respective master's programs. This information will provide insight into the kinds of teaching preparation that they received as well as the compatibility of that preparation with the current teaching context. Lastly, I report participants' prior teaching experiences, specifically the curriculum in which they taught prior to attending UTK. This data provides insight into the kinds of curricula with which they were familiar.

Participants and Their Contexts

For the academic year 2016-2017 at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, nine PhD GTAs were accepted into the doctoral program for the Department of English. These GTAs were seeking doctoral degrees in one of three concentrations: literature, creative writing, or rhetoric, writing and linguistics (RWL). Of the nine that were accepted, eight first-year PhD GTAs agreed to participate in this study. The participants go by the following pseudonyms (in alphabetical order): Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer. Below, I provide participant profiles of each participant, identifying their demographic information, area of concentration, academic history, teaching history, and WPE history. Participants provided this information in their responses to the Demographic Information Sheet. From these profiles, writing pedagogy educators can learn who GTAs were, particularly how diverse their writing and

pedagogical experiences were. With this knowledge, writing pedagogy educators can assess GTAs' pedagogical knowledge and note theoretical and practical areas that need more development.

The Participants: Who Are They?

Ava, a white female GTA who was in her mid-twenties, enrolled into the doctoral program for Creative Writing. Prior to enrolling into UTK's doctoral program, she received a BA in English with a French minor from a public, comprehensive university in the West. From the same institution, she also received a MA in English. Ava's prior teaching experiences consisted of two FYC courses; she taught these courses as she was pursuing her MA degree. She reported that her prior WPE consisted of a practicum entitled, Introduction to Teaching English. In this course, she learned composition theories and had opportunities to microteach lesson plans. She also received professional development through Educational Testing Services, which entailed training in how to evaluate and rank student writing for advanced placement (AP) exams.

Clara, a white female GTA who was in her early thirties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Literature. She received her BA and MA in English Literature from a Midwestern public, comprehensive university. As for prior teaching experiences, she had experience in teaching one course, which emphasized academic reading and writing, for two years. Clara's WPE, on the other hand, was quite extensive. She reported taking three pedagogy courses during her MA degree: Teaching College Composition, The Study of Writing, and Digital Pedagogies. These courses exposed Clara to pedagogical theories, such as Expressivism, and pedagogical tools like digital mapping.

Cornelius, a white male GTA who was in his late thirties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Literature. Cornelius received both his bachelor's and master's degrees in English from a public, comprehensive university in the Southeast. During his MA program, he taught two FYC courses. As for WPE, he reported attending a conference on teaching composition to all grade levels (i.e., from elementary to postsecondary). He also took a pedagogy course that was "a condensed version" of the two-sequenced FYC courses that he was required to teach.

Joseph, a white male GTA who was in his late twenties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Literature. He received both his bachelor's and master's degrees in English Literature from a Western public, comprehensive university. As for his prior teaching experiences, Joseph reported teaching at three different institutions. During his MA degree, he taught two FYC courses. He also taught a total of eight FYC courses at two other institutions, which were both public two-year colleges. As for WPE, Joseph took a "Teaching Writing for Credential Candidates" when he was an undergraduate. This course introduced him to composition theories, but it was more focused on developing his writing than his pedagogy. When he was pursuing his master's degree, he participated in a practicum, where GTAs discussed and shared pedagogical practices. He also took a course about his MA program's Writing Center and best tutoring practices.

Liz, a white female GTA who was in her early forties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Rhetoric, Writing and Linguistics (RWL). She received her bachelor's in English with a minor in Political Science from a Southwestern private, comprehensive university. As for graduate degrees, she earned a M.Ed. (Master of

Education) in Curriculum and Instruction from a public, comprehensive university in the Southwest, and nine years after that degree, she earned a MFA in Creative Writing from a private university in the Southwest. Out of all the participants, Liz had the most extensive teaching history. For three years, she taught English in secondary schools, and for approximately fourteen years, she had taught higher education. As for postsecondary instruction, she taught reading and writing, developmental writing and reading, and FYC at a public two-year college in the Southwest. The year prior to enrolling into UTK's doctoral program, Liz worked as an adjunct writing instructor for a public two-year college in the Southeast. Similar to her teaching history, Liz received extensive WPE. During her MA program, she took preparation courses in the following areas: Reading for Secondary, Reading and Language Arts Instruction, Student Teaching, English Literature Curriculum, Social Studies Curriculum. At a Southwestern public, comprehensive university, she took a course in Writing Program Instruction, and at a Southwestern public two-year college, she attended a conference that focused on developmental education and college reading and learning design and support. She had also attended school district workshops, which prepared her to design, implement, and assess curriculum for various grade and achievement levels for secondary language arts courses.

Mandy, a white female GTA who was in her mid-twenties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Literature. She received her bachelor's in English with a minor in Psychology from a private university in the Southeast. She received her MA in English from a Southeastern public, comprehensive university. During her MA program, Mandy

co-taught a Basic Writing course, and she taught two FYC courses. As for her WPE, she took a Teaching College English Course for four semesters, which was the length of her MA program. This practicum was balanced because it exposed Mandy to composition theory as well as provided pragmatic pedagogical tools, such as classroom management strategies, and mentorship.

Mike, a white male GTA who was in his mid-twenties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Literature. Mike double-majored in English and History with a minor in Philosophy for his bachelor's from a Northeastern public liberal arts college. From the same institution, he received a MA in English. During his MA program, he taught two FYC courses. He also taught reading and studying skills at the Institute of Reading Development, a program aimed at developing pre-kindergarten to continuing education students' literacy skills. As for WPE, Mike took a practicum for four semesters, which was the length of his MA program. He also took a Modern Theories of Writing course the summer prior to beginning his master's program. This course introduced him to composition theory.

Lastly, Spencer, a white male GTA who was in his early forties, enrolled into UTK's doctoral program for Creative Writing. While other participants received bachelor's degrees in English, Spencer received his first bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering from a Midwestern public university. Ten years later, he returned to school for a Certificate of Major in English from a public, comprehensive university in the Midwest. After completing his certificate, he received a MFA in Creative Writing from a Southeastern public, comprehensive university. Throughout his MFA program, he taught

three courses. He taught two sections of the second sequence in the FYC curriculum and one section of Fiction Writing. As for WPE, he had two mentors who were experienced GTAs throughout the first year, meaning he observed and co-taught both FYC courses. He also attended a year-long tutor training workshops and tutored in the Writing Center. He also took a pedagogy course during the spring term of his first year. In this course, Spencer was introduced to composition theory, and he had opportunities to microteach lesson plans.

By comparing these participant profiles, I noticed that participants were neither blank slates nor homogenous in experiences (see Table 4). They had diverse experiences in undergraduate and master's-level education. While seven participants received a bachelor's in English, Spencer was the exception. His undergraduate education began in Civil Engineering, and ten years later, he returned for a Certificate of Major in English. As for graduate education, six participants received a master's in English, and two participants received MFAs in Creative Writing. Liz, in addition to her MFA, also received an M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. These prior educational histories demonstrate that not all GTAs enter into doctoral programs with backgrounds in English. Some GTAs have prior educational and writing experiences in other disciplines, which could be useful in WPE for sharing and guiding pedagogical practices aimed for transfer-based writing instruction.

In addition to diverse educational experiences, participants also had diverse teaching experiences (see Table 4). While seven participants had prior experiences in teaching FYC courses, these courses varied in curricula objectives and values, which will

be further discussed in "Prior Teaching Experiences." Three participants had teaching experiences that were in, what they termed as, either Basic English or Developmental Writing and Reading courses. Based on their descriptions, these courses were consistent with basic writing pedagogies, as the courses consisted of instruction in reading and writing skills that went beyond correcting errors to developing critical thinking skills (Mutnick & Lamos, 2014). One participant, Liz, reported experiences in teaching secondary education English courses for three years, and another participant, Spencer, had experience in teaching a Fiction Writing course. By inquiring into GTAs' prior teaching histories, writing pedagogy educators can learn about GTAs' pedagogical practices and knowledge. For some GTAs, pedagogical practices for teaching Basic Writing or secondary education may conflict with approaches for teaching FYC. WPE can guide GTAs in detecting how prior teaching experiences align or conflict, in both theory and practice, with their current teaching assignments. Because GTAs' prior teaching experiences are diverse, they may not be familiar with teaching and curricula of FYC courses, so writing pedagogy educators should consider these prior teaching experiences.

As for WPE experiences, participants' experiences were also diverse (see Table 4). Six participants had at least one course in either pedagogical theory or practices. Two participants reported attending conferences and workshops about teaching practices, whereas two other participants reported attending training in Writing Center practices. GTAs did not share similar WPE, which will be further explored in "Prior WPE Experiences." These diverse experiences in WPE demonstrates that GTAs are not generic

and need to have continued teaching preparation that meets their educational needs. By noting what WPE they have had, writing pedagogy educators can redesign WPE to address theoretical subject matter and pedagogical practices that need to be developed further, especially if that knowledge is vital for implementing the curriculum that they will be tasked to teach.

PhD GTAs' Prior Experiences in Writing, WPE, and Teaching

Before investigating the extent to which experienced, first-year PhD GTAs reused or adapted prior knowledge into their pedagogical practices for a new teaching context, I must first learn about participants' prior histories, particularly their experiences in taking FYC courses as undergraduates, the WPE they received from their prior institutions, and their prior teaching experiences and curriculum knowledge. In this section, I report participants' experiences in these areas, and from this data, I learned that experienced GTAs enter doctoral programs with a wide spectrum of writing, education, and teaching experiences. Most participants were familiar with FYC courses because they took at least one FYC course as an undergraduate. These classes varied in structure and requirements. Some participants' experiences with FYC were based in literature, whereas others' FYC courses emphasized argumentation. Participants' prior WPE experiences were also diverse; in fact, not a single participant shared a similar structure in how they were prepared to teach. Moreover, the subject matter and best practices provided through their WPE was localized to the contexts that provided it. I also report WPE experiences that participants reused or adapted into their pedagogical practices for their prior teaching contexts. Lastly, I note that participants were experienced in teaching college-level

Table 4

Participants and Their Contexts

Participant	**Undergraduate Education**	**Graduate Education**	**Teaching Experiences**	**WPE Experiences**
Ava	BA English	MA English	2 FYC Courses	Introduction to Teaching English course; Educational Testing Services
Clara	BA English	MA English	Academic Reading and Writing Course 2 Years	Courses in Teaching College Composition; The Study of Writing course, and Digital Pedagogies Course
Cornelius	BA English	MA English	2 FYC Courses	Conference on Teaching Composition; Pedagogy Course
Joseph	BA English	MA English	8 FYC Courses	Course on Tutoring in the Writing Center

Table 4. Continued.

Participant	Undergraduate Education	Graduate Education	Teaching Experiences	WPE Experiences
Liz	BA English	M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction MFA in Creative Writing	English Courses Secondary Education 3 Years Developmental Writing and Reading; FYC Postsecondary 14 Years	Courses in Reading for Secondary; Reading and Language Arts Instruction; Student Teaching; English Literature Curriculum; Social Studies Curriculum; Writing Program Instruction; Conferences and Workshops on Curriculum Design and Pedagogy
Mandy	BA English	MA English	Co-Taught 1 Basic English; 2 FYC Courses	Teaching College English Course
Mike	BA English and History	MA English	2 FYC Courses	Institute of Reading Development; Practicum; Modern Theories of Writing Course

Table 4. Continued.

Participant	Undergraduate Education	Graduate Education	Teaching Experiences	WPE Experiences
Spencer	BS Civil Engineering Certificate of Major in English	MFA in Creative Writing	2 FYC Courses; 1 Fiction Writing Course	Mentorship; Tutor Training Course; Writing Center; Pedagogy Course

writing classes, such as FYC and Basic Writing. Even with their prior teaching experiences and localized WPE, participants struggled to identify the curricula objectives and values of their prior teaching contexts. They did not possess the theoretical knowledge or academic discourse to identify and describe the conceptual underpinnings of those prior experiences. By learning about participants' prior histories, writing pedagogy educators can see GTAs' learning processes and prior experiences on a wide continuum that demonstrates their pedagogical development and needs.

First-Year Composition as Undergraduates

I first inquired about their writing experiences as undergraduates, particularly about their experiences in FYC courses, the equivalent to courses for which they were instructors at UTK. Seven out of eight participants had taken at least one FYC course. The one exception was Ava, who tested out of FYC courses and enrolled in a 200-level Persuasive Writing in Research Modes course. Spencer, too, tested out of FYC courses but was placed in an English Honors course, which emphasized literary analysis.

As for Mandy and Mike, they tested out of English Composition I and enrolled into English Composition II at their respective institutions. Both participants described their course as argument-based, though the assignments were different. Mandy's course was a joint writing and public speaking course, and she composed annotated bibliographies and position papers as well as argumentative speeches, which were presented to the class. Mike recalled writing research papers and definitional arguments about ecocriticism, and he delivered a presentation to his class, too.

Cornelius and Joseph did not test out of FYC courses, but their respective institutions only offered a single FYC course. Cornelius described his as a "one-shot class." While their respective institutions only offered one FYC course, their experiences were divergent, as expected. Cornelius reported that his instructor was a "creative fiction person," so he composed mostly creative writing assignments for the class, such as poetry and short stories. Cornelius noted that he had taken this course prior to dropping out of the program. He returned to the same institution, which was where he earned his bachelor's, fifteen years later. Joseph, on the other hand, reported that his FYC was "standard," which meant for him that is was composed of argumentative and analytical research papers.

Liz recalled taking two FYC courses. The first course required "four or five shorter papers" and was described as "literature analysis heavy." The second course was also described as "literature heavy" but required a "giant research paper." She described the writing in this course as more analytical than persuasive.

Unlike the other participants, Clara's FYC experiences were more extensive. Prior to enrolling into a FYC course, Clara took a developmental writing course. Based on her description of the class, the instruction emphasized developing literacy skills as well as local and global writing skills, which Deborah Mutnick and Steve Lamos (2014) associated with basic writing pedagogy. She was aware that her peers had not experienced developmental writing, as she stated, "I think it's kinda funny when people are like, well, we're in English departments, and so like a lot of us don't know exactly what it's even like to be in like a 101 or 1100 course. But I'm like the opposite." Clara claimed that she had taken the course because she had "a really hard time with sentence structure and like what is correct." Clara experienced problems in her FYC course, too. She reported taking two courses. She reported that she failed the first one due to an interpersonal conflict with the professor. She retook the course and received a "C" in it, and in that course, she experienced difficulty in connecting the professor's expectations with the assignments. Specifically, Clara recalled a disconnect between the professor's positive feedback on her journal writing and receiving "C's" on her formal writing assignments. This conflict in feedback left her feeling "confused" about what constituted good writing.

While only Ava tested out of FYC courses during her undergraduate education, the other participants took at least one FYC course, whether that was the second in the sequence or an honors course. Liz was the only participant who reported taking both FYC courses that her institution offered. Clara, Cornelius, and Joseph reported that their respective institutions only offered one FYC course. Prior to taking her FYC course,

Clara had also experienced taking two basic writing courses. As for the curricula of these FYC courses, the participants' writing experiences were mostly focused on argumentation. Some FYC courses included speech writing, as was the case for Mandy, or literary analysis, as Liz reported. Cornelius was the exception because his FYC course emphasized creative writing. Table 5 provides a brief summary of whether the participants took at least one course in either basic writing, FYC, or tested out.

Table 5

Participants' FYC Experiences as Undergraduates

Participant	**Took Basic Writing**	**Took FYC**	**Tested Out of FYC**
Ava			X
Clara	X	X	
Cornelius		X	
Joseph		X	
Liz		X	
Mandy		X	
Mike		X	
Spencer		X	

Prior WPE Experiences

GTAs' prior WPE experiences varied, ranging from no formal training to multiple pedagogy preparation courses. Most participants were able to describe in detail the kinds of WPE they received, the content of that preparation, and any materials that were reused or appropriated into their respective pedagogical practices. The most common types of WPE were pre-service orientation, pedagogy course(s), practicum, tutoring, mentorships, and conferences/workshops. Participants' WPE experiences were idiosyncratic and localized to the institution that provided the preparation. While participants received similar styles of WPE, the subject matter and best practices of those WPE opportunities were limited to the curricula for which they taught. Moreover, not all WPE opportunities influenced participants' pedagogical practices; participants reused or adapted practical teaching tools or materials, as those were perceived to be most useful.

Pre-Service Orientation. Four of eight (Ava, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) participants experienced pre-service orientation as part of their prior WPE. Ava, Mandy, and Spencer attended a pre-service orientation one week prior to beginning the fall term of their respective master's programs. The length of these orientations varied from three to five days. Ava recalled workshops about disability and counseling services as well as first-day class activities. Additionally, she received the textbooks and a list of assignments for the course and was required to develop her syllabus throughout the pre-service orientation. Ava submitted the syllabus on the last day, which was a Friday, of the pre-service orientation for approval and began teaching the following Monday. Mandy's workshops were more "practically focused" because the workshops focused on grading practices as well as taking and reporting attendance. Spencer's experience was more

theoretical. Without going into much detail, he recalled reviewing rhetorical theory, such as the Aristotelian appeals, in his pre-service orientation. Mike, on the other hand, attended a one-day, eight-hour pre-service orientation, but he did not specify the subject matter that was discussed in that orientation. Based on these findings, pre-service orientation varied in structure, and the subject matter was localized to the context for which they were required to teach. The content from this WPE opportunity was not generalizable to other teaching contexts. Moreover, participants recalled best practices in greater detail than composition theory.

Pedagogy Course(s). The pedagogy courses that participants recalled were also localized in preparation. Four out of eight (Clara, Cornelius, Mandy, and Spencer) participants were required to enroll into at least one pedagogy course. Clara recalled enrolling into three pedagogy courses: Digital Pedagogies, The Study of Writing, and Teaching College Composition. These classes provided a wide range of composition theory for Clara to apply to her pedagogy. Clara took the first two courses in the last semester of her MA program. She recalled that the digital pedagogies course was taught by a "digital rhetorician." From that course, she recalled working alongside a sophomore-level literature course that "was specifically geared to STEM students." In the course, graduate students developed creative projects to be used in the literature course, such as a mapping and plot rewriting activities. As for The Study of Writing course, she could recall neither the content nor purpose of the course. She explained, "This was the last semester of my master's degree, and I just wanted to finish." She did recall more details about the Teaching College Composition course. This course was aimed toward creative

writers and required reading Donald Murray's *A Writer Teaches Writing*. From the course, she recalled learning "how to use my strengths and my weaknesses to guide other students," but she did not elaborate on what those strengths and weaknesses were. Additionally, she noted that the professor of the course was retiring and that her class was his last one. She reported that the professor "functioned on just the basic idea that you can't hurt them too much, and as long as you're clear, your expectations will be met." This concept of being explicitly clear about expectations was repeated throughout her first interview as an objective for her pedagogical practices. She believed in being transparent and explicit in her teaching so that students clearly understood her expectations.

Cornelius, Mandy, and Spencer, on the other hand, reported taking one pedagogy course at their respective institutions. Cornelius's pedagogy course was "a condensed version" of the two-sequenced FYC courses. He recalled writing assignments that were required of freshman students as well as learning how to teach those assignments. Similar to Cornelius's experience, Spencer's pedagogy course followed this model, too, and he added that the course required microteaching, meaning he would teach miniature lessons to peers. He found the microteaching valuable because the experience provided generative feedback about his pedagogical practices. Mandy, on the other hand, enrolled into a pedagogy course but took it for four semesters. While the course became "a little bit repetitive," it provided her with coaching and mentoring as she was teaching for the first time. The course emphasized the theoretical and practical components of the assignments as well as classroom management strategies. Mandy believed the objective

of the course was "just mentoring us through teaching." She felt that some information could have been acquired through reading instead of attending the course, but she noted that the course was valuable in strategizing how to engage students. Based on these responses, most participants recalled the best practices that were directly applicable to teaching from these pedagogy courses.

Though not technically pedagogy classes, Joseph and Mike reported two similar class experiences that they correlated with pedagogy. Joseph reported taking a pedagogy course as an undergraduate, entitled "Teaching Writing for Credential Candidates." This course introduced him to writing theories but was meant for "improving your own writing than it was teaching you how to teach writing." As for formal pedagogy courses, Joseph stated, "I never had very formal, I would say none of them were incredibly formal, pedagogy-focused courses with the exception of maybe that class as an undergrad for the credential program." Mike also was not required to take a formal pedagogy course. He elected to take a Modern Theories of Writing course the summer prior to beginning his master's program. He recalled that the course required "a lot of comp readings" that were mostly about pedagogy, but he could not provide examples of readings or assignments. While these respective courses were not required, both participants elected to take them as part of their WPE.

Based on these findings, pedagogy courses ranged in subject matter. Some courses provided a survey of composition theory, such as digital pedagogy or modern composition theories. Some courses were balanced in providing composition theory as well as opportunities to practice applying theory to pedagogical practices through

microteaching. While these participants had a pedagogy course, their experiences were divergent, and they were not exposed to the same theories or practices.

Practicum. Three participants (Ava, Joseph, and Mike) reported attending a weekly practicum at their respective institutions. Ava's practicum occurred every Friday. She believed that the practicum's objective was "to familiarize" graduate students with "teaching theory" and to "engage with other instructors" through microteaching. She recalled teaching a miniature lesson about reflection, and she (along with other graduate students) was encouraged to share teaching ideas and lesson plans with her peers. The practicum also required theoretical readings in composition about topics like transfer theory and discourse community. Ava recalled these particular discussions because she had written a paper about these topics. She noted that she had mostly "skimmed" readings due to a busy teaching and coursework schedule. In regard to theory, she reported experiencing conflict:

> [I]t seemed like [the theories were] just kind of all over the place, all of these contradicting theories, and theories that were just like so vastly different from each other that it was like, why are we even looking at these together? Do you have one that you like better? Like what are we doing? So, it was just kind of like, here's all the theory that I have read, now you read it.

In addition to the theory and microteaching, Ava was also required to observe her peers. She learned about different teaching styles; for example, she recalled observing a peer who was more relaxed in the classroom. Ava found that her peer's relaxed demeanor enabled her to connect with her students. Ava compared this observation to her own teaching style, which she described as more "authoritative." She believed that this style affected her ability to connect with her students, and because of these observed

differences, she decided to shift her pedagogical style from being "authoritative" to being "informal."

Whereas Ava's practicum required observations, Joseph's and Mike's respective practica did not. Joseph recalled attending a practicum that met "once a week to discuss their pedagogical approaches, the syllabi, lessons, you know, assignments, activities, anything that they were doing in class." The practicum served as a check-in for how each graduate student was doing in his/her class, and it was also a space for sharing ideas and lessons. Similar to Joseph's experience, Mike found the practicum valuable for the sharing of ideas and seeing different approaches to teaching, specifically in seeing how experienced teachers taught lessons or assignments. Unlike Joseph, Mike's practicum met for two years. The first year, the practicum met weekly and then transitioned to every other week in the second year. Mike recalled presentations about pedagogical theories, such as transfer theory or multi-cultural issues, and pedagogical practices, e.g., successful lesson plans or assignment sheets. These presentations would serve as conversation starters and as opportunities to share instructional materials and pedagogical practices.

From these findings, participants experienced the practicum as a space for sharing pedagogical ideas, materials, and practices. While participants shared teaching lore and best approaches in the practica, these approaches were situated to their respective teaching contexts. The shared lesson plans and activities were tailored to the curricula of the prior teaching contexts. Moreover, the structure of the practicum varied per participant. While most participants recalled practical opportunities to practice teaching opportunities and advice, one participant's practicum included composition theory.

Tutor Training. In addition to preparation in practical or theoretical approaches to teaching composition, some participants received tutor training or were required to tutor as part of their teaching fellowships. Four of eight participants (Ava, Cornelius, Joseph, and Spencer) recalled tutor training as part of their WPE. Ava and Cornelius did not go into detail about their tutor training, only that they worked in the writing center for one semester. Joseph, on the other hand, recalled his tutor training, which was a required course aimed at preparing tutors for the writing center. He reported the objective of the course was to introduce rhetoric and composition theories to tutors to help them understand professors' assignment sheets or the scaffolding of an assignment. He noted, "But [the course] set a nice foundation for rhetoric and composition for a lot of us and just kind of gave us the basics to enter the conversation." Joseph experienced the tutor training as informative to his comprehension of rhetorical theory. Similar to Joseph, Spencer also recalled attending tutor training course as well as serving as a tutor in the writing center. Unlike Joseph, he did not provide any details about these experiences.

From these findings, participants reported the writing center training or tutoring as part of their WPE, but participants did not elaborate on what those experiences entailed. Joseph was the only participant to report that the tutoring experience informed his understanding of rhetorical theory. Nevertheless, all four participants did not connect tutor training to their pedagogical practices; instead, they compartmentalized this WPE opportunity to their work in the writing center.

Mentorship. The last most common WPE that GTAs experienced was mentorship. Two of eight participants recalled working with a mentor in the first year of

their respective master's programs. Cornelius recalled shadowing a full-time lecturer for one term. From this experience, he recalled learning about rhetorical theory, specifically "learning terminology and how to properly define, and then teaching our students." In addition to learning about rhetorical theory, he reported learning how to assess and grade student writing, which he found "very helpful." Spencer found his mentoring very helpful, too. He was a mentee for experienced GTAs throughout his first year of his MFA program. He had two different mentors, one for the first sequence and another for the second sequence of the FYC program. Spencer reported that mentoring provided him the space to practice teaching FYC students and to develop a "teaching persona." He stated, "The persona that I have now was formed almost entirely by what I saw other people doing, especially in the classroom." Spencer experienced his mentorship as formative to his pedagogical development because his reported learning style was through observations. Overall, Cornelius and Spencer found these mentorships beneficial because they provided the experimental space in a real-time classroom to practice teaching and grading.

Conferences and Workshops. One participant, Liz, did not experience WPE that consisted of pre-service orientations, pedagogy courses, tutor training, or mentorships. Liz recalled her pedagogical training beginning with the National Writing Project (NWP). She took a course through the NWP the summer before beginning her Master of Education program. Liz described the course as "experimental" because it required a book review and the incorporation of a variety of writing strategies, from creative to scientific writing. Liz noted that teachers from all levels (i.e., from elementary to

postsecondary) could participate in the course. She noted, "If you're a good educator, you adapt, right? You adapt it for your class. Even though I was teaching college, I still took the course." In addition to the NWP course, Liz also took a Reading for the Secondary Student course, which explained how YA literature was structured for 9th through 12th grade audiences. She noted that this course taught her audience awareness. Liz recalled additional training from summer seminars or conferences. She recalled attending a training in teaching writing to students with dyslexia, specifically learning to teach writing abstractly. She also reported trainings in ESL and ESOL, where she learned to identify and to address problems as well as how to "change your curriculum so that it's culturally unbiased." As for WPE in her MFA program, she recalled adapting these training experiences into the teaching of creative writing. She did not mention any specific WPE from her MFA program.

Overall, participants had diverse WPE experiences. While some participants shared in the types of WPE that they received, not a single participant had the same experience because the WPE structure and subject matter were localized and idiosyncratic to the institution that provided it. GTAs' exposure to composition theory and best practices ranged in content and relevance to the writing program for which they taught. Because of how diverse these WPE experiences were, participants' pedagogical development and needs fell onto a wide spectrum. While some participants had more theoretical knowledge, others had more opportunities to practice teaching and receive mentorship. Ongoing WPE, such as a pre-service orientation for a new teaching context,

could not address these GTAs' pedagogical needs without considering their prior WPE experiences.

Reuse or Adaptation of WPE Experiences

The data revealed that most of these varied WPE experiences, whether informal or formal, influenced the development of pedagogical practices with tutor training as the exception. Not only did participants recall the kind of WPE they received and what that WPE mostly consisted of, but seven of eight participants also recalled particular teaching observations or instructional materials from these experiences that they have reused or adapted in their prior teaching contexts. Table 6 briefly summarizes from which WPE source that participants reused or adapted teaching observations or instructional materials for their prior teaching experiences.

Table 6

WPE from Which Participants Reused or Adapted Teaching Observations or Instructional Materials for Prior Teaching Experiences

Participant	Pre-Service Orientation	Pedagogy Course	Practica	Tutor Training	Mentorships	Conferences and Workshops
Ava	X					
Cornelius					X	
Joseph		X	X		X	
Liz						X
Mandy		X				
Mike			X			
Spencer		X			X	

Two participants reported adapting what they observed into their pedagogical practices, such as roll call questions or abstract teaching methods. For example, Cornelius recalled his mentor beginning classes with a roll question, a practice he adapted into his pedagogical practices. From his pedagogy course, he also learned how scaffolding facilitated the writing process. Prior to the course, he reported not understanding the term or its function, but after the course, he reported comprehending and becoming more "enthusiastic" about scaffolding writing assignments. Liz also reused teaching strategies that she had learned from a conference in her classroom. She reported using "abstract methods" such as science or mathematics to teach students with dyslexia. She reported that the experience was "eye opening" in learning about the different ways of processing information. These participants observed that these particular pedagogical practices were effective for teaching students, and because they perceived these approaches as useful, they adapted these practices into their pedagogies.

While Cornelius and Liz incorporated teaching strategies into their pedagogical practices, the most common influence from WPE was the reuse or adaptation of lesson plans that were shared in practica or pedagogy courses. Ava, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer reported reusing or adapting lesson plans or assignment sheets. Ava found the sharing of lesson plans in her practicum as beneficial, particularly for days when she did not have anything planned. She neither recalled nor reported any specific lesson plans. Joseph, on the other hand, recalled a reading and discussion of Anne Lamott's "Shitty First Drafts" from his undergraduate credentials course. He reported beginning semesters with this reading, asking students for their thoughts about it. For Joseph, this

essay was "sort of [his] first experience with pedagogy." Joseph also recalled "liberally" trading assignments, such as an in-class debate to reverse outlining activities, with peers from his practicum. He reported adapting other instructional materials into shortened handouts or PowerPoint presentations, too. One specific activity that he recalled was the "quote boat," which was a prewriting document that consisted of MLA citation and quotes from sources. He was introduced to this activity from one of his professors, and he adapted it to be "simplified" for a shorter paper. As for Liz, she recalled teaching activities from the NWP in her teaching practices. From the NWP, she reused graphic novels to teach students how to structure a paragraph. Mandy, too, reported generous sharing of lesson plans and activities; she adapted conversations and suggestions about engaging students through group work from her pedagogy course into her pedagogical practices. Mandy did not describe how she adapted suggestions. Mike also reused group activities in his teaching practices. He recalled a debate activity that he had learned from his practicum professor, who was described as "quiet and timid most of the time." Mike recalled the activity that required him and fellow students to pick sides of the room and debate each other. During the debate, the professor "threw his book across the room." Mike explained the importance of this experience as making the teaching and lessons memorable, an idea he reported adapting into his teaching. For example, Mike adapted this approach into his teaching by asking students to persuade him to buy a pen or to debate whether a water bottle is half full or half empty. As for Spencer, he reported having a binder full of materials from his pedagogy course and lessons from his

mentorships. He reported reusing lessons from this binder when he does not have a plan or activity for that day. He could not recall any particular lessons from that binder.

While some participants could not recall rich details about what their pre-service orientations, pedagogy courses, practica, tutor trainings, or mentorships entailed, participants were able to recall specific actions or activities in which they reused or adapted from those experiences. These reports of reusing or adapting teaching observations and/or instructional materials are significant because these acts demonstrate how participants' prior WPE experiences influenced their pedagogical practices and teaching personae. Participants perceived the sharing of these materials as best practices because they were either demonstrated by or approved by the writing program, as they were shared in either the practicum or a pedagogy course, or experienced peers and mentors. Participants reused lesson plans and adapted pedagogical approaches that they perceived as useful for themselves as instructors or for their students' learning. Whether the reasons were not having anything planned or being inspired by an activity or mentor, most participants relied on these pragmatic experiences and materials for teaching at their prior institutions.

Prior Teaching Experiences

As previously discussed, each participant experienced teaching college composition courses prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program. Their experiences varied overall, but there were overlaps in the types of classes they taught. In addition to reporting their teaching experiences, some participants described the assignments and textbooks used to teach the courses, and each participant was asked about their

understanding of the curricula in which they had taught. Based on each participant's answer, I coded their understanding of the curriculum by the terms they provided, ranging from unknown to writing process, genre-based, rhetoric-based, and discourse communities/transfer-based. Participants, for the most part, either were uncertain or estimated what they perceived the curriculum classification to be. While they were less confident in providing a curricula paradigm, most participants could recall the kinds of writing assignments associated with the curricula of their prior teaching contexts.

Unknown. When asked about the curricula for the classes in which they had previously taught, four of eight participants responded with "don't know." Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, and Mike recalled the kinds of classes and assignments they taught, but they did not have either the discourse or knowledge to describe the curricula of their prior teaching contexts. Clara recalled teaching Academic Reading and Writing for two years. In this course, Clara described the writing program as in flux as changes to the curriculum were being made, and she recalled feeling that "this group of GTAs kind of just got to do whatever we wanted. Or at least I felt like I did." Clara assigned her students topics and assignments that she "thought were interesting," e.g., rape culture. Though she did not have a term to label the curriculum, she recalled writing assignments ranging from teaching students active reading and annotation skills to writing academic arguments. Clara reported that she "ditched" the literacy narrative, a required assignment, because she felt that it was not "fun" and found the assignment as "counterintuitive" to teaching academic writing. She replaced the assignment with a reflection, as that was

"based on personal experience." She assigned a textual analysis of an advertisement, textual analysis with research of a music video, and then a movie evaluation.

Cornelius taught FYC courses for two years, and he, too, did not know the curriculum of the writing program for which he taught. He did not provide details about the kinds of assignments, only noting that there were "three major assignments" and a weekly writing assignment. He reported that he was given the textbooks but had flexibility in designing day-to-day lessons or bringing in additional materials.

As previously discussed, Joseph taught FYC courses for three different institutions, two of which were community colleges. At one community college, he reported no instruction on how to teach the courses he was assigned. He stated, "At that course, I was essentially told: show up on the first day, have a syllabus, tell us what textbooks you want to use, and just go." He noted that the syllabus had learning outcomes that were required by the department, but outside of those outcomes, he was free to design and teach the course as he wanted. He described his experience at the other community college as similar with the caveat of more guidance from an advisor. When he was teaching during his master's program, he described the syllabus as more prescriptive, and the program was more "strict" about what was included in the document and how the course was taught. When asked about the curriculum's focus for that institution, he hesitantly responded with transfer theory: "It was… It was…transfer was a focus, right?" He described the curriculum further:

> They wanted to get you prepared to take the knowledge you learned in your 101 course into, you know, the major course that you'll be taking down the road and try to prepare you to enter, you know, to think rhetorically about reading and writing, but even there, it was one of those

> situations where at times I felt that we as instructors were given too much freedom at times.

It is possible that he came to understand his prior teaching curriculum by applying his current learning about UTK's transfer-based FYC curriculum to it, also known as backward reaching transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). For example, Joseph reported that the courses he had taught were not labeled as 101 on his Demographic Information Sheet, but the first sequence of UTK's FYC program was English 101. When asked about the kinds of assignments he assigned, his response diverged from what was required by UTK. He described assignments that he had taught at his prior institutions, such as multimodal projects like a collage essay, video, or PowerPoint. He also required students to write a brief explanation of their rhetorical choices that they made in those projects. He also assigned a rhetorical analysis, argumentative essay, and a research paper. Smaller assignments were bibliographies and a writing journal.

Mike, like Joseph, was also hesitant in his response about his previous program's curriculum. He had taught FYC courses for one year, and he described the courses as emphasizing genre and argumentation. However, when he was asked about the curriculum, he reported not understanding the question. To help him understand the question, I provided field-established examples like Writing Across the Curriculum or Writing in the Disciplines (Tate et al., 2014). Upon hearing these examples, he informed me that those emphases did "not really" describe the curriculum. When asked about the assignments, he described the first sequence of the FYC courses as genre-based; that is, he assigned a narrative, restaurant review, and a research paper. There was a fourth paper, but he noted that the genre varied. As for the second FYC course, he recalled assigning

various argument-based assignments, such as a definitional argument, a nostalgia argument (i.e., an argument connected to course topic and students' experiences), and a creative argument assignment.

Writing Process. Mandy reported her prior teaching context's FYC curriculum as emphasizing writing process. She found this emphasis to be the curriculum paradigm because students were required to write multiple drafts. While her categorization of the curriculum was writing process, she did note that the writing program "was part of the quality enhancement program; they were trying to do like a Writing Across the Curriculum thing on a wider university basis." She did not define Writing Across the Curriculum and what that meant for her teaching objectives; instead, she emphasized the curriculum objective as getting students to learn writing processes. Moreover, Mandy compared her FYC experience to the focus of UTK's curriculum to make sense of her prior teaching context. She stated, "Comp I was actually pretty similar to English 101 here, centered on analysis and rhetorical strategies like ethos, logos, and pathos. We didn't have stasis, so that's new for me. We started with an analysis paper and then moved towards an argument." In Comp I, she reported assigning three papers: rhetorical analysis, comparative analysis, and an argument. The second FYC courses consisted of a proposal, annotated bibliography, research paper, exploratory paper, fiction paper, and an in-class poetry paper. Mandy reported that she had freedom to pick materials from assigned textbooks or additional texts for the literature component. She noted that there "wasn't that much" course structure provided by the writing program other than that the cohorts should teach the same units at the same time for consistency in the practicum.

Genre-Based. Liz reported her curriculum's emphasis as genre-based. She had taught reading and writing courses for approximately 14 years at a community college prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program. Specifically, she had taught literature and reading courses, developmental writing, and a FYC course. She described the writing program as "vanguard" because "[t]hey were doing active learning before anybody was doing active learning." When asked about the developmental writing course, she recalled emphasizing individual writing growth and teaching genres and grammar. In comparison, her FYC course emphasized discussion. She assigned argumentative and persuasive assignments as well as an annotated bibliography and research paper. However, some of these assignments went beyond the writing program's expectations: "There were things I did that weren't expected. I did an annotated bib. I did a research paper even though it was [a FYC class], and they [i.e., students] were just expected to have to write several papers throughout." This idea of writing several papers in various genres was how Liz defined the curriculum's emphasis as genre-based. She noted that she had freedom in designing the course, and that as long she met course objectives and incorporated the textbook, "they [the writing program] didn't care how [she] did it." In her classroom, she emphasized genres and discussions about readings.

Similar to Liz, Mandy described the curriculum for the Basic Writing course as genre-based. In the course, the instructors were responsible for teaching students how to write in "different genres of writing." Mandy assigned descriptive and persuasive paragraphs, expository papers, persuasive paper, and a narrative paper. Beyond

identifying the genres that were assigned for this course, she did not explain further how the curriculum was genre-based.

Rhetoric-Based. Spencer reported his institution's writing program's curriculum as rhetoric-based. Spencer's prior teaching experiences were comprised of teaching Introduction to Fiction and the second sequence of the FYC courses. For the FYC course, he defined the curriculum's emphasis as "rhetoric-based," i.e., teaching students "how to use rhetorical strategies to influence [a] reader." As for assignments, Spencer did not provide detailed information about what he assigned. He noted that there was a syllabus template that he used, which he found helpful. The course was themed, and he had to obtain the writing program's approval for the course.

Discourse Communities and Transfer. Ava reported her prior institution's curriculum as emphasizing discourse communities and transfer. Like Joseph, it is possible that Ava applied her current learning about UTK's curriculum to understand the curriculum of her prior teaching context à la backward reaching transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). For two years, Ava taught both sequences of the FYC courses and a 200-level course, Introduction to Writing in the Persuasive Modes. Ava reported a "disconnect" in the content and learning between the FYC courses and the 200-level writing course. She did not perceive any scaffolding among the FYC and 200-level courses that clearly promoted transfer theory. When she taught a 200-level course, she decided to connect the FYC objectives with the 200-level course objectives to promote students' transfer of learning. While she had freedom to design this 200-level course to facilitate transfer, she and her fellow colleagues were required to use "the same

curriculum, the same assignments." In addition to sharing the same assignments, teachers were required to use the same textbook, one in which the Director of Composition had published. She reported that the textbook, which emphasized genres, was "poorly organized and was really hard to follow, even for me." As for assignments, Ava required her FYC students to select two genres from the textbook to write. Additionally, students composed a discourse community paper, which required students to compare their non-academic to academic discourse communities, and a literacy narrative. In the 200-level course, Ava assigned persuasive research essays that required different organization schemes, such as Rogerian and Toulmin. Students also composed satire and position papers. While she reported the curriculum' emphasis as discourse community and transfer, Ava noted, "I don't feel like a lot of instructors used that curriculum to its full advantage or made that the focus of their class, and that was what I tried to make the focus of my class but without really understanding what I was doing at last for the first semester." Elaborating on how she tried, Ava reported informing students about how activities or assignments could be used for non-English courses.

Based on these provided curricula descriptions and classifications, participants either reported not knowing the curriculum or estimating the curriculum based on the structure and assignments of the course. GTAs did not report any direct conversations with their prior respective writing programs about either the curriculum's conceptual underpinnings or how the design of the course met that curriculum's objectives. Participants associated the types of writing assignments and recurring pedagogical practices with the curricula objectives. However, some participants' descriptors of

curricula did not align with the established composition pedagogies of the field (Tate et al., 2014). For example, Clara, Joseph, and Mike required their students to write literacy narratives, which are often associated with Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs. Through assignments like this one, students are learning about their discourse and practices through writing (Thaiss & McLeod, 2014). Similarly, Mandy reported writing process as the curriculum objective but also noted that the FYC program was part of a WAC initiative. Mandy struggled to connect that pedagogical practices for teaching writing as a process as a significant part of WAC pedagogies (Thaiss & McLeod, 2014). These GTAs did not detect the conceptual underpinnings of the assignments and thus curricula, which affected the extent to which they understood their pedagogical objectives.

Moreover, some GTAs' uncertainty about prior curricula objectives was echoed in their possible backward reaching transfer of what they were learning about UTK's FYC curriculum. Whereas Mandy compared her experiences to identify the curriculum of her prior teaching context, Joseph's and Ava's identification of transfer theory aligned more with the focus of UTK's FYC curriculum. For example, Ava criticized her prior teaching context for not having explicit scaffolding among courses to promote transfer; however, she reported that the required textbook was organized by genres and emphasized the instruction of writing for particular genres. By this account, it is plausible that her prior teaching context's curriculum was more genre-based than transfer-based. If these participants applied current learning to their prior experiences, then it demonstrates

that they did not possess the academic discourse or theoretical knowledge to understand the conceptual underpinnings of their prior teaching contexts' curricula.

While these participants struggled to identify curricula that aligned with field-established composition pedagogies, there was one participant, Spencer, who did report pedagogical practices associated with the identified curriculum. Spencer noted that he was required to teach "rhetorical strategies," which he defines in Interviews 2 and 3 as Aristotelian appeals. This description aligns with composition pedagogies that emphasize rhetoric and argumentation (Fleming, 2014). In these pedagogies, instructors provide students with rhetorical situations, and students are tasked to "move one's audience" (Fleming, 2014, p. 250). To appropriately move an audience, students should employ Aristotelian appeals, or what Spencer described as "rhetorical strategies." Spencer was able to detect the curriculum objective because the writing program required him to use an annotated master syllabus. While he did not report whether the writing program explicitly provided the curriculum emphasis or not, the prioritization of teaching rhetorical strategies in the master syllabus led Spencer to identify rhetoric as the curriculum paradigm.

Based on these findings, participants, for the most part, did not possess the theoretical knowledge or the academic discourse to identify the curricula of their prior teaching contexts. Instead, they detected curricula objectives and values through deductive reasoning. As seen in some these participants' reports, their deductions did not align with composition pedagogies, which affected how they perceived their teaching objectives. If GTAs were unaware of the writing program's curricula objectives and

values, to what extent are they implementing the curriculum? Based on this data, GTAs taught the required assignments, but they did not understand the role and function each writing assignment played in the grand scheme of the curriculum. Without theoretical knowledge and academic discourse, GTAs' pedagogical practices could reflect their uncertain or estimated comprehension of the writing program's objectives and values.

Conclusion

My purpose in this chapter was to explore experienced, first-year PhD GTAs' prior writing, WPE, and teaching experiences. By learning about GTAs' prior histories, I could identify the extent to which these prior experiences and knowledge were reused or adapted into GTAs' pedagogical practices for a new teaching context. Based on this data, GTAs' prior histories were complex, diverse, and idiosyncratic. Surprisingly, most of the participants had experiences in taking FYC courses when they were undergraduates. While they had these experiences, the content and structure of their FYC courses were diverse. Some participants' FYC courses were literature-focused, whereas others' courses were argument-based. Just as their prior FYC writing experiences were diverse, GTAs' prior WPE experiences were also diverse. Participants did not possess the same theoretical knowledge and best practices; in fact, their prior WPE and teaching experiences were localized to the contexts that prepared them for teaching. Even with their localized preparation, they did not have the academic discourse to identify curricula objectives and values that aligned with the course structure and pedagogical materials. By identifying this diversity and idiosyncrasy, writing pedagogy educators can assess GTAs'

pedagogical knowledge and recalibrate WPE to fit their educational and instructional needs.

Keeping these prior histories in mind, I next examine participants' current pedagogical experiences and practices at UTK. In the following chapter, I report GTAs' recollection and overall impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation, particularly noting what they valued from this WPE opportunity. Then, I assess their pedagogical knowledge of UTK's writing program, specifically their curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. Lastly, I examine the extent to which GTAs' reused or adapted their prior histories, as reported in this chapter, as well as the subject matter and instructional materials from UTK's pre-service orientation into their pedagogical practices for teaching at UTK.

CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS 2:
FIRST-YEAR PHD GTAS' IMMEDIATE RECOLLECTIONS OF UTK'S PRE-SERVICE ORIENTATION AND CURRENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES AT UTK

In the previous chapter, I constructed narratives about participants' prior histories in writing, writing pedagogy education (WPE), and teaching. Those narratives provided accounts of participants' experiences in first-year composition as undergraduates as well as the kinds of WPE they received from their respective master's programs. Participants also reported reusing or adapting teaching observations and instructional materials from previous WPE into their pedagogical practices prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program. From those narratives, I learned that participants' prior histories in writing, WPE, and teaching were complex, diverse, and idiosyncratic. They come into doctoral programs with pedagogical identities, practices, and values that inform their teaching practices. These narratives demonstrated that participants' pedagogical development fell onto a wide learning spectrum, as they had been exposed to various composition theory and best practices, but that exposure was limited to their prior teaching contexts. Even with this localized WPE, participants struggled to identify curricula paradigms because they were still developing their theoretical knowledge and academic discourse through WPE and teaching opportunities. Knowing participants' prior histories, I can learn more about GTAs' learning processes, such as what they value from WPE, and how they reuse or adapt their prior and current learning for teaching in a new context.

In this chapter, I examine the extent to which prior experiences in writing, WPE, and teaching were reused or adapted in a new teaching context like UTK's FYC program. I first investigate participants' immediate recollections and overall impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation, asking participants about the kinds of workshops and content that they recalled from that experience. Writing pedagogy educators will learn that first-year, PhD GTAs value practical pedagogical tools to help them transition into a new teaching context, and they do not perceive a need for WPE, such as a pre-service orientation, that provides instruction of familiar concepts. I also inquired about their appropriation of UTK's standardized syllabus, which was a required document for all first-year PhD GTAs. Participants, for the most part, were eager to convert to the standardized syllabus, but there were some who chose to adapt their prior experiences into the syllabus. In both cases, participants only understood surface features of the curriculum. In addition to analyzing participants' syllabi, I examined their current pedagogical practices through the second interview, two classroom observations, and their instructional materials. I report participants' teaching experiences at UTK by focusing on five knowledge domains: curriculum knowledge, teaching rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practice knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. From this examination, participants' pedagogical knowledge, generally, was theorized insufficiently. Participants' theories-in-use demonstrated either their superficial understanding of these knowledges or their ability to connect similar, key features through teaching the curriculum. For first-year PhD GTAs to implement the curriculum and develop their pedagogical practices, their knowledges within these domains need theoretical

development.

Recollections and Impressions of UTK's Pre-Service Orientation

One to two weeks prior to Interview 1, first-year PhD GTAs were required to attend a three-day pre-service orientation at UTK. This orientation ran from 9 AM to 5 PM, and each day was consisted of approximately five workshops. These workshops focused on departmental and university resources, demonstrated pedagogical approaches for teaching FYC assignments at UTK, and explained theories relevant for implementing the curriculum, such as stasis theory. At the end of the pre-service orientation, participants attended a workshop and presentation led by a visiting keynote speaker. The purpose of this pre-service orientation was to prepare new GTAs, whether novices or experienced, transition into and teach FYC for a new teaching context. Prior to identifying what first-year PhD GTAs adapted from these workshops into their current pedagogies, I inquired about what they recalled and their overall first impressions. Then, I asked participants if they reused or adapted any pedagogical practices or instructional materials from UTK's pre-service orientation into their teaching. From the pre-service orientation, there were seven workshops recalled. Table 7 provides an overview of the recalled workshops, and it is arranged from most to least recalled workshop. Participants recalled workshops that provided practical resources or demonstrated best practices the most, and their overall impressions of the pre-service orientation ranged for boredom and overwhelming to reassurance. Participants mostly experienced boredom because participants reported being familiar with the subject matter.

Table 7

Types of Workshops Recalled from UTK's Pre-Service Orientation

Kinds of Workshops	**Participants Who Recalled the Workshop**
Resources	Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer
Beyond Ethos, Pathos, & Logos: A Rhetoric Crash Course for Teachers	Ava, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer
Using Active Learning from Day One	Ava, Cornelius, and Mandy
Scaffolding, Processing, and Transferring Galore!	Ava and Mandy
The Purpose of Stasis Analysis in 101	Mandy and Spencer
Understanding and Working with Accessibility	Mike
Invited Scholar's Workshop and Keynote	Liz

Note. Resources is a combination of panels about the Writing Center, Thornton Center, Counseling Services, Disability Services, MLA Reviews, and Discussions about CourseSites.

Recollection of UTK's Pre-Service Orientation. Six of eight participants recalled various workshops and discussions about campus resources. Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer reported "resources" as a topic covered by the pre-service orientation. Ava, Clara, and Mandy reported informative workshops about university and departmental procedures and policies as resources. Clara and Mandy found

the information beneficial for their first year, whereas Ava perceived these workshops and discussions as mandatory and unexciting. As for specific resources, Clara and Cornelius recalled the counseling services, particularly phone numbers to help students. Joseph recalled discussions about CourseSites, an online archive of instructional materials, ranging from handouts and assignment sheets to PowerPoints. Spencer found the resources to be repetitive, as he was already familiar with the information, but he reported recalling the session about the new MLA edition because that information was new to him.

Five of eight participants recalled the "Beyond Ethos, Pathos, & Logos: A Rhetoric Crash Course for Teachers" workshop; these participants were Ava, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer. This workshop consisted of a brief review of rhetorical theory, and it included microteaching lesson plans about *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*. Ava and Joseph found this workshop informative because it demonstrated how other people approached teaching these topics. For Ava, the workshop got her "into the swing of thinking about planning [her] own lessons," and Joseph identified potential lessons that he could "take and borrow" for future use. Liz, on the other hand, recalled the workshop because there was a contemporary debate used to identify Aristotelian appeals. She described this approach as "a little bit different, and it wasn't using the difficult old speeches that you use in secondary [education classes]." Mandy found the introduction and definition of terms as beneficial. She reported being familiar with the Aristotelian appeals but not *kairos* or *exigency*, so she appreciated this review because it further developed her understanding of the rhetorical situation. She noted, "The whole workshop thing was a

really good way to build on what I already knew from [previous institution].” Spencer, too, recalled the workshop for two contradictory reasons. For one, he recalled it because he was unfamiliar teaching the Comparative Rhetorical Analysis, which was a required writing assignment in the first FYC course. Because he was unfamiliar with this assignment, he recalled this workshop because it demonstrated pedagogical approaches for teaching Aristotelian appeals, which he would be teaching at the start of term. While he identified the workshop as useful, he also reported it as an overview because he was already familiar with this workshop and its purpose from attending a similar pre-service orientation during his MFA program.

Three of eight participants recalled “Using Active Learning from Day One” workshop, which emphasized first day of class activities. This workshop provided pedagogical strategies that aimed to get FYC students writing on the first day of class. Ava, Cornelius, and Mandy recalled an activity that required students to work in groups. The activity required them to come up with a series of items to get off of a deserted island. Ava reported that she typically “hat[ed]getting-to-know-you activities,” but she acknowledged that she enjoyed this activity. Mandy and Cornelius noted that they were accustomed to reviewing the syllabus on the first, but this workshop introduced an alternative first day lesson plan.

Two of eight participants, Ava and Mandy, recalled the “Scaffolding, Processing, and Transferring Galore!” workshop. In this workshop, three experienced PhD GTAs discussed how they scaffolded units in the first FYC course to encourage a writing process and the transfer of knowledge and writing skills. Ava recalled this workshop

because it modeled an in-class activity for workshopping individual paragraphs. She reported this workshop as a "cool" idea because she liked "the idea of breaking [the papers] up so that [students] are forced to kind of look at [the paragraphs] more closely, and they have less that they can just skim over when they read." Mandy found the workshop useful because it demonstrated how transfer operated among the assignments. She also reported that it could help students develop their assignments earlier, which was a problem that she had experienced at her previous institution. Though she noted that she did not know if the smaller writing process assignments, such as "turning in a thesis statement and a couple of paragraphs, and all that kind of stuff," would "necessarily work better or worse." Overall, she described the workshop as "good" because it demonstrated practical scaffolding of the assignments provided in UTK's standardized syllabus.

Two of eight participants, Mandy and Spencer, recalled "The Purpose of Stasis Analysis in 101" workshop. This workshop aimed to introduce instructors to stasis theory and the teaching of it, which was required for the Debate Analysis paper. Mandy briefly recalled the stasis workshop without elaborating any specific content. She noted that she was unfamiliar with stasis, and she reported that the workshop prepared her to teach it. Spencer, on the other hand, recalled the workshop due to his previous knowledge of stasis theory. Spencer reported, "Teaching stasis is like impossible. It's not impossible, but without that refresher and having somebody like [the Director of Composition] explain it to you all over again, you go, 'Oh, that's right. Okay, I have this. I can do it.'" When asked why he found this session useful, Spencer described his difficulty in grasping the concept, but he found the workshop beneficial because he had a better understanding of it

afterwards. Both participants experienced feeling better prepared to teach the Debate Analysis unit after this workshop.

One participant, Mike, recalled the "Understanding and Working with Accessibility" workshop. This workshop informed instructors about designing accessible syllabi and assignment sheets. Mike found this workshop "really interesting" because it challenged his understanding of accessibility in the classroom. The content, such as formatting syllabi and course policies, discussed in the session had "literally never crossed [his] mind" prior to the workshop. He reported remembering the workshop because it was "something new."

One participant, Liz, recalled the invited scholar's workshop and keynote address as "really helpful." The keynote address was about productive failure in the classroom and how to reflect-in-action to understand that teaching experience. Liz reported this discussion served as a reminder to take the time to reflect on teaching experiences. She noted how few teachers she knew took the time for reflection because they were "trying to get from point A to point B." Liz stated that reflecting was difficult because of busy teaching schedules. However, she reported that the workshop and keynote address taught her about the timing of reflection. Prior to workshop, she believed reflection needed to directly follow an event, assignment, or lesson; however, she learned that it could come any time "after the fact." She found this reminder helpful.

Overall, the most recalled workshop from UTK's pre-service orientation were the workshops and discussions about resources, which provide practical rules, regulations, and expectations from the department and university. These workshops familiarized

participants with available resources, which they were unaware of prior to attending the pre-service orientation. The second most recalled workshop was the "Beyond Ethos, Pathos, and Logos: A Rhetoric Crash Course for Teachers," which defined rhetorical terms and situated that terminology in how UTK's writing program used rhetorical theory in teaching FYC students. This information was applicable to the first major writing assignment, and some participants found the review beneficial. Some participants found the other practical workshops about first day activities, scaffolding major writing assignments, making documents accessible applicable to teaching, and reflecting on productive failures as beneficial. Participants reported that these workshops introduced them to new practices and ideas that could be applied directly to their pedagogical practices. When I analyzed participants' syllabi, I did not discover any annotated descriptions that contained subject matter or pedagogical approaches that echoed the material and practices demonstrated in the pre-service orientation. However, participants could have included that content in their pedagogical practices without recording it in their syllabi. The stasis workshop was recalled by, surprisingly, two participants. Stasis theory is not a common writing assignment, and I had presumed that more instructors would immediately recall this workshop because the theory was perhaps new and unfamiliar. However, Mandy was the only participant to recall it for that reason, whereas Spencer recalled it due to reported difficulties that he had experienced with the concept during his MFA program.

Impressions of UTK's Pre-Service Orientation. As for participants' overall impressions of the pre-service orientation, the most prevalent description of the

experience was boring, overwhelming and/or repetitive. Six of eight participants described their overall impressions of the pre-service orientation as "bored," "tedious," "repetitive," and/or "overload." Clara reported that the content from the workshops was "a lot of repeated information" that she had previously learned from prior teaching and WPE experiences, which led to her feeling "bored in workshops." However, she also reported that the workshops alleviated anxiety she had about beginning a new program because she was experienced in teaching. Clara also reported that the workshops were also an "information overload," which led to her comparing her prior experiences with what she was learning from the workshops. Cornelius, too, reported that the workshops were "tedious" and contained "a lot to take in in a short amount of time," though he understood that the content was beneficial. Liz, with her extensive history in teaching, found the workshops "overwhelming" and a little repetitive, particularly in discussions about classroom technology. Mandy experienced the workshops as a "blur" because there were several to attend. She felt overwhelmed in learning how to teach an entire course within three days but was overall appreciative that workshops were provided. Mike, too, reported that the workshops were "a lot in terms of like day-to-day" activities and events. He found the content as a review of information that he had either known or experienced prior to beginning this PhD program. He was able to recall the workshop about accessibility because it was not a review of information or pedagogical practices. Though it was overwhelming and repetitive, Mike did find the workshops as beneficial. Similar to Mike, Spencer found the workshops beneficial because the experience provided a refresher about teaching the curriculum. However, he described the pre-service

orientation experience as "tedious" and repetitive. Spencer noted that since he had participated in these workshops during his MFA program, he had heard the information before but aimed to listen for specific suggestions and strategies for teaching.

Four of eight participants reported that the workshops provided them with a better understanding of UTK's expectations and practices in comparison to their previous teaching experiences. Ava reported that the workshops helped her comprehend the syllabus, particularly in relation to her prior teaching experiences. Ava stated that the workshops inspired her to redesign how she scaffolded writing workshops or approached the first day of class. The workshops also reminded her of prior lesson plans she had used in the past. For example, the discussion about discourse community reminded her about a "cultural eye" lesson that she had previously taught. Because the expectations were similar to her prior teaching experiences, she noted that the experience "was kind of like a reassurance that what I was doing initially when I was teaching was like good….I feel like it meshes better with what I thought was good instruction." While Ava experienced a convergence of experiences and expectations, Cornelius, Liz, and Joseph learned how UTK' expectations and curriculum were different from their prior teaching experiences. Cornelius and Liz pointed out how workshops taught them about the required assignments, particularly noticing how they were different from what they were familiar assigning. Joseph, too, noticed the difference between his prior experiences and UTK's writing program, particularly its structure and expectations. He reported that the workshops helped to "pinpoint those areas" that needed modification or change. However, Joseph found that "a lot of [his prior teaching experiences] transferred and a lot

of that [was] still applicable here [at UTK].” It is unclear as to the extent of what experiences transferred in from his previous teaching to his current pedagogical practices. Overall, participants made sense of UTK’s writing program as it compared to their prior teaching experiences.

Most participants found UTK’s pre-service orientation as mixture of tedious, redundant, and overwhelming. Some participants made sense of their current WPE experiences through backward reaching transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). Participants compared their new learning with what they had learned previously from their prior WPE and teaching experiences, and they detected what was similar or unfamiliar. Because participants perceived the subject matter and pedagogical approaches as similar, their overall experience with the pre-service orientation was described as repetitive and boring. Nevertheless, the similarities were also reassuring that these GTAs’ prior experiences would be relevant for teaching in this new context. Writing pedagogy educators can learn from this data that first-year PhD GTAs are comparing their prior and current pedagogical knowledge and experiences, and with these comparisons, they are continuously prioritizing pragmatic pedagogical tools to facilitate their teaching. While some participants experienced backward reaching transfer to understand their new teaching context, it is currently unclear as to the extent of which these prior experiences compatibly connected with the theoretical underpinnings of the new context. However, by examining GTAs’ pedagogical knowledge, writing pedagogy educators can begin to discern the extent to which these prior experiences compatibly connected to the new teaching context.

Participants' Degree of Appropriation of UTK's Writing Program's Instructional Materials

After learning about participants' histories in writing, WPE, and teaching in the previous chapter, one question remained: How have these prior experiences impacted their ability to appropriate a new curriculum's instructional materials? At the end of the first interview, I asked each participant, "Did you use the standardized syllabus and assignment sheets? If so, why? If not, what changes did you make, and why?" There were two common responses:

1. I did not make significant changes to the standard documents because I wanted to experience the curriculum first, and
2. Because of teaching experiences, I mixed the content of the syllabus.

Five of eight participants claimed the former response, whereas the other three participants asserted the latter. Using Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia's (1999) "five degrees of appropriation," I have coded the first response as "Appropriating Surface Features" and the second response as "Lack of Appropriation."

While it appeared that five participants (Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, and Mike) were appropriating the standard materials (the first response), there was not any evidence that they understood the theoretical underpinnings of the course design, particularly in the scaffolding and teaching of the units. In fact, most of these participants reported a degree of uncertainty with the curriculum, thus appropriating the surface features. For example, Liz stated, "I did not change the assignments and all the other stuff just because I didn't know. I mean, it's the first semester. There's no way I'm changing anything." Similarly, Joseph stated, "Since I'm still learning the way it is here, I felt like if I'm going to use the standardized syllabus, it makes sense to use the standard

assignment sheets at least for this first semester until I get more comfortable with the textbooks and the curriculum and stuff." These participants recognized that, even with their prior teaching experiences, they still needed to learn the new curriculum by experiencing it via teaching with instructional materials provided by the department. Participants generally expressed trust in the FYC program's design, or as Mandy asserted, the program was "already very successful and already doing lots of really good things." Participants did not acknowledge any compatible connections between their reported prior curricula and new curriculum knowledge. Instead, they reported converting to the standard materials to develop experience and knowledge needed to teach the new curriculum. However, to convert, they could not disregard their prior experiences as they made sense of the new curricula via backward reaching transfer, which limited their comprehension of the new context to surface features that were perceived to be similar.

While these participants did not make significant changes to the instructional materials, there were reports of minor reuse of materials or policies. The most common report of small change was putting the annotated master syllabus into a table format for the course calendar. Cornelius and Mike conceptually appropriated this table format from an experienced PhD GTA's syllabus. The course content from the standard materials were used in the table format, though they condensed the descriptions to be briefer. Mike explained this abbreviation as a means of providing more flexibility in teaching. Keeping the formatting of the course calendar, Mandy abbreviated the descriptions because she was more familiar with a shorter, briefer syllabus from her previous institution. She kept the descriptions because they helped her teach the course for the first time. Cornelius

reported reusing weekly writing assignments in his course, but those assignments were connected to the daily tasks or assignments provided in the standardized syllabus. For example, Cornelius changed the medium of the Comparative Rhetorical Analysis worksheets to a writing task; the spirit of the assignment was unchanged. Cornelius also reused a point system instead of alphabetical letters for the course's grading system; he also included an internet access policy in his syllabus, which was reused from a prior institution's syllabus. These changes did not alter the standardized syllabus and assignment sheets conceptually. Joseph, too, added a policy to the standard. He adapted the late work policy to allow for one paper to be turned in fourteen hours late without questions asked or penalties assigned; this part of the policy was reused from a prior institution's syllabus. Joseph also did not adapt (i.e., lack of appropriation) one daily activity in which students were to write to a younger audience; the assignment was designed for audience awareness. Joseph altered the assignment to have students write to their future selves to establish outcomes for themselves as students. As for Liz, she added a more detailed communication policy that encouraged students to contact her via BlackBoard or UTK email. Additionally, the policy included a statement about responding to emails over the weekend. Because these changes were not significant revisions to the content and function of the standardized syllabus, I coded the participants' as appropriating surface features of the new curriculum's materials and design, with the exception of Joseph's assignment change, because participants were learning about the curriculum through conversion. They did not demonstrate a conceptual understanding of course design and curriculum objectives prior to this conversion.

Three participants (Ava, Clara, and Spencer) reported that they reused or adapted their prior experiences into the design of the standardized syllabus. This deviation and thus perceived lack of appropriation could be identified as resistant. They altered the syllabus, and they made such decisions based upon their prior experiences. For example, Ava admitted that she was resistant because she did not "like being told what to do." She stated, "I've taught for two years already; I know things." While Ava, Clara, and Spencer could be labeled as resistant, their "Lack of Appropriation" does not necessarily equate to rejection. In terms of adaptive transfer, lack of appropriation could be the reusing or reshaping of those prior experiences to navigate complexity, conflict, or unfamiliarity, and these participants' explanations for the changes they made presented a more complex narrative beyond that of rejecting the course design.

For example, Ava reported reusing prior teaching experiences and materials in her UTK syllabus for two reasons: conflict and unfamiliarity. She reported feeling "not familiar with the way that everything is scaffolded and everything, and [she had] never done it before." She described how the new curriculum was unfamiliar:

> It probably would have been in my best interest to just leave everything, but then, I was like reading the descriptions of each day, and I'm like I don't know what that means. I don't know what you're telling me to do. So, then I got all nervous that I wouldn't do it right, and then it would be terrible and would look like I didn't know what I was doing. So, that's why I was resistant to it.

Ava's description points out that she was unfamiliar with expectations of the curriculum and feared that she would not succeed in teaching. For these reasons, she reused instructional materials, such as the cultural eye discourse community activity, from her prior teaching context. She also reported altering the first assignment sheet. Instead of

assigning two texts for students to rhetorically analyze, she allowed students to freely choose their own texts as long as they connected to the course "in some way." These changes were evident in the submitted instructional materials, and she added that these changes provided more flexibility in her teaching. While she reused or altered materials, she also appropriated one lesson from UTK's pre-service orientation: the first day activity about the deserted island. Noted in her course calendar, she adapted it for her first day activity. So, though she reported being resistant to the new syllabus, she did not outright reject the curriculum and values but reused materials or altered lessons to negotiate perceived conflict and unfamiliarity.

Similarly, Clara reported that she "mashed up" her prior teaching syllabi with UTK's standardized syllabus due to experienced complexity and conflict. Throughout the first semester, Clara reported working from three separate documents, which were submitted in the .zip file of instructional materials. The first document was a "bare bones" schedule for the students to follow. Specifically, Clara found that the design of UTK's syllabus and course schedule was too complex because it did not "fit the way [her] mind works," which "follow[ed] the format on the spreadsheets." She expressed a desire to be transparent with her students as to what her expectations were of them, and by reformatting the course schedule into spreadsheets, her expectations were laid out in "bare bones." The second document was UTK's schedule, which she reported "using to help build [her] classes." The third document consisted of her lecture notes, which were personal annotations about the subject matter from the required textbook. Additionally, Clara reported a conflict with UTK's revision policy, which required two revisions.

Instead of appropriating the policy, she adopted a policy from a fellow peer's syllabus. This peer was an experienced GTA in the PhD program. When asked about this change, she reported that two revisions were "too much, too much of a chance to mess things up and too much work for [her] to agree to take on" as a graduate student. Clara added that opportunities for revision increased the likelihood that students would deliver "crap work" if they knew there were opportunities for revision. In regard to the revision policy and the "mash up" of instructional materials, Clara's lack of appropriation stemmed from a conflict between prior teaching experiences and the expectations and design of this new curriculum.

Spencer, unlike the other participants, was more familiar with UTK's FYC curriculum because he received his MFA and prior WPE from UTK. Because of this familiarity, Spencer adapted the syllabus and instructional materials to reflect his prior experiences. At the beginning of the year, the Composition Office had altered assignment sheets to better meet the needs of FYC students. Spencer, however, did not appropriate these revisions: "I think I changed the word length in the first paper to be a bit shorter. I think it was 1000 words on the template; I changed it to 750. That's just from experience in the writing center." This change was evident in his submitted instructional materials. Spencer's prior experiences in the writing center informed his decision to not appropriate the new teaching assignment sheet. Prior to the revision, the assignment was in fact 750 words, which the Composition Office deemed to be too constricting for students to complete a comparative rhetorical analysis. Because the previous assignment sheet was familiar, he decided to reuse the outdated assignment sheet without considering the

department's rationale. Additionally, Spencer changed due dates and daily class work, which were evident in his syllabus and course calendar. For class work, he reported typing up his own lesson plans as well as "steal[ing] stuff" from the department's shared instructional materials provided on CourseSites. From his submitted instructional materials, I discovered that he appropriated a plagiarism PowerPoint, a PowerPoint from Purdue's Online Writing Lab about rhetorical situations, and student samples from CourseSites. In his syllabus, the policies and other assignments followed the standard materials, but he changed the course calendar to be in the format of a table, which he borrowed from an experienced PhD GTA. While Spencer did appropriate some surface features of assignments and policies, but he did not convey any conceptual understanding of the course design as provided in the annotated syllabus. He also had a lack of appropriation when it came to the due dates, daily activities, and the first assignment sheet. This lack of appropriation stemmed from a conflict between his prior knowledge and the current curriculum expectations. Because he did not perceive the underlying structure of the scaffolding, activities, and assignments, he did not adapt the changes. Instead, he relied on what was familiar.

Ava, Clara, and Spencer reported significant changes to the standardized syllabus and assignments sheets, and while these reports could be perceived as resistance, their decisions to reuse previous materials stemmed from reported experiences of complexity, conflict, and unfamiliarity. They attempted to converge their prior teaching and WPE experiences into the design of the new curriculum at UTK, whereas the other participants attempted to convert to the new materials and practices by teaching the curriculum

without significant changes. For the participants who appropriated the standard instructional materials, they reported wanting to learn through trial and error instead of attempting to connect their experiences to the new curriculum. Because they did not report understanding the conceptual underpinnings of the scaffolding and overall design of the curriculum, they were appropriating identifiable surface features of the curriculum. Whether participants converted or adapted, none of the participants reported an understanding of the purpose or function of the FYC program's design.

Curriculum Knowledge

After asking participants about their recollections and impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation and the development of their instructional materials, I inquired about participants' understanding of UTK's writing program's curriculum objectives. In the previous chapter, I learned that participants did not possess the academic discourse or theoretical knowledge to identify the curricula paradigm of their prior teaching contexts. If participants struggled to identify their prior curricula, to what extent will they be able to identify the curriculum of a new teaching context? Identifying participants' curriculum knowledge is important because the conceptual framework of the curriculum informs teachers' pedagogical practices and objectives. If participants do not conceptually understand their teaching context's curriculum, then to what extent are they implementing it? To learn about experienced, first-year PhD GTAs' curriculum knowledge, I examined how they perceived curriculum objectives values immediately following pre-service orientation in Interview 1 and again in Interview 2. Additionally, in the second interview, I asked participants about how they met those objectives in the

classroom and any challenges they may have experienced in teaching the curriculum. They were also asked about any resources they drew upon to help them teach the curriculum. Most participants detected either the label of curricula paradigms or surface features of curriculum objectives based on recurring themes and practices from the standardized instructional materials. Because they struggled to connect the underlying structure of the curriculum with their pedagogical experiences and knowledge, they demonstrated that their curriculum knowledge was theorized insufficiently.

Interview 1

AT UTK, the FYC composition program was grounded in two theoretical paradigms: transfer and rhetoric. The curriculum was designed to teach FYC writers how to transfer rhetorical knowledge in addition to other knowledges, such as discourse community, genre, subject matter, and writing as a process, into various new or unfamiliar writing contexts (Beaufort, 2007; Fishman & Reiff, 2008). Because these paradigms were central to the structure and instruction of the FYC program, I examined participants' degrees of appropriation for comprehending the curriculum's theoretical underpinnings. Table 8 provides a brief review of the degrees to which participants appropriated the curriculum's theoretical concepts of transfer and rhetorical theory.

Most participants (7 of 8) had a lack of appropriation of rhetorical theory; these participants did not recall or detect rhetoric as being a part of the curriculum and therefore did not appropriate it. Liz was the only participant who mentioned audience awareness as a curriculum objective. Because she only mentioned a small part of

rhetorical theory, she appropriated the label of the curriculum without demonstrating how the comprehensive theory functioned within the curriculum.

Table 8

Curriculum Knowledge: The Degree to Which the Theoretical Concepts Were Appropriated

Participant	Transfer Theory	Rhetorical Theory
Ava	Appropriating a Label	Lack of Appropriation
Clara	Appropriating Surface Features	Lack of Appropriation
Cornelius	Lack of Appropriation	Lack of Appropriation
Joseph	Appropriating Conceptual Underpinnings	Lack of Appropriation
Liz	Appropriating a Label	Appropriating a Label
Mandy	Appropriating Surface Features	Lack of Appropriation
Mike	Lack of Appropriation	Lack of Appropriation
Spencer	Appropriating Surface Features	Lack of Appropriation

As for transfer theory, participants' degrees of appropriation were more divergent. Ava, Clara, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer emphasized the process of applying writing skills to any or future writing contexts. Clara and Mandy referenced both backward and forward reaching transfer processes, whereas Spencer mentioned forward reaching. Their reports demonstrated an appropriation of surface features, such as how transfer operates within and beyond FYC courses. Ava and Liz, however, referenced the transferability of

general writing skills, but they did not discuss high road abstraction of knowledge like forward and backward reaching transfer. Their reports were limited to the label of transfer theory. Mike and Cornelius, on the other hand, identified neither a label nor surface features of transfer theory and thus had a lack of appropriation for understanding the curriculum's objectives. Joseph was the only participant whose reports conveyed an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings. Joseph emphasized teaching adaptation and abstraction to facilitate students' transfer of learning. He reported aiming to develop students' foundational skills in writing and thinking, and from that foundation, students could abstract and repurpose that learning for new or different contexts. Joseph's comprehension of teaching for transfer demonstrated his knowledge and awareness of the curriculum that went beyond the label and surface features.

As noted above, participants did not detect the dual curriculum paradigms of UTK's FYC writing program. Most participants' immediate understanding of the curriculum within 1-2 weeks after UTK's pre-service orientation was transfer theory, but not all participants were able to identify this curriculum paradigm. Some participants reported "writing across modes and courses" and "rhetoric," whereas others did not have the academic discourse to identify curriculum objectives and values. Table 9 provides a brief overview of how each participant identified the curriculum objectives of UTK's writing program.

Table 9

Participants' Reported Objectives of UTK's Writing Program's Curriculum

Participant	Transfer Theory	Writing across Modes and Courses	Rhetoric	Did Not Respond/Did Not Know
Ava	X			
Clara	X			
Cornelius				X
Joseph	X			
Liz		X	X	
Mandy	X			
Mike				X
Spencer	X			

Five out of eight participants (Ava, Clara, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer) identified the curriculum as transfer-based, though Clara and Mandy expressed doubt about their responses. Ava reported that the FYC program's curriculum objective was to teach FYC students to transfer general writing skills that can be applied to "any writing situation." Whereas Ava's comprehension of the curriculum was to teach transferable general writing skills, Clara, Mandy, and Spencer perceived the curriculum as preparing FYC students to write in future classes, which is akin to Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward reaching transfer. In fact, Clara explicitly mentioned backward and forward reaching transfer; she described the teaching of the curriculum as helping students learn how to

apply writing to future writing contexts. Then, she added that it would be the "student's job to be able to go back in their memory and say this is what I learned in this place and this is how it is applicable here." While Clara described the process of backward and forward reaching transfer, she expressed doubt about whether her understanding was correct. Similar to Clara, Mandy defined the curriculum as transfer, i.e., the application of past learning to future learning, and she, too, expressed doubt about her understanding of transfer. Spencer understood the curriculum as teaching students to "make the thing look like the thing." When asked to explain the answer, he defined it as "being able to take what you're using in one class and apply it to another class." Spencer's understanding of the curriculum was based on the notion of forward reaching transfer. Joseph, on the other hand, reported that the curriculum was about teaching students to adapt their thinking and writing for new contexts. He described the curriculum as helping students build "a strong base of ways of thinking about reading and writing and ideas and knowledge and seeing how you can apply it to seemingly unrelated fields or concepts." For Joseph, the curriculum was aimed to teach students how to abstract their learning in a way that both built off of prior knowledge but was also amended to fit the new context appropriately. For all of these participants, the curriculum aimed to develop FYC students' writing skills and knowledge for later use in other writing contexts or coursework.

Whereas Ava, Clara, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer explicitly noted that transfer was the curriculum's emphasis at UTK, Liz's response was a bit more nuanced and could be interpreted as either the transferability of general writing skills or the objectives for Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), as defined in the previous chapter (Thaiss &

McLeod, 2014). She reported that the curriculum emphasized "teaching writing across any course work or mode," which is more closely associated with WAC initiatives, such as preparing students to write "beyond the curriculum" of an English course (Thaiss & McLeod, 2014, p. 294). While Liz provided this description for UTK's FYC curriculum, she added, hesitantly, that she believed transfer theory originated from this idea that writing instruction should extend beyond the English classroom. Though Clara and Mandy expressed doubt about the validity of their definitions of transfer, they still provided explicit descriptions of the curriculum as transfer-based. Liz, on the other hand, reported more uncertainty about the concept; she stated, "I don't know. I'm still learning about it." She did not describe the curriculum as teaching students writing skills that were applicable to other courses; for her, the curriculum's goal was to teach general writing skills. She added to her understanding of the curriculum as audience-based, which was the first response from a participant that alluded to the curriculum being rhetoric-based.

As for the other two participants, Cornelius and Mike were either uncertain or did not know UTK's curriculum objectives and values. Cornelius did not answer the question; instead, he discussed the program's values of writing academically and professionally without plagiarizing. Mike, on the other hand, reported difficulty in answering the question. After some time to think about the question, he responded, "Nothing's popping up at the moment. I'm trying to think what I'm doing in my life." Cornelius and Mike were unable to identify the curriculum paradigms, but when they were asked to define terms like "transfer" and "rhetoric," they were able to provide definitions, which will be discussed further in "Discourse Community Knowledge."

While they could define the terms, they could not connect the definitions to the curriculum structure and philosophy.

From this data, participants were able to detect the significance of transfer theory in the design of the FYC curriculum within 1-2 weeks post pre-service orientation. Most participants who detected transfer theory comprehended surface features of the theory, such as the application of learning to another context, but they did not describe how the theory functioned beyond future or general application. There were two participants, Ava and Liz, who provided a curriculum label, but they did not describe any key features associated with that label. Joseph, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of explicit instruction in teaching students how to abstract and repurpose their learning for various writing contexts. Joseph demonstrated that he understood how the theory informed pedagogical practices to have an outcome of writing transfer. As for the other participants, only one was able to detect rhetoric as a significant curriculum paradigm. Participants, in general, were unable to connect the recurring rhetorical knowledge in the standardized syllabus and textbooks with transfer theory. While most participants provided curriculum objectives, two participants were unable to detect connections between how they defined terms like rhetoric and transfer theory to UTK's writing program's curriculum.

Interview 2

After approximately two months of teaching the curriculum, I asked participants about what they identified as the curriculum's focus for UTK's writing program. Additionally, I asked participants to report how they promoted that curriculum, whether

they experienced any challenges, and whether they drew upon any resources to help them teach it. Participants' comprehension of UTK's curriculum's theoretical underpinnings fell into three categories: transfer theory, rhetorical theory, or research and analysis. In the first interview, participants similarly identified the curriculum objectives with a couple distinct differences. The first difference was that two participants, Cornelius and Mike, either did not answer or did not know the curriculum objectives, which meant a lack of appropriation. The second difference was that Liz reported two curriculum emphases, rhetoric and writing across modes, in Interview 1, but in Interview 2, she only reported rhetoric. In the second interview, no one reported not knowing or not answering, and Ava and Mike were the participants who reported two curriculum emphases in Interview 2. Additionally, participants' curriculum knowledge either remained the same, progressed in understanding, or altogether changed. Table 10 provides a comparative analysis of participants' reported curriculum objectives and the degrees of appropriation.

As for the most common reported curriculum emphasis, four of eight participants reported that transfer was the curriculum for UTK's FYC program. Ava, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer defined transfer as the process of applying what students learned in their classrooms to future writing contexts or classes. For Joseph and Mandy, they identified transfer theory because of how the assignments were scaffolded throughout the first FYC course. This scaffolding was important for transfer of learning because assignments built off one another, leading to an application of writing skills from the previous assignment into the next one. While Joseph and Mandy connected scaffolding to the curriculum's emphasis of transfer theory, Joseph emphasized abstraction and adaptation as part of the

Table 10

Curriculum Knowledge: Comparative Findings from Interview 1 and Interview 2 about Participants' Reported Curriculum Objectives and the Degree of Appropriation

Participant	**Interview One**		**Interview Two**	
	Curriculum Objectives	**Degree of Appropriation**	**Curriculum Objectives**	**Degree of Appropriation**
Ava	Transfer	Label	Transfer	Surface Features
			Primary and Secondary Research	Label
Clara	Transfer	Surface Features	Rhetoric	Label
Cornelius	Did Not Answer/ Did Not Know	Lack	Rhetoric	Label
Joseph	Transfer	Conceptual Underpinnings	Transfer	Conceptual Underpinnings
Liz	Transfer	Label	Rhetoric	Surface Features
	Rhetoric	Label		
Mandy	Transfer	Surface Features	Transfer	Surface Features
Mike	Did Not Answer/ Did Not Know	Lack	Analysis and Research	Lack
Spencer	Transfer	Surface Features	Transfer	Surface Features
			Rhetoric	Surface Features

Note. Degrees of Appropriation were shortened to contain the key label.

curriculum's emphasis of transfer; he believed these skills developed first-year writers' "core value system in writing and composition," which they then can "translate" into other classes or "areas of their strengths." Whereas Joseph saw the purpose of the curriculum as teaching thinking and writing skills, Spencer identified that teaching the transfer-based curriculum entailed instructing students about the importance of audience, purpose, and genre because these concepts were applicable to other majors and communicative tasks. Ava's initial response was transfer; she reported, "We want whatever we are teaching to be applicable to basically any course that they can take that's writing intensive at UTK." This response changed her earlier report from transferring any kind of writing to forward reaching transfer of writing knowledge and skills. In response to this question about curriculum knowledge, she added teaching primary and secondary research as another component of UTK's curriculum. After experiencing the curriculum, these participants perceived the curriculum as preparing students for writing in future contexts.

After asking participants described their understanding of the FYC curriculum, I asked them how they promoted transfer theory via their pedagogical practices. Ava and Spencer reported explicit teaching of genre awareness. They expressed a desire for students to see beyond genres typically associated with English courses and to identify genres in other courses or, as Spencer reported, in different mediums, e.g., "conversation over the phone with your mom." In fact, I observed Spencer teaching genres through comparison in both classroom observations; he had students compare genres as they switched major writing assignments as well as visual genres such as TED Talks. Joseph,

on the other hand, reported leading discussions that explained how smaller tasks could be abstracted and applied to a different writing task. For example, he recalled this teaching strategy:

> One of the things we've been working on is looking at readings and stuff that we've used in previous essays and how we can adapt the way we speak about them and talk about them and pinpoint aspects of the discussion or the conversation that's taking place and apply it to something sort of completely new.

Joseph's strategy aimed to build and scaffold lessons in way that facilitated a transfer of learning and/or skills. Moreover, this scaffolding aimed to help students adapt discussions and points of view to new learning contexts, such as readings and conversations. In the classroom, he referred to adaptation as "reskinned" topics, which he discussed as students repurposed their Position Papers for an Academic Audience for a Public Audience. Similarly, Mandy reported assigning "research and thinking activities" that required students to problem-solve issues. However, her expressed hope in this strategy was to develop her students' interest and motivation in learning from the activities "instead of just blowing it off," not critical thinking skills as Joseph described. Mandy did not discuss how problem-solving activities promoted transfer, and I did not observe any activities that asked students to problem-solve. From these reports, participants promoted transfer differently from each other, but they all reported promoting connections either through class discussions or activities.

When these participants taught for transfer, they encountered two distinct challenges in teaching this curriculum paradigm. The first challenge was getting students to understand transfer. Ava reported challenges in connecting assignments from her class with what students would encounter in other classes or future writing contexts. Similarly,

Spencer reported, “It’s difficult to get them to click onto it, I think. The idea we are already doing this; we do it every day. We act and communicate differently according to who our audience is and what context we’re speaking or writing.” For Spencer, audience, purpose, and genre were the key components of transfer, and to understand these concepts would mean that transfer was possible. Both Ava’s and Spencer’s respective solutions for this teaching challenge were to be more explicit in teaching. Ava said, “Maybe I could make the transfer more specific.” Ava implemented this solution in by giving explicit reminders of how discussions and assignments were applicable to other contexts or classes at least once a week. Similarly, Spencer reported designing clear lesson plans that explored various audiences and their expectations and demonstrated how that affected the genre and style of writing.

The second challenge was student burnout. Joseph and Mandy reported challenges with the course theme, which was interwoven into all four assignments in the first FYC course. They perceived students as burned out with the course topic due to scaffolding and connections among the assignments. Joseph stated, “Just because our assignments are so built into one another that a lot of times, by the third essay at this point, I can see the burnout in some of the students with these themes and ideas.” Similarly, Mandy reported student complaints that she had received in one-on-one conferences where students expressed boredom with the themes and ideas. Mandy’s solution was to encourage students to dig deeper into the topic and discover their interests within the topic’s broader scope. Joseph, too, reported encouraging students to think more broadly about the topic, but he also added that he varied the readings to demonstrate

how the discussion could be expanded.

While participants implemented solutions to address these experienced challenges, they also drew upon resources to teach for transfer. The most common resources were the textbooks provided by the department. Ava, Mandy, and Spencer referenced textbooks such as *Rhetorical Choices*, *The Writer's Harbrace Handbook* (*WHH*), and *They Say, I Say* as guides for teaching the curriculum. All three textbooks were included in the standardized syllabus. The first textbook was custom-made to fit the first FYC course, whereas the *WHH* was comprehensive handbook for writing. In the standardized syllabus, the third textbook was used for the provided writing templates that guided students toward putting sources in conversation with one another.

The second most common resource was CourseSites, an online archive of instructional materials available to UTK teaching instructors. Mandy and Spencer reported using instructional materials from the site. For example, Mandy reported using PowerPoints from UTK's pre-service orientation about stasis theory along with other handouts about the topic that were provided on CourseSites. She reused these materials because she was less familiar with the concept. However, when she started teaching more familiar subject matter like argumentation, she no longer referenced the site. Spencer, too, reported using the online archive for student example papers and videos that were linked to Purdue University's Online Writing Lab (OWL). Specifically, he reported using a video about the rhetorical situation.

As for other resources, Ava and Joseph drew upon prior experiences or conversations with peers. Ava reported relying on prior teaching experiences and

instructional materials. Specifically, she reported reusing lesson plans about research and writing annotated bibliographies; she also reported scanning and assigning chapters from the textbook that she had previously taught from during her master's program. This textbook emphasized genres, which was what she reported for how she promoted the transfer of learning. Joseph, on the other hand, reported talking with fellow peers from his cohort, specifically listening for activities that either did or did not work well. Based on those conversations, he would "plan [his] weeks according to see what's working for [his peers]" by incorporating that information into his pedagogical practices. Additionally, he reported conversations with the Associate Director and Director of Composition, which gave him insight into teaching the first FYC course. However, these conversations were about proposing the second FYC course, and those conversations helped him to "rethink some of the things [he was] doing." He reported planning to change the selected readings in his current course the next time he were to teach it. Overall, resources ranged from reused instructional materials to appropriated materials such as CourseSites documents or textbooks, and participants used these resources to teach UTK's transfer-based curriculum.

While Ava, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer reported transfer as the curriculum objective for UTK's writing program, Clara, Cornelius, and Liz reported rhetorical theory. Clara and Cornelius based their responses off the design of the required assignments. Clara, for example, reported that the curriculum's aim was "building and crafting various different kinds of arguments" and "examining arguments from different angles." To teach these skills, she emphasized rhetorical strategies such as Aristotelian

appeals. Similarly, Cornelius understood the purpose of the assignments as "building students up to be able to complete" the assignments. Part of this building was through rhetorical examination, or what he termed as dissection. Cornelius reported teaching students to "dissect what they read through either rhetorical elements or the stasiscase." Rhetorical elements would be the Aristotelian appeals, and "stasiscase" referenced the hierarchical arrangement of stasis issues (conjecture, definition, quality, and policy). Cornelius adapted this terminology from the Director of Composition's pre-service workshop on teaching stasis theory. While Clara and Cornelius mentioned specifically Aristotelian appeals, Liz mentioned other rhetorical elements of the curriculum, such as context-based, discourse community, and audience. She believed that the curriculum was heavily situated in context- and audience-based teaching: "I definitely feel like it's strongly grounded in your audience and that message you're trying to get to your audience, whether it just be an analysis, or an evaluation, or an actual opinion." For Liz, the rhetorical situation was the curriculum's emphasis. For these participants, they were able to discern this curriculum paradigm through the act of teaching the standardized instructional materials. They detected rhetorical theory because concepts like rhetorical situation, Aristotelian appeals, and stasis theory were emphasized in the standardized instructional materials and required textbooks.

As for promoting rhetorical theory in the classroom, Clara, Cornelius, and Liz approached the concepts through different pedagogical strategies. Clara emphasized one-on-one conferences to get a better sense of how her students were thinking critically and rhetorically about the assignments. She also mentioned encouraging small group work

and the Socratic Method to help them become problem-solvers, which I observed. After group work, she reported and was observed bringing the class back together to share and review what they discovered from the work. Cornelius, on the other hand, emphasized repeating rhetorical terminology throughout the discussions about assignments, which he did in both classroom observations. He stated, "I'm bringing the rhetorical elements back into the conversation much more, and, of course, still mentioning things about the stasiscase" in discussions about the third assignment, which was the Position Paper for an Academic Audience. Cornelius believed that previous assignments, discussions, and readings should be "carried over" and be applicable to later assignments, which was why he promoted the curriculum through repeating terminology. Liz, who believed the curriculum was audience-centered, reported talking about audience "probably every class." She reported bringing up questions about who the audiences were for readings and papers. Those discussions would turn to analyzing and comparing discourse community values. In the second classroom observation, I observed Liz asking students questions about audiences for different Op-Ed examples; I did not observe her comparing discourse community values, as was outlined on her syllabus. Nevertheless, through either active discussion about audience and critical thinking or repeating terminology, these participants aimed to promote rhetorical theory in these reported and observed pedagogical practices.

When it came to teaching a rhetoric-based FYC curriculum, these participants reported experiencing teaching conflicts, ranging from unfamiliarity to students' expertise. As for unfamiliarity, Clara's direct response to the question about teaching

challenges was "not really running into many" beyond teaching students to develop their arguments instead of offering uninformed opinions in class debates. However, at the beginning of the interview, I checked in with Clara to see how she was adjusting to teaching. Her response was a reported conflict that she was experiencing with the curriculum. She stated:

> My general motto right now is just be more transparent…And it's kind of a shit show. I think part of it is because I was so comfortable with the curriculum that I was teaching before that I was…It didn't ever feel like it was a shit show, so it's not really…. It's like…I think this is actually probably what your dissertation is supposed to be about, right? There's these things that are popping up that things that I didn't anticipate because the curriculum… Like, the things were being provided to me, I'm just taking them, and I'm giving them to my students. And there's discrepancies, and I can't account for them because they're not my things, right?

Clara's response conveyed a conflict with teaching a curriculum in which she had not designed but inherited from the Composition Office. She reported experiences of not being able to answer questions about discrepancies, such as number of sources for an assignment. The document contained a typo of the number of sources, and she did not know which one was preferred by the department. Another reported conflict was that the department provided an overview document for the instructor and an assignment sheet for the student. The overview document was aimed to inform the instructor about the assignment's purpose and parameters. Clara reported giving the instructional document to her students, which led to confusion within her class. Because the curriculum and instructional materials were new and unfamiliar, Clara experienced conflict in teaching the assignments. To manage this conflict, she reported being transparent with her students by informing them that she, too, was a student. Cornelius, too, reported a conflict but in

regard to being unfamiliar with stasis theory, which was used in the Debate Analysis assignment. He reported not knowing it but having to teach it. He reported being familiar with the Aristotelian appeals because he had taught that content at his previous institution, but this rhetorical theory was new to him. Like Clara, his solution was also transparency. He informed his students that he was a student who was teaching something "little bit different" from what he had previously taught.

The second challenge was managing teaching in regard to students' expertise. Liz reported challenges in reaching her students, who she described as "young." These students did not have "a large cache of experience of different types of audiences," which inhibited their ability to actively discuss audience and discourse community in the classroom. Liz reported that her teaching style was having a dialogue with her students about course topics such as audience. Because students did not have experience or expertise in different types of audiences, she found the dialogue element of her pedagogical practices challenging. She reported having to teach them how to dialogue by asking them questions and stimulating conversations in one-on-one conferences. She found that the conferences were generative spaces where students began dialoguing with her about the course assignments and topics.

In addition to conferences or being more transparent in pedagogical practices, participants drew upon resources (e.g., textbooks, peers' instructional materials, CourseSites, and personal experiences) to help them teach the curriculum. Both Clara and Cornelius reported using the textbook, *Rhetorical Choices*, and the instructional materials such as the standardized syllabus and assignment sheets to help them teach. Clara also

reported designing her own rubrics, which helped her examine the "criteria of the assignment as it's laid out on the assignment sheet." Cornelius added that he drew upon another textbook, *They Say, I Say,* as well as an experienced PhD GTA's syllabus. He noted that the graduate student shared her syllabus to provide an optional approach to the course beyond the standardized syllabus. He described it as a "practical use syllabus" that he used to learn more about "how the other students are, the other GTAs, are applying what needs to be done." Liz also reported relying on what other experienced GTAs did via CourseSites, which she used "a lot" for readings, presentations, and rubrics. In addition to CourseSites, she reported turning to her "prior experience in teaching writing and what [she] thought worked to get people to relate to the assignment more." These experiences were from the years of teaching prior to enrolling into UTK's PhD program, and she reported that she drew from her experiences of teaching a genre-based curriculum. She noted how she had to "adjust" approaches by "stretching" her thinking to make the course "relevant" and not "boring." One example she provided was her adjustment to teaching brainstorming in the current curriculum more than she had in previous experiences. She reported spending more time teaching brainstorming because "it's a different approach to the theme" than what she would have done, which was to discuss audience. Some of the brainstorming activities that she reported required students to explore different audiences and values, but it was more frequent in this course than in previous experiences.

Whereas most participants reported either transfer or rhetorical theory as the curriculum's emphasis, one participant, Mike, reported analysis and research as the

writing program's emphasis. Mike's response was in comparison to his prior teaching experiences at his previous institution. He found that there was a heavier emphasis on "research and stasis and those kinds of analytical skills" at UTK. While he mentioned stasis, he did not present the concept with its rhetorical implications but emphasized the theory's analytical process. He also noted that the writing program's curriculum prioritized "higher level stuff and not the basics." Higher level stuff meant critical and rhetorical thinking skills, whereas basics entailed teaching how to compose a unified paragraph. Mike reported promoting these curricular values by repeatedly talking and conferencing about stasis theory; however, he did not mention stasis theory in the two classes I observed. He also noted that students struggled to develop those higher order thinking skills that were required by the curriculum. He believed that the students would understand it better in "two years" because they "weren't there yet." He reported challenges with students unable to complete the stasis paper correctly, and he would return to "teach[ing] it again and again and again." He found the process of having to repeat and clarify the teaching as taking away from the time he had to teach students "a basic lesson on how to use commas or something like that." Mike did not report any unfamiliarity with stasis theory, but his experiences with these challenges pointed to a conflict of familiarity. He continued to compare his current experience in context of his prior teaching experiences, and he expressed a desire to teach the writing skills, such as paragraph unity and comma usage, that were emphasized at his previous institution.

Beyond teaching the content repeatedly, Mike reported drawing from resources such as CourseSites, Google, and peers. From CourseSites, he reported appropriating a

PowerPoint presentation about patchwriting and plagiarism, which was presented during UTK's pre-service orientation, and an online video about stasis "directly in class." He also reported using other unspecified activities and noted that he "looked at some lesson plans and rubrics" from the online archive. He was also a self-proclaimed "Googler" because he would Google lesson plans and activities on nights he planned lessons. He stated that he would search online to see how other people approached their teaching of similar topics. In addition to online instructional materials, he reported seeking advice from peers within the program. He would share what was occurring in his course and would ask other GTAS, typically more experienced within UTK's curriculum, how they approached the problem or task. Mike did not mention any particular peers' names; he only reported general conversations. He found the advice from more experienced GTAs helped him to teach the curriculum.

In both Interview 1 and Interview 2, I asked participants to describe their understanding of UTK's writing program's curriculum objectives. By comparing participants' responses, their curriculum knowledge either remained the same, progressed in understanding, or altogether changed within two months of teaching the curriculum. There were two participants, Joseph and Mandy, who defined and described their curriculum knowledge similarly in both interviews, thus their expression of curriculum knowledge remained the same. In Interview 1, Joseph reported transfer as the curriculum emphasis, particularly emphasizing abstract, critical thinking and adaptation. Joseph reported transfer theory in Interview 2, and his curriculum knowledge appropriated conceptual underpinnings. His response emphasized abstraction and adaptation again,

and he believed that critical thinking skills formed students' core writing skills, which then could be "translated" into other contexts to develop students' strengths and weaknesses. Mandy, too, spoke in ways that suggested she remained unchanged in her understanding of transfer theory. In the first interview, she noted that she aimed to develop students' writing skills for future writing courses and contexts. Continuing to emphasize forward reaching transfer, Mandy described how course activities and assignments were scaffolded to offer opportunities for future application. Her description of transfer remained at the level of appropriating surface features.

While Mandy and Joseph remained unchanged, there were three participants who further developed their degrees of appropriation in curriculum knowledge. The descriptions and reports from Ava, Liz, and Spencer showed an increase in understanding one of UTK's writing program's theoretical concepts. Ava and Liz reported a limited understanding of the curriculum in Interview 1. They both reported key terms without acknowledging surface features of the respective theory. Ava developed her understanding of transfer theory because, at first, transfer involved the development of general writing skills. In Interview 2, Ava emphasized the forward reaching aspect of transfer theory by aiming to develop students' writing skills for future application, which was similar to Mandy's understanding. While Ava's description of transfer theory developed, she also added an additional curriculum focus: primary and secondary research. These research methodologies were not applicable to the first FYC course, and at the time, she was preparing a course proposal for the second FYC course, which does emphasize these methodologies. Nevertheless, primary and secondary research skills

were a small part of the transfer- and rhetoric-based curriculum objectives for the writing program, and I have labeled this knowledge as appropriating a label. Liz, who reported two curriculum emphases in Interview 1, only provided one emphasis in Interview 2: rhetorical theory. Liz's understanding of rhetorical theory became more nuanced that her initial description of emphasizing audience. In Interview 2, she emphasized developing students' audience awareness as well as the discourse communities in which the audiences were situated. Additionally, she emphasized context-based approaches to writing, such as rhetorical situation. These descriptions went beyond the label of rhetorical theory as she included more surface features of rhetorical theory. These additional descriptions demonstrated that she connected a broader concept of rhetorical theory to the curriculum objectives, thus signaling a development in the degree of appropriation—from appropriating the label to appropriating surface features. Spencer, too, expanded upon his previous answer of transfer theory in Interview 1, where he described transfer theory as forward reaching, which was appropriating surface features. Spencer's second description of the curriculum's emphasis included developing students' awareness of audience, purpose, and genre. His curriculum knowledge incorporated rhetorical and transfer theory, particularly noting how rhetorical knowledge helps students transfer learning. Additionally, he emphasized genre awareness; if students were aware of different genres and the conventions required for those systems, then students would be better prepared to transfer learning and writing skills. This inclusion of transfer and rhetorical theory elevated Spencer's curriculum knowledge from appropriating surface features of transfer only to incorporating surface features of both transfer and

rhetoric.

Similar to Spencer's change of curriculum knowledge, three other participants altered their initial responses in the second interview. Clara first reported that the curriculum's emphasis was in transfer theory, but she changed that response to rhetorical theory. She emphasized the curriculum's objectives of introducing students to Aristotelian appeals and examining communication from various angles. She did not mention forward and backward reaching transfer as she did in the previous interview. Cornelius, too, changed his initial response from a did not answer/did not know to rhetorical theory. Similar to Clara, he emphasized the teaching of Aristotelian appeals and stasis analysis. Both Clara's and Cornelius's respective responses demonstrated appropriating the label of rhetorical theory. They understood the significance of analytical activities; however, they did not describe how the theory informed or developed students' writing skills. The terms mentioned were the ones emphasized in the first two required writing assignments of the first FYC course. Mike, too, went from did not answer/did not know to providing a response. He reported that the curriculum's emphasis was analysis and research, and while these are features of the curriculum, he did not mention rhetorical or transfer theories in his descriptions. And while he discussed stasis theory in Interview 2, it was within the concept of analysis that the curriculum emphasized. Because Mike did not report transfer or rhetorical theory as the curriculum objective, I labeled his curriculum knowledge as a lack of appropriation. Mike struggled to make sense of UTK's curriculum objectives, and he often referenced his prior teaching experiences to help him understand the teaching objectives for this new context.

However, that backward reaching transfer misguided Mike's understanding of UTK's curriculum. Because he understood the importance and value placed on research and analysis in his prior teaching context, he applied these objectives to UTK's curriculum. He did not detect the structural and philosophical differences between his prior and current teaching contexts. For this reason, he did not demonstrate an understanding of UTK's curriculum via label or surface features in the second interview.

Overall, participants' curriculum knowledge either further developed or altogether changed after experiencing the curriculum. Three participants' reports demonstrated a more detailed comprehension of curriculum values, whereas three other participants altered their initial conceptions of the curriculum. While changes were limited to labels or comparisons, it was a shift toward considering rhetorical theory as part of the curriculum's conceptual framework. In fact, Spencer's development meant the inclusion of transfer and rhetorical theories, and his comprehension was beyond labeling parts of each theory. Whereas in Interview 1, Liz reported both theories via labels, but in Interview 2, her curriculum knowledge developed to emphasize only the rhetorical theory aspect, thus lack of appropriating transfer theory. As Liz shifted her focus from both to rhetoric, Clara, too, shifted her curriculum knowledge from transfer theory to rhetorical theory. As for Joseph and Mandy, their current experience with the curriculum did not affect their curriculum knowledge, as they provided the same or similar response to their initial interviews. Table 11 provides a brief overview of participants' degrees of appropriation for both transfer and rhetorical theory; these findings are based on Interview 2 responses.

Table 11

Curriculum Knowledge: The Degree to Which the Theoretical Concepts Were Appropriated

Participant	Transfer Theory	Rhetorical Theory
Ava	Appropriating Surface Features	Lack of Appropriation
Clara	Lack of Appropriation	Appropriating a Label
Cornelius	Lack of Appropriation	Appropriating a Label
Joseph	Appropriating Conceptual Underpinnings	Lack of Appropriation
Liz	Lack of Appropriation	Appropriating Surface Features
Mandy	Appropriating Surface Features	Lack of Appropriation
Mike	Lack of Appropriation	Lack of Appropriation
Spencer	Appropriating Surface Features	Appropriating Surface Features

Rhetorical Knowledge

Considering that UTK's writing program emphasizes rhetorical theory, I inquired into participants' experiences with rhetorical knowledge, e.g., Aristotelian appeals, appropriateness, audience awareness, rhetorical situation, and stasis theory. I asked participants about their extent of comfortability in teaching rhetorical theory and what benefits, if any, were gained from teaching it. Additionally, I inquired about the extent to which, if at all, rhetoric informed their course design, instructional materials, and pedagogical practices. Participants experienced comfort when teaching familiar rhetorical

theory and discomfort with unfamiliar rhetorical concepts. Their degree of familiarity with rhetorical theory stemmed from reported prior educational and teaching experiences. As for how rhetoric informed their pedagogical practices, most participants, either explicitly or implicitly, adapted rhetoric to construct their pedagogical identity and practices. While most participants adapted rhetorical theory to inform their pedagogical practices, there were two participants who struggled to abstract and repurpose rhetorical theory to inform their pedagogical practices.

Comfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory

I asked participants what they felt comfortable teaching in regard to rhetorical theory. Most participants responded that they were most comfortable teaching rhetorical concepts like Aristotelian appeals and rhetorical situation. Five of eight participants (Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) reported experiencing comfort when teaching rhetorical concepts like Aristotelian appeals, audience awareness, and purpose. These concepts were most familiar to them. Cornelius was the only participant who specifically mentioned teaching these concepts prior to UTK. As for the other participants, they reported having a strong foundation in the subject matter prior to teaching it at UTK. I also observed these participants being visibly comfortable in teaching rhetorical concepts like the rhetorical situation and Aristotelian appeals during classroom visits. For example, Cornelius drew the rhetorical situation on the board as well as annotated it to align with the Aristotelian appeals. He then led a discussion about the employment of rhetorical appeals in a sample article, and he returned to this style of teaching in the second classroom observation. Similarly, Mandy and Spencer included

rhetorical analyses of sample texts and led class discussions about those rhetorical moves in their teaching, too. These participants did not demonstrate a visible discomfort in teaching this subject matter. They were quite flexible in both probing students to think about responses and accepting various evidence-based interpretations that students provided. And they naturally returned to these concepts to connect to class activities throughout the observed class sessions.

Some participants reported experiencing comfort in teaching stasis theory. Four of eight participants reported this experience, and only one participant, Ava, reported prior experiences with stasis theory. Ava reported teaching the concept at a prior institution. She noted that the concept was difficult to teach at first but is what she "like[d] to teach the most." Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer reported feeling comfortable teaching the concept after teaching it. Prior to teaching stasis theory, they reported feeling "nervous," but the process of preparing and actually teaching the concept increased their understanding as well as confidence in teaching it. Joseph noted that he explored CourseSites assignments and instructional materials, which helped him feel better prepared to teach it. Spencer reported developing teaching strategies and learning the debates prior to teaching the subject matter. He noted, "Unless I understand it myself, I can't fake it." He reported making himself understand by sitting down with the material until "it clicked." Ava, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer reported feeling confident with stasis theory only after experiencing it, whether that was prior to or after enrolling into UTK's PhD program.

The third common experience was teaching rhetorical argumentation, either through examining arguments or developing persuasive arguments, which was reported

by Clara and Liz. Clara reported that she was comfortable helping students break down argumentation to discover "main claims," and as reported, I observed her encouraging students to interrogate the sample texts by examining and breaking down arguments in sample Op-Eds. Liz, on the other hand, reported that she was familiar teaching anything that entailed "persuasion." She specifically mentioned feeling comfortable teaching counterarguments and managing ethos, or what she described as "being as unbiased as you can be." For example, in the second classroom observation field notes, I noted how Liz encouraged students to think about writers' *ethos* by evaluating their construction of credibility and inclusion of evidence. Liz and Clara reported experiencing these comforts, which were found in their pedagogical practices, because they were familiar with these concepts and practices.

From these findings, participants' reported comfort teaching rhetorical theory that they had either taught previously or understood from personal experiences. Participants had reported prior experiences or knowledge with rhetorical concepts, such as Aristotelian appeals, or argumentation. Because of these prior experiences, participants connected familiar features to aid in their teaching of rhetorical theory at UTK, which affected their comfort and possibly confidence in teaching rhetorical theory.

Discomfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory

After gathering what participants felt comfortable teaching, I inquired about any discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory. The most recurring response was teaching stasis theory. Four of eight participants reported stasis theory for one of two reasons: 1. It was new and unfamiliar, or 2. It was complex. Cornelius and Mike reported that stasis theory

was new and unfamiliar to them; for these reasons, they reported discomfort with teaching it. Cornelius stated he was "still learning it and fe[lt] less confident about [his] own knowledge of it." As Cornelius was learning the theory, Mike, too, reported no prior teaching experiences with stasis theory. Like Cornelius, Mike reported that the subject matter was new to him. As for Liz and Spencer, they reported the difficulty of understanding stasis theory's complex framework. While Spencer reported he felt more comfortable teaching stasis theory after teaching it, he also noted that he experienced some discomfort in the "really hairy" aspects of the theory. Specifically, he reported an experience when he had prepared to teach mapping the debate by learning and identifying the issues within it. However, the debate was open to interpretation, and when doing this activity in class, students interpreted the issues differently. Spencer had preset interpretations of the debate from his preparation, and when those were challenged by students, the teaching became "challenging." He noted that he saw this "switch gears" during the pre-service orientation workshop about stasis theory, and because of this irresolute aspect of the theory and its application, Spencer noted that the process was "not totally clear." Liz, on the other, had reported difficulty in teaching students how to distinguish the differences between issues of conjecture and definition. She noted that conjecture was "an abstract concept," making it difficult for students to grasp. Despite this discomfort, Liz returned to teaching stasis theory when she taught both position papers. Overall, these participants reported discomfort in teaching stasis theory because it was new and complex.

The second most recurring discomfort was teaching the rhetorical situation, which

both Ava and Joseph reported. Ava stated that the concept was "a little weird" for her. She surmised that she experienced this discomfort because she had not used it in previous teaching experiences. Since she had not taught it before, she did not have "a very good grasp of exactly what the rhetorical situation is." Because she was unfamiliar with the concept, she reported that she "glossed over it a little bit." Nevertheless, when I observed her teaching, she often asked students to identify explicitly the purpose of assigned genres and encouraged students to explain how particular writing tactics, such as fallacies, appeal to an audience's values and beliefs. From this observation, Ava demonstrated a tacit understanding of teaching rhetorical situation. Joseph, on the other hand, provided specific terms associated with the rhetorical situation that were "tricky" for him. These terms were "exigence" and "*kairos.*" He noted that he was "working through" the concepts. For example, I observed him asking students about the timeliness of the message for the audience. While students struggled to respond, he turned to the textbook to provide definitions and added examples relevant to the course topic. He reported that these terms were difficult for him to comprehend, and he expressed hope that through teaching it, then the concepts would "fall in." Based on the classroom observation, I noted that such "working through" did "fall in" for Joseph because he demonstrated appropriate use and teaching of the terminology.

Clara reported discomfort in teaching Aristotelian appeals because she had no prior experience in teaching it. She noted how students were coming into the classroom with prior knowledge about the appeals, and while they were familiar with the terms, she found the appeals within "a gap in [her] knowledge." She noted that rhetorical theory was

"something that [she had] to work more on as an instructor to make it clear to [her students]." She reported this discomfort as challenging because she could not "anticipate" students' problems and because it was ultimately new for her as well. Because the Aristotelian appeals were new to her, she reported that discomfort stemmed from "an ethic[s] thing, or like a confidence thing." She reported experiencing pressure to ensure she was teaching the correct concepts and definitions. I observed this discomfort during the second classroom observation. When the class was reviewing an in-class activity that required a genre analysis of an Op-Ed, she asked students about the author's use of Aristotelian appeals. Students only addressed the inclusion of statistics, and she did not probe students to think about the author's appeals to *pathos* or *logos*. Instead, she shifted the class discussion to the effects of the article, as in whether students experienced a reaction to the author's call to action. Throughout this class, Clara's discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory was noticeable in how she curtly asked and addressed rhetorical theory in relation to the sample writing, and often without explaining or exploring rhetorical moves, she shifted the focus to topics in which she felt more comfortable discussing, such as students' emotional responses or writing tips.

From these findings, participants' reported discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory that stemmed from their unfamiliarity with concepts, such as stasis theory, rhetorical situation, or Aristotelian appeals. Most participants' reports compared their prior teaching experiences to the discomfort of teaching new concepts that were required to teach in UTK's curriculum. Because there was no prior knowledge or experience of these rhetorical concepts, participants reported some discomfort in teaching the new

and/or complex material. There was only one participant, Mandy, who reported not feeling any discomfort in teaching any rhetorical theory.

Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory

After inquiring about what parts of rhetorical theory participants experienced dis/comfort teaching, I also inquired about what perceived benefits, if any, they found in teaching rhetorical theory. The most recurring response was for transfer or everyday application, which four of eight participants reported. Ava was the only participant who mentioned transfer specifically. She stated:

> In terms of accomplishing the university goals of transfer, I think that rhetorical theory is probably the most useful way to accomplish that, and that's probably why we have such heavy focus on that especially initially. If [students] understand stasis theory and stuff like that, it's easier to see how that might be transferable.

Ava believed that rhetorical theory provided students with a framework and writing tools that could be used in other contexts or courses. More generally, Cornelius, Mandy, and Spencer somewhat agreed in versatility and applicability of rhetorical theory to other communicative tasks. They described the benefits of rhetorical theory being found in various examples and analogies to demonstrate that various mediums contained rhetorical aims and were constructed via Aristotelian appeals. Spencer described this applicability as a potential "awakening" for students to become more "skeptical" about their interactions and readings and to understand how rhetoric informed everyday communication. For these participants, rhetorical theory was a tool for transfer, and I observed them teaching this tool by applying it to various mediums (e.g., op-eds, open letters, blogs, and academic articles) in their classrooms, as they reported.

While most participants reported transfer and everyday application, two participants, Clara and Mike, reported developing students' thinking and voice as a benefit of teaching rhetorical theory. Both Clara and Mike noted that rhetorical theory encouraged students to "step back" and to examine work, people, and topics from different angles. Mike mentioned that rhetoric encouraged students to think about how they constructed their communication, and I observed Mike using the rhetorical situation and Aristotelian appeals to examine the construction of *logos*. In a class activity, students evaluated an author's message by using the STAR (*S*ufficient, *T*ypical, *A*ccurate, and *R*elevant) criteria. He informed students that this method could be applied to examining evidence as well as their own writing, and he encouraged them to "play devil's advocate" when evaluating the message. What Mike reported to be beneficial in teaching rhetorical theory was also evident from this classroom observation. Similar to Mike, Clara noted how that understanding rhetorical theory helped students develop "their own voice and their own thoughts" to participate in debates. Clara believed that students could pinpoint their strengths and weaknesses in how they developed their communication, and from those pinpoints, they could "strengthen their voice." While it is possible that Clara used rhetorical theory to promote students' voices in other classes, I did not observe these connections during my class visits, but that could be due to the purpose of the class sessions, which was to introduce a new assignment. Nevertheless, in interviews, Mike and Clara reported that rhetorical theory ultimately benefited students by developing their thinking and voice because it provided a means of constructing arguments and thus authorial voice.

Liz found the benefits of teaching rhetorical theory as helping students develop their overall writing. Specifically, she noted how rhetorical theory "drives" the structure, evidence, and tone of writing. Rhetorical theory informed how students composed their arguments and determined the kinds of evidence needed to support the message. I observed Liz encouraging these skills by teaching students to analyze first the audience, particularly what they valued, and then to evaluate the credibility and applicability of evidence. When she taught the Position Paper for a Public Audience, Liz asked students to check hyperlinks in online Op-Eds and to determine whether the inclusion of those links or evidence was appropriate for the audience and purpose. Because Liz found the development of these skills as beneficial, she structured her classes to include rhetorical examinations of evidence and audience.

While most participants reported how rhetorical theory was beneficial for student writers, Joseph reported that rhetorical theory was a beneficial teaching tool. He found the emphasis on the "core concepts" or terminology as beneficial, as that created familiar, common discourse that the class drew upon in discussions and writing. This common discourse, Joseph reported, was consistently referenced throughout assignments, discussions, and readings. He found that students' exposure to this repetition helped them to recognize the employment of terminology and how that application changed per situation. Joseph experienced the inclusion and reuse of terminology as beneficial for teaching the application of rhetorical theory, and I observed him using rhetorical theory as a learning touchstone for each assignment. I discuss these observations in the following subsection.

Overall, participants found teaching rhetorical theory as beneficial for their students, whether that was developing students' general writing or thinking skills. One surprising finding was how participants found rhetorical theory amenable to transfer or everyday application, as four of eight participants reported the versatility and applicability of the theory to everyday communication. This finding was surprising because participants had not reported both rhetorical and transfer theory as UTK's curriculum focus; the curriculum focus was either one or the other (with slight exceptions in the cases of Liz and Spencer; see "Curriculum Knowledge"). Joseph was the only participant who reported rhetorical theory as beneficial for teaching. He thought the use of terminologies functioned as a touchstone for teaching writing as well as a common language that he and his class shared. Ultimately, participants perceived rhetorical theory as a helpful tool for writing, teaching, or thinking.

Rhetorical Theory in Pedagogical Practices

In addition to ascertaining the extent to which participants found rhetorical theory beneficial and comfortable, I also inquired whether rhetorical theory informed their pedagogical practices, i.e., their teaching persona, lesson plans, assignments sheets, etc. Rhetorical theory informed participants' pedagogical practices in one of two ways: 1. They applied the rhetorical situation, either explicitly or implicitly, to their teaching, or 2. They found themselves reinforcing key terms in teaching and assignments.

Six of eight participants applied concepts from rhetorical theory, such as Aristotelian appeals and rhetorical situation, to their pedagogical practices. Participants commented on whether or not this application was explicitly or implicitly directed to

their pedagogical practices. Four participants, Cornelius, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer found that they explicitly considered rhetorical elements of their pedagogical practices. As Spencer put it, "Obviously, teaching is a rhetorical situation. I have an audience. I have a purpose. I have a message. There are definitely ways in which I have had to adjust how I communicate." This idea that teaching was a rhetorical situation was echoed by Cornelius and Liz. They noted how they had an audience, purpose, and message. They mentioned how they thought critically and rhetorically about approaching their teaching to their students. Both Cornelius and Liz reported reflecting about their lessons or lectures to determine whether their approaches would reach their students. Spencer recalled integrating videos and breaks within his course to keep students engaged, which would help them "absorb the message." As for Aristotelian appeals, Cornelius noted that he considered how he framed his discussions, particularly if he were making *pathos* arguments, and amended those to include more facts or evidence. Mandy specifically mentioned *ethos*. She noted how aware she was of her age and position of authority in the classroom. She recalled thinking, "Okay, well, I'm also young, and I look like them, so how do I present myself as somebody that they learn from instead of somebody that they buddy around with." Mandy reported thinking about her teacher *ethos* more toward the beginning of the term, where it would set the tone for the course. All of these participants explicitly considered their students, their authority, and their lessons in context of the rhetorical situation and/or Aristotelian appeals. They relied on these analyses to determine how they structured and approached their pedagogical practices, which varied per class, or audience.

Clara and Mike also mentioned either rhetorical situation or Aristotelian appeals in their responses, but they noted that, that thinking was implicitly directed. Similar to Spencer, Clara noted how "everything is a rhetorical situation," meaning that there was always an audience, purpose, and genre. While she reported that it was important to dissect these concepts, she found herself doing that as "an unconscious thing." She reported being aware that her class met at 8 AM course, and because of this early meeting time, students may feel tired and thus unresponsive. She was also aware of class meetings where she perhaps was not "on top of [her] game," which negatively affected the class dynamic. In these scenarios, she noted how she would need to adapt her teaching to fit the "rhetorical situation," which she identified as a "weird mashup between like a student-centered and teacher-centered approach." So, while she was aware of her audience and their needs, she would not explicitly think rhetorically about the situation but would adapt her pedagogical practices to fit the classroom dynamic. Mike, too noted that he did not think "meta" about "rhetorically acting as [he's] teaching." He reported that he focuses on the Aristotelian appeals "because how could you not be somehow appealing to your students." However, he never reflected about his teaching or classroom dynamic in terms of rhetorical theory. In these reports, Clara and Mike noted how rhetoric applied to teaching and the classroom, but that was after being asked about how rhetorical theory informed their pedagogical practices.

While the most common report was rhetorical theory or Aristotelian appeals, two participants, Ava and Joseph, reported that rhetorical theory informed their pedagogical practices because they found themselves reinforcing the concepts in their teaching and

assignment sheets. Ava noted that she did not have any formal experience in rhetorical theory prior to teaching first-year composition, and she believed that rhetorical theory had not affected her pedagogical practices, at least in way that she "could quantify or talk about sensibly." However, prior to this response, she reported that she used rhetorical theory to "carry through the same ideas throughout" her pedagogical practices. Ava noted how she reinforced key terms or concepts throughout the course. These concepts were incorporated into her assignments sheets, activities, and discussions, but she reported that the terminology reinforcement was not necessarily "dictated by rhetorical theory." Nevertheless, I observed Ava returning to rhetorical terminology in both classroom observations. In the first observation, Ava emphasized purpose and audience awareness when constructing arguments, and in the second observation, this emphasis was more noticeable. When teaching the Position Paper for a Public Audience, she lectured on the differences in purpose between the previous (Position Paper for an Academic Audience) and current assignments. She asked students to define "discourse community" as well as identify values held by specific audiences. In fact, she asked students to conduct a rhetorical analysis of an example Op-Ed to familiarize themselves with the genre and rhetorical moves associated with it. This return to rhetorical concepts that were established at the beginning of the term was how she perceived rhetorical theory informing her pedagogical practices. The subject matter itself was tied to her pedagogical practices, whereas some participants perceived rhetoric as being flexible and applicable to the shaping of their pedagogies, i.e., how they approached teaching subject matter.

Similar to Ava, Joseph found this question "tricky" because he reported that

rhetorical theory functioned as the "foundation" for "lessons and stuff like that," but he noted that was pre-existing in the standardized syllabus, which was "nice to have." He reported looking at the standardized syllabus and determining which rhetorical strategies that he would need to focus on in his teaching, and he would use those strategies as "touchstones for each of the units." I observed him returning to rhetorical theory key terms in both classroom observations. For example, in the first classroom observation, he returned to Aristotelian appeals and the rhetorical situation. He also asked students, "How does *kairos* tie into argument?" As a class, he and students discussed these rhetorical concepts in relation to the new assignment (Position Paper for an Academic Audience), and then he assigned students to complete a handout that reinforced this discussion. In the second classroom observation, he used rhetorical theory as a touchstone for transitioning to the Position Paper for a Public Audience. He reviewed the new assignment sheet and asked students to identify the audience's values as well as the rhetorical situation. When students were broken into groups to analyze sample Open Letters, I overheard him instructing one group to think about the author's employment of Aristotelian appeals. In class lectures and in private discussions, Joseph returned to rhetorical theory in the teaching of both assignments. As reported, he reinforced rhetorical terminology, i.e., the subject matter, as a central part of his pedagogical practices, and like Ava, he did not convey how the theory could be flexibly applied to approaching his situated classes.

Most participants, either explicitly or implicitly, considered their classrooms as rhetorical situations, which determined their teacher personas, pedagogical practices, and/or lessons or assignments. Most participants mentioned that they had somewhat

considered their students as their audience, and with them in mind, they adapted their lessons, or messages, to fit their needs. Participants who explicitly applied the rhetorical situation and Aristotelian appeals to their pedagogical practices demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings of rhetorical theory. These participants adapted rhetorical theory from student writing to the classroom environment, thus demonstrating a conceptual understanding of the concepts and new means of using the theory. Participants who implicitly applied either rhetorical situation or Aristotelian appeals to their pedagogical practices demonstrated, at least verbally, an appropriation of surface features. In thinking about the question, they were able to apply one of the concepts to their pedagogical practices, but that application did not apply to either the conceptual whole of rhetorical theory or their teaching.

Whereas most participants applied rhetorical theory to their classroom, two participants identified the inclusion and reinforcement of rhetorical terminology as to how rhetorical theory informed their pedagogical practices. Because UTK's curriculum emphasized rhetorical analysis and stasis theory, these terms were interwoven throughout the standardized syllabus and assignment sheets, which meant that teachers, ideally, would use and reinforce the terminology throughout the first FYC course. Ava and Joseph detected surface features of rhetorical theory that they needed to teach their students. However, they did not apply those features to their pedagogical practices beyond repeatedly returning to rhetorical terminology. For this reason, their rhetorical knowledge in regard to their pedagogical practices was limited to the subject matter and was coded as appropriating a label. For their rhetorical knowledge to develop, they would

need to consider explicitly or implicitly how rhetorical theory informs their pedagogical identities, practices, and values.

Genre Knowledge

UTK's writing program required first-year PhD GTAs to teach from a standardized syllabus and assignment sheets. Participants were required to teach four major writing assignments: Comparative Rhetorical Analysis, Debate Analysis, Position Paper for an Academic Audience, and Position Paper for a Public Audience. The assignments, with the exception of selected readings, were standard for all participants. Participants had more freedom in genre selection for the fourth assignment, Position Paper for a Public Audience. While the standard assignment suggested an Op-Ed, participants could select a different genre (e.g., PSA, advertisements, multimodality, etc.) as long as it was aimed toward a public audience. The idea behind this assignment was to apply the same argument from the Position Paper for an Academic Audience but adapt it for a public genre and audience. Even though genres were given to participants for most assignments, I wanted to explore participants' recollections of major assigned genres and the reasons for why they perceived these assignments as required. By investigating their recollections and rationale for the four major writing assignments, I can assess the extent to which they detected the conceptual underpinning for teaching these specific genres in UTK's FYC curriculum. From this examination, participants did not detect the theoretical purpose for requiring the four major writing assignments; moreover, most participants did not recall all the genres that were provided to them. I also examined their degree of comfort in teaching genres, which demonstrated participants' familiarity with genre

theory. Participants reported comfort when teaching genre types and conventions via analysis or rhetorical theory and discomfort in teaching either unfamiliar or similar genres.

Assigned Genres for Major Writing Assignments and Rationales for Assigning Genres

Four of eight participants (Clara, Cornelius, Liz, and Mike) recalled all four major writing assignment genres. They mostly referred to the Debate Analysis assignment as either Stasis Analysis, which the assignment required students to employ, or Exploring an Argument. As for the fourth assignment, Clara did not report the genre she had chosen for the assignment, but her instructional materials showed that she had given students a choice between an Op-Ed or a poster. Cornelius, Liz, and Mike provided students with an editorial option, whether that was a Letter to the Editor, an Op-Ed, or an Editorial. Liz also required her students to write a "teaser post" for social media about the Op-Ed, and Mike gave his students an option between the Editorial or a Blog.

As for why these participants assigned these genres, they all reported that the curriculum required them, and Liz did not expand upon this reasoning. Cornelius extended his rationale to explain why he thought the genres were assigned. He noted that the first two analytical assignments provided a foundation for students to construct their own academic or public arguments. The analytical assignments taught students to consider their own *pathos* and *logos* as well as determine the kinds of evidence they would need to persuade their readers. Clara, on the other hand, did not provide a rationale for why the genres were assigned beyond their requirement, but she noted that her "expectations" of the genres were "not clearly defined." She emphasized that her

"primary expectation" was to help students develop thinking skills. Mike extended his explanation to include his reasoning for selecting the fourth assignment's genre options. He stated, "I don't know what I would call… It's the easiest one, which doesn't sound great, but for my first semester, I was trying not to do too much until I got a real feel for the curriculum." Because Mike had the choice, he selected a familiar genre in which he perceived as "easy" for him to teach in an unfamiliar context; he believed this tactic would help him adjust to the new teaching context. Clara, Cornelius, Liz, and Mike were able to recall all four genres, and they reported assigning those genres because they were required by UTK's writing program. Of these four participants, Cornelius was the only participant who detected the significance of the first two analytical assignments because those provided students with foundational writing skills to be applied to the latter two assignments. As for Clara, Liz, and Mike, they did not detect the theoretical significance for assigning and scaffolding these genres within the FYC curriculum. They accepted and trusted the writing program's requirement of assigning these genres. Clara, however, did express frustration in not comprehending fully what to expect from teaching those particular genres.

While half of the participants recalled all four major assignments, there was one participant, Ava, who recalled three genres: Comparative Rhetorical Analysis, Position Paper for Academic Argument, and Op-Ed (Public Argument). In her response, Ava noted that the Comparative Rhetorical Analysis was different from her previous teaching experiences where she taught a rhetorical analysis, and while the genres were "same idea," they were "a little different." As for why she assigned these genres, she reported

that was what writing program required and what "corresponded to the assignments." She did not provide further explanation as to why those were required by the department and thus did not detect the theoretical underpinnings for how genres functioned within the FYC curriculum. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the genres she did recall was due to her prior knowledge and familiarity in teaching similar genres.

As for the remaining three participants (Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer), they recalled two genres, which varied per participant. Both Joseph and Mandy recalled the Debate Analysis and Position Paper for Public Audience. Joseph provided students with an option of choosing either an Op-Ed or Open Letter for the public argument, whereas Mandy assigned a Blog. As for the other two assignments not mentioned, Joseph reported that names were "super fuzzy." Mandy, on the other hand, referred to them generally as "academic papers." Spencer recalled the Position Paper for an Academic Audience and for a Public Audience, and for the latter of which, he assigned advertisements. Spencer neither mentioned nor referenced the first two analytical assignments when discussing genres specifically.

As for why these genres were assigned, Joseph and Spencer referenced the curriculum, whereas Mandy reported the "goal of the class," which was "teaching [students] to write within an academic environment." She noted that the formal academic writing conventions were what students should "take away" from the course. Spencer did not provide further explanation, but he provided a suggestion to "switch it up a bit more." He did not provide any suggestions about what that would entail. Joseph, on the other hand, provided a rationale similar to Cornelius's. He reported that he taught the genres

that were required by the writing program but added that he "like[d]" and even "love[d]" how the assignments were scaffolded and thus prepared students for the next assignment. In fact, he explicitly mentioned how the assignments encouraged transfer: "I like that there's something in each one [assignment] that very clearly transfers to the next one. There's clearly a building process between the four papers." He described the connections between stasis analysis and developing an argumentative proposal, a minor genre that he assigned. While participants only recalled two genres, they reported that they assigned those genres because that was either the design of the curriculum or the goal of the course. Of these three participants, Joseph was the only participant who detected the role genres played within the structure of the curriculum. The other two participants rationalized the assignment of the recalled genres because those were typical for first year writing courses.

Overall, only half of the participants recalled the required genres for which they were responsible in teaching. The most recalled genre was the fourth assignment, which was the one where participants had the freedom to select their own genres. Because the writing program provided the purpose, context, structure, and scaffolding for most of the major writing assignments, most participants relied on teaching them as designed without critical examination. For this reason, Ava, Clara, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer demonstrated an appropriation of the genre labels. They detected neither how the genres facilitated students' transfer of learning nor how the genres influenced their instruction of rhetorical theory and writing as a process. Only two participants, Cornelius and Joseph, thoughtfully examined the reasons for the required genre assignments, and they detected

how the genres built off one another to facilitate students' transfer of learning. This detection demonstrates their appropriation of surface features of genre knowledge within the curriculum. While Cornelius and Joseph detected and connected genre assignments to the underlying conceptual underpinnings of the curriculum, most participants were unable to detect this connection due to their acceptance of and reliance on the standardized instructional materials. Without identifying how curriculum objectives shaped the course design and informed the genre selection, GTAs will not perceive a need for recalling the genres or for teaching the required genres. In fact, Ava, Clara, Cornelius, and Liz did not detect and connect the underlying theoretical structure of the curriculum with the assignment of genres. Without this knowledge, they broadened the scope of the fourth assignment, which prevented students from transferring their academic arguments into a public genre for a public audience. If GTAs do not examine why genres are assigned and how they function within the course design, then they will not implement the correct writing assignments and, more than likely, will deviate from the curriculum.

Reported Comfort in Teaching Genres

When I asked participants about what they felt comfortable teaching in regard to genre, their interview responses overlapped minimally and were mostly diverse. As for minimal overlaps, there was one recurring answer. Some participants (Ava, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) reported comfort when teaching genre conventions through either comparing genres or providing the structure, whereas the other four participants (Joseph, Liz, Clara, and Cornelius) experienced comfort in teaching genres via writing processes

or rhetorical theory. While their interview responses overlapped minimally, their pedagogical practices demonstrated a common trait in teaching genre awareness. Participants, with Mike as the exception, often taught genre awareness through rhetorical theory.

Ava, Mandy, Mike and Spencer, reported comfort when teaching genre by emphasizing typical conventions, which they taught via analysis and/or comparison. Ava reported that her comfort stemmed from prior teaching experiences because she taught from a textbook that emphasized genre approaches to writing. She reported reusing the textbook and some assignments (e.g., brainstorming and outlining activities) in teaching genres at UTK. When I observed her, I did not see any reuse of these materials, but it is possible that she reused them in other class periods. I did observe her in the second classroom observation teaching genre through comparison. She asked students to compare and contrast genres between the Position Paper for an Academic Audience and the new assignment, which was an Op-Ed; she even created a table to note the comparisons provided by students' responses. In a class discussion, she also asked students to think about appropriate rhetorical appeals (e.g., anecdotal evidence) found within the example and how those were associated with the genre and intended audience. Ava's pedagogical approach to teaching genres demonstrate her tacit knowledge about how genres function rhetorically.

Mike, too, was observed having students compare genres of Op-Eds and open letters; however, his pedagogical approach emphasized analysis of structure instead of rhetorical theory. Prior to comparing the genres, he did have students analyze the

conventions and layout of each genre, such as font type and size, inclusion of bylines and bios, and paragraph structure. When asked as to why he felt comfortable teaching genre this way, he reported that he had not put too much thought into why. Mike's pedagogical approaches did not demonstrate any tacit knowledge of how genres function rhetorically. His experienced comfort stemmed from what he knew and could identify via genre analysis, which he modeled for his students.

Mandy taught genres through teaching the structure of the genre and the audience's expectations. Mandy did not explain why she felt comfortable teaching genres this way; nevertheless, she was observed teaching students to consider their audience's needs when designing blogs. For example, she demonstrated how the use of color, pictures, and themes affected audience's needs and thus the author's rhetorical purpose. Mandy's pedagogical approach demonstrated her tacit understanding of the relationship between genre and rhetorical theories.

Spencer approached teaching genres via analysis and comparison of what he termed as the "container" for writing. Genres as "containers" was an important metaphor for Spencer because he believed writing took on different shapes for different purposes and audiences, which demonstrates how he perceived the symbiotic relationship between genre and rhetorical theories. This comfort was evident during my classroom observations. In the first observation, he drew a container on the white board and defined it based on features and form by using popular and academic examples. Spencer's container approach was comfortable for him because it helped students "make the thing look like the thing," which was what he reportedly wanted to convey through his teaching

to his students about genres (see "Discourse Community Knowledge").

These minimal overlaps demonstrated how only four participants' reported comfort in teaching genre conventions, whether that was through teaching structures, audience's needs, or genre comparisons. It is important to note that Ava, Mandy, and Spencer demonstrated tacit knowledge about how genres can function rhetorically, which they emphasized in their pedagogical practices. Participants' comfort could also stem from familiarity, as was the case for Ava. She explicitly reported prior knowledge and experience in teaching genres that were similar to those assigned at her previous institution. Mike's comfort in teaching genres possibly stemmed from familiarity, too. Though he did not have the discourse to express this familiarity, he demonstrated comfort in teaching genre conventions and form when I observed him modeling a genre analysis of an Op-Ed for his students. Mike was also the only participant who neither report nor was observed teaching genre awareness through rhetorical theory.

As for the other interview responses in regard to reported comforts when teaching genres, some responses were writing-centric, whereas other responses were rhetoric-focused. Joseph and Liz reported comfort in teaching genres as it related to the research and writing process. Joseph stated that he was comfortable teaching writing as a conversation and as a process, which entailed teaching students to think critically about research and analysis. When I observed him teaching the genre of Op-Eds, he gave students an activity that required them to analyze rhetorical moves as well as genre conventions. This activity emphasized his objective for teaching analytical skills, but most of the conversation was more about rhetorical moves, specifically the employment

of Aristotelian appeals. Liz, on the other hand, reported being comfortable in teaching anything in regard to argumentative-based genres, such as analytical and evaluative arguments. She felt comfort in teaching students about accumulating evidence and organizing main ideas. She even desired to feel this comfort in the teaching of the Debate Analysis, where she suggested that the assignment should be an evaluation instead of an analysis and should also include "mini reflections." As for her instruction of genres, I observed her introducing Op-Eds for the Position Paper for a Public Audience. She assigned a class activity, which was followed by a class discussion that encouraged students to analyze sample Op-Eds, particularly taking note of author's tone and word choice as well as any inclusion of hyperlinks. While she noted that the jargon in an Op-Ed should be different from academic writing, the class discussions about tone and word choice were more focused on the rhetorical effectiveness of such moves and not its relevancy to the genre. As reported, she did emphasize the inclusion of hyperlinks, i.e., the evidence, in her class, and she noted that this practice was common in the genre. While she did not report teaching genres via analysis of structure, I did observe her teaching Op-Eds through an annotated example, which she walked her students through the composition and purpose of the writing and format. While Liz and Joseph reported comfort in teaching genres through writing processes, they were both observed in teaching rhetorical moves associated with particular genres, thus demonstrating a tacit understanding of how genres function rhetorically. Moreover, they were observed teaching genres through analysis and/or comparison, which they did not report. Their pedagogical approaches demonstrate their comfort in being able to compare genres, but

they did not have the discourse to explain these approaches to teaching genre theory as the previous participants were able to do.

As for Clara and Cornelius, their interview responses connected genres to rhetoric explicitly. Clara reported feeling comfortable teaching genres as part of the rhetorical situation. She noted how genres and rhetorical situation overlapped, and she reported feeling comfortable in guiding students toward that discovery. Clara stated that she guided students by asking them questions about differences and would allow them to come to the connections "on their own." I observed this pedagogical approach during the second classroom visit. She assigned students to groups, and each group was responsible for reading and analyzing a sample Op-Ed. Then, as a class, students compared their findings with other groups' analyses. In the class discussion, they discussed each writer's employment of Aristotelian appeals and jargon, and they compared this use among the sample texts as well as to the previous assignment, Position Paper for an Academic Audience. Clara also drew comparisons between two public mediums: the Op-Ed and an advertisement poster. Clara's pedagogical approach to teaching students was similar to other participants in that she went back and forth in connecting rhetorical moves to genre structure. Cornelius, similarly, reported feeling comfortable in teaching students to identify modes of writing that "best suites" a writer's purpose. He expressed comfort in helping students come to the realization that genres are a means to achieving purpose, and he also noted that he was more comfortable teaching literary, music, and movie genres. When I observed him teaching the genre of Op-Eds, he began by defining its rhetorical purpose, which he pulled from *Wikipedia*:

> An op-ed (originally short for "opposite the editorial page" though sometimes interpreted as "opinion editorial") is a written prose piece typically published by a newspaper or magazine which expresses the opinion of a named author usually not affiliated with the publication's editorial board. Op-eds are different from both editorials (opinion pieces submitted by editorial board members) and letters to the editor (opinion pieces submitted by readers). – *Wikipedia*, "Op-ed"

He read the above definition and concluded by stating, "Fun times, right?" When he returned to discussing the structure of the Op-Ed, he focused on the format, such as creating two columns to fit the style of a newspaper. Beyond this comment on structure, the majority of the class session focused on the rhetorical moves made by writers in sample Op-Eds. For Clara and Cornelius, they expressed comfort in teaching genre through rhetorical awareness, which was evident in the classes I observed. While this was their reported comfort, they were also observed in teaching the structure and form of the genre through comparison and/or analysis.

From these responses, participants' comfort in teaching genres were either in distinguishing differences and conventions or discussing how genres can be used to guide research and writing. Participants' overall perception of genres were that they were tools that helped writers decide upon a rhetorical approach to writing. Only four participants reported, explicitly, comfort in teaching genre conventions. The other four participants' comfort were more associated with either a writing process or rhetorical theory, though they were observed teaching genres through analysis and comparison of genre types and forms. Participants' teaching of genre was most noticeable in the second classroom observation, which took place during the Position Paper for a Public Audience unit. For Clara and Cornelius, these discussions were mostly short in length and referenced more rhetorical concepts such as audience and purpose. However, Ava, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer led class activities and discussions that either required students to analyze main features of genres or had students compare and contrast genre features of examples. Liz

reported feeling comfortable teaching genres of argumentation through analysis of evidence and organization, but I observed her teaching genres through analyzing the genre's conventions and structural features. As for Ava, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer, I observed them teaching genres in accordance with their interview responses. While participants varied in self-reports, it was quite noticeable that most participants had tacit knowledge in teaching genre awareness via rhetorical theory, which was the most common approach. Participants often connected form and word choice to the rhetorical purpose and intended audience of the genre. Participants who taught genre awareness via rhetorical theory demonstrated a theory-in-use of how genres functioned theoretically, though they did not have the discourse to describe or explain their pedagogical approaches to teaching genre. Mike, on the other hand, did not demonstrate a theoretically informed approach to teaching genre knowledge, as he presented genres as static through the teaching of conventions and form.

Discomfort in Teaching Genres

Whereas participants' interview responses were varied in the discussion of comfort, participants' responses about discomforts in teaching genres were more similar. The most recurring report was the discomfort in teaching the nuanced distinctions between similar genres, which five of eight participants reported. Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Liz, and Mike reported experienced discomfort in teaching the differences or "minor shifts," as Mike described it, between closely related genres. Ava reported this discomfort in explaining the difference between an academic argumentative paper and the Op-Ed, particularly in how the latter becomes more of a "rant" because the opposition needs to

be addressed as one would do in an academic paper. Liz, too, reported discomfort in teaching the differences between the comparative rhetorical analysis and the debate analysis assignments. She found them to be too similar and expressed a desire for a clearer distinction between the two. Thus, she suggested that the debate analysis should emphasize evaluation more than analysis. Clara and Cornelius did not provide examples but also referenced the slight differences between genres. Clara called genres "slippery," and she reported that the word "genre" was intimidating. Cornelius noted how genres were not absolute, leading to overlaps of different genres. He also mentioned how he had no prior experience in teaching genres. He described himself as "fairly clueless" when discussing "different genres of the essay." Cornelius described his teaching of genres as "regurgitating the facts that's in the book; [he was] not really adding anything new to that conversation." He found that the teaching of essay genres was dissimilar to the teaching of genres of literature, music, and movies. Overall, these participants identified discomfort in teaching the nuances of genres and how each genre is distinct or different.

While most participants reported discomfort in distinguishing genres, two participants, Joseph and Mandy, reported discomfort in teaching genres with which they were unfamiliar. Joseph reported experiencing this discomfort in teaching the Debate Analysis assignment. He noted that he was unfamiliar with stasis theory because he had never encountered the theory much less taught it prior to UTK. When he encountered unfamiliar genres, he reported reading and re-reading the assignments, aiming to learn the terminology. Once he understood the terms, he could articulate the assignment to students without confusing them. This process, he noted, was time-consuming, as it required

"spending a lot of time in the weeks leading up to each assignment prepping and planning how" to approach the assignment. Mandy, too, reported being unfamiliar with stasis theory and experiencing discomfort when teaching that assignment. While she felt like she understood "the elements" of the assignment, she did not know what to expect in regard to the "nuances" of writing the assignment, which she found uncomfortable to teach. Both Mandy and Joseph reported discomfort in teaching unfamiliar genres, as they did not know the terms, conventions, or writing processes involved with those genres.

Participants experienced discomfort in teaching genres when they were either too similar or unfamiliar, but one participant, Spencer, reported that he did not experience any discomfort in teaching genres. He stated, "I really can't think of anything I'm uncomfortable teaching. Maybe I'm just not aware of it." Spencer attempted to think of any potential discomfort in teaching genres, but ultimately, he could not recall any.

Overall, participants' discomfort in teaching genres were one of two reasons. Either participants experienced difficulty in distinguishing the "minor" or "slippery" differences between similar genres, or they experienced difficulty in learning and thus teaching genres with which they were unfamiliar. While I observed participants integrating genre into their lesson plans for the Position Paper for a Public Audience, three participants devoted a short amount of time (i.e., approximately 6 minutes or less) to the discussion and analysis of genres. This reported discomfort in distinguishing genres could have limited this devoted time to teaching genres in the classroom. Whether participants were observed teaching genres for 6 minutes or less or for at least 15 minutes, participants experienced discomfort when they were unable to define and

distinguish the nuances of a genre. Participants understood that there were minute differences among genres, but they did not have the theoretical knowledge or academic discourse to describe and instruct how genres functioned as social constructs.

Pedagogical Practices Knowledge

Participants were required to use the standardized syllabus, which included an outcome that stated students, by the end of term, "should demonstrate the ability" to "[r]espond constructively to drafts-in-progress, applying rhetorical concepts to revisions of their own and peers' writing." Therefore, the standardized syllabus was designed to encourage writing as a process; in the course calendar, some of the assignments and lesson plans encouraged a writing process by assigning smaller writing assignments, group work, peer reviews, and/or teacher conferences prior to final due dates. However, participants could adapt or change these daily lessons and due dates. To get a better understanding of their pedagogical practices, I wanted to learn about participants' approaches to teaching writing as a process, particularly what they reported in interviews, documented in their syllabi, and were observed teaching. I asked participants about the extent to which they experienced comfort in teaching writing as a process, and I inquired about how they encouraged writing processes in their respective classrooms. While most participants experienced the greatest comfort in teaching writing as a process, most of them demonstrated a superficial comprehension of what teaching writing processes entailed. Most participants reported an idealized version of teaching writing as a process, such as writing multiple drafts.

Reported Comfort and Discomfort in Teaching Writing as a Process

When I asked participants about feeling comfortable teaching writing as a process, the most recurring response was "pretty much everything," which five of eight participants reported. Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, and Mike reported that they felt very comfortable teaching writing as a process, in general. Clara noted that it was her "forte" and her "favorite part" of teaching composition. She found it "easy-peasy" to teach multiple drafts and revision. Cornelius, Joseph, and Mike reported being comfortable teaching the activities that led to the larger, final assignments. For example, Cornelius mentioned smaller assignments such as proposals and annotated bibliographies. These assignments were noted in his instructional materials, and I also observed him assigning students two freewriting tasks that were connected to the major writing assignments. These freewriting tasks occurred during the first classroom observation. Joseph, too, reported assigning prewriting activities such as free writes, which he found helped students move toward outlining and drafting. Liz, too, reported not having "a problem with any of it," and she found the course at UTK to be "the best process approach" that she had experienced "in a long time." Like Cornelius, she liked how the course included smaller writing assignments like the proposal because it directed students' thinking and writing toward the final draft. For the most part, these five participants, with one exception, did not report any discomfort in teaching writing as a process.

The one exception was Cornelius. While he reported comfort "with most of it [teaching writing as a process]," he experienced discomfort in teaching reflection. He reported being familiar with the concept and had even experienced writing reflections; however, that experience was described as uncomfortable because he did not enjoy

talking about himself. As for the teaching discomfort, this stemmed from his lack of experience in seeing the teaching of reflection being modeled by his prior professors. He reported, "[I]t's not something that I've seen modeled as often, so I don't have that experience to pull from." Because he had not seen the teaching of reflection modeled in conjunction with his attitude towards the practice, he experienced this discomfort in teaching it as part of a writing process.

Most participants were like Cornelius and experienced comfort in teaching writing as a process in general. However, there were three participants (Ava, Mandy, and Spencer) who provided divergent responses about what they felt comfortable teaching, but these participants' responses about discomfort were quite similar. Ava found brainstorming to be what she was most comfortable teaching in regard to a writing process. In fact, I observed her teaching brainstorming activities in both classroom observations. In both class visits, she had students develop either issue/information questions or potential paper topics. As a class, she asked students to share their brainstorming and then guided students in connecting the topics to the purpose of the assignment. She felt comfortable with this process because she self-identified with the process of generating ideas. She stated, "I'm a huge nerd, and I like thinking about all the possible things I could write about." This process of thinking about potential writing topics, for Ava, meant developing an interest in the assignment, which would be a motivating factor. Ava projected her positive experiences with brainstorming onto her students. She reported that such activities were "valuable" for students to discover their interests, which was why she incorporated brainstorming activities in her pedagogical

practices. As for discomfort, Ava reported teaching revision. She believed that teaching revision needed to be an individualized process. She reported that it was difficult to teach revision in way that reached all of her students' needs to make it valuable for them.

While Ava experienced discomfort in teaching revision, Mandy reported feeling "really comfortable" in teaching it. She stated, "I feel like most of my teaching and writing as a process is very revision based more so than perhaps, oh, write two pages every day and doing that kind of initial stuff." Mandy believed that revision was an "assumed" part of teaching writing as a process, and she felt that she could not teach a process without discussing revising drafts or thesis statements. She also reported feeling comfortable providing general feedback to students; for example, she reported telling students, "You need to do drafts; you need to revise; you need to focus on your thesis and your topic sentences and things like that." While she felt comfortable giving general advice to her students, she did report, like Ava, discomfort in managing to provide individual feedback to students. With the general feedback, she could anticipate the recurring problems with the assignment, but she found it "more challenging" to provide the individual feedback to help each student revise his/her work.

Unlike Mandy, Spencer did not experience comfort in teaching revision. He reported feeling comfortable teaching writing templates and outlining for a writing process. Revision, on the other hand, was what he reported to be a teaching discomfort. As for the templates, he noted using *They Say, I Say* to teach students how to form argumentative statements and introduce evidence. He reported having students use these templates to fill out an outline, which was also evident in his instructional materials. He

found that the templates and outlines helped students identify the "shape for the paper" and thus the expectations for each part of a paper. He experienced comfort when teaching students how to make "the thing look like the thing." When it came to revision, he experienced discomfort in teaching it, but for different reasons from Ava and Mandy. He stated, "I don't even know how to revise very well myself. […] I don't know if it's a weakness of mine or a quirk of mine. I've always been a bit like dumbfounded by people who write a whole draft." Spencer reported that his revision process was more "iterative" than writing one draft, revising, and producing a second draft. His description of his writing process does convey that he revises, and it also conveys that he has a particular understanding of what revision entails, which is the production of multiple drafts instead of revising iteratively and digitally. Spencer experienced discomfort in teaching revision to his students because he did not understand his own writing process, particularly that he did revise. Because his writing process knowledge was limited theoretically, he did not teach his students "much about that process," but he did mention that he "should work on" integrating that teaching more into his pedagogical practices.

Overall, most participants reported feeling very comfortable with teaching writing as a process to the extent of no reported discomforts. Only three participants reported specific comforts, and four participants reported specific discomforts. Ava and Spencer experienced comfort in teaching prewriting skills such as brainstorming and outlining, whereas Mandy reported teaching revision. While Mandy reported revision as a comfort, she noted that there was a discomfort in not knowing how to provide individualized feedback to students during those lessons, which Ava also experienced. Spencer also

reported discomfort in teaching revision as part of a writing process; however, his reasons were tied to his limited understanding of what it meant to revise. As for the other participants, they reported that they were confident and comfortable in teaching writing as a process in general. From these findings, all participants were comfortable assigning smaller writing tasks that developed thinking and writing for a larger, final draft, but three participants experienced challenges in teaching students individualized revision strategies as part of a writing process.

Teaching Writing as a Process in the Classroom

When I asked participants about how they encouraged writing as a process in their respective classrooms, participants provided a range of examples for how particular major writing assignments were scaffolded. While there was a range of activities and lessons, the scaffolding process was similar across all participants' responses. That is, they reported assigning smaller lessons and activities that built into the next assignment and so forth until the student had a completed draft. Four participants, Clara, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer, acknowledged UTK's writing program's standardized syllabus for implementing this scaffolding into the course design. As for other means of teaching writing as a process, participants reported various pedagogical practices, such as prewriting activities, group work and/or writing workshops, peer reviews, and conferences (see Table 12). An important note about conferences, UTK's writing program required participants to hold two teacher-student conferences per course, per semester. These conferences were present in each participant's syllabus. However, only

three participants reported conferences in interviews, and I further discuss these reports in this section.

The most recurring pedagogical practices for teaching writing as a process were either prewriting activities or group work and/or writing workshops. For prewriting activities, seven of eight participants reported various kinds of lessons that encouraged students to begin thinking and writing about a major writing assignment. Prewriting activities entailed brainstorming, freewriting, and outlining as well as classroom discussions about the topic. Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mike, and Spencer reported assigning various activities such as these. For example, Ava required students to brainstorm main ideas that would be applied, potentially, to writing an outline that had working theses and topic sentences. I observed Ava assigning brainstorming activities for both position papers; these brainstorming sessions required students to explore either issue questions or new research topics. Liz, too, required students to brainstorm main ideas, and she noted that she spent more time teaching brainstorming at UTK than at her previous institutions. In fact, I observed Liz requiring students to free write their conclusions from the Debate Analysis assignment to discover their main ideas for the Position Paper for an Academic Audience, and she had additional brainstorming exercises documented in her syllabus. Spencer, like Ava, reported requiring students to formulate outlines based on templates they adapted from *They Say, I Say*. While it is possible that he incorporated this approach into his teaching in other classes, I did not observe him teaching these prewriting activities during my two classroom visits. It was

Table 12

Participants' Documented, Observed, and/or Reported Pedagogical Practices for Teaching Writing as a Process

Participant	Prewriting Activities	Group Work/ Writing Workshops	Peer Reviews	Conferences
Ava	R, O, D	R, D	D	D
Clara	R, D	O, D	D	D
Cornelius	R, O	R, D	D	D
Joseph	R, D	R, O	R, D	R, D
Liz	R, O, D	D	D	R, D
Mandy	D	R, D	R, D	D
Mike	R	R, O	R, D	R, D
Spencer	R		R, D	D

Note. R = Reported in Interview 2; O = Observed in Classroom Observation 1 and/or 2; D = Documented in Syllabi.

also unclear as to when these activities were assigned in his syllabus because the daily activities descriptions were general and brief. Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, and Mike reported requiring their students to respond to writing prompts or to write freely about the assignment. The syllabi for Clara and Joseph support these reports because there were documented in-class writing activities that functioned as prewriting. For Cornelius and Mike, I observed them assigning students free writing activities that were either developing paper topics (Cornelius) or reflecting on writing development (Mike). Overall, these participants reported and/or were observed incorporating prewriting activities, such as free writing or brainstorming, in their pedagogical practices to teach writing as a process.

While seven participants reported requiring prewriting activities, five participants reported requiring writing workshops and/or group work into their course. Ava, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Mike reported encouraging a writing process by requiring group work and/or writing workshops in class. Group work ranged from working with peers to analyze readings or completing worksheets and exercises. For example, Cornelius reported bringing to class five sources found on Facebook; students were broken into ten groups, and they analyzed the credibility of the sources. While I did not observe him teaching these group work activities, it is possible that he incorporated this activity in another class. Based on his instructional materials, it was unclear as to when these activities were assigned in his syllabus because descriptions of daily activities were general and brief. Mike also required "lots of little group activities or in-class writings" that would occur "three weeks out" from the final draft. Mike's reported group activities

would discuss course topics and ways to apply learning to writing. From classroom observations, I observed Joseph and Mike assigning group work. For example, Joseph asked students to work in groups to evaluate and develop working thesis statements, and Mike assigned groups to apply the STAR evaluation criteria to peers' working paragraphs for their Position Paper for an Academic Audience assignment. I also observed Clara, who did not report group work in her interview, requiring students to work in groups to discuss statements of purpose or complete exercises provided in the textbook. These participants' either reported and/or were observed incorporating group work into their pedagogical practices; the group work gave students an opportunity to analyze readings, develop their ideas and writing, or work on exercises connected to the major writing assignment.

As for writing workshops, Ava, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Mike also reported requiring students to bring in a paragraph or 1-2 pages of writing to be workshopped by peers. Mike reported encouraging revision workshops. He wanted students to learn the difference between revision and copy editing. Prior to encouraging students to revise their own papers, he reported modeling revision for students with his own work. While I did not observe Mike modeling or assigning revision workshops, I did observe Mike requiring students to workshop paragraphs by applying the STAR criteria to their peers' writing; there were also homework reminders in his syllabus that encouraged students to bring in paragraphs and partial drafts to the following class. Ava, too, reported requiring workshops on revising techniques; she described one workshop that asked students to underline topic sentences and revise those, and another workshop

asked students to circle citations and check those for accuracy. While I did not observe her teaching these workshops, she had a day dedicated to revision workshops in her syllabus. Joseph also encouraged workshopping paragraphs or partial drafts so that students could receive "additional feedback," but I did not observe him assigning writing workshops. It was also unclear as to when these workshops were assigned in his syllabus because descriptions of daily activities were general and brief, but it is possible that he included such workshops in another class that I did not observe. Similar to Joseph, Mandy reported encouraging revision workshops because she wanted students to learn to "value other people's input." These workshops, she believed, would teach students that the first draft is neither the best nor only draft that they should be writing. While I did not observe Mandy incorporating writing workshops, she did remind her students about a writing workshop scheduled for the next class meeting, and her course syllabus included class sessions devoted to workshopping introductions and thesis statements, too. Overall, Ava, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Mike reported and/or were observed incorporating writing workshops in their pedagogical practices to give students the opportunities to draft and revise as part of a writing process.

As for another means of encouraging a writing process, four participants (Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) reported assigning peer reviews; however, all eight participants' syllabi contained at least one peer review day. From interview data, Joseph reported requiring students to bring a rough draft to class for "peer review and self-reflection." Students were required to not only give their peers but also themselves feedback. They had to write responses to questions on the back of their drafts responses.

He believed that self-reflection provided time and space between writing and reviewing the draft for students to provide critical feedback to themselves. Joseph noted that the questions and structure of the peer reviews were tailored to each assignment; however, his syllabus only included one day dedicated to peer review. It is possible that he included modified peer reviews in classes I did not observe. Mandy also mentioned that she assigned peer reviews, which was corroborated by her syllabus. However, she did not provide any details about how the three peer reviews were structured. Mike, too, reported assigning peer reviews, but he noted that his experience at UTK teaching with peer reviews was much different from previous teaching experiences. He stated, "In the past, what I like to do with my peer review days is have each day be a very different version of peer review to kind of model different processes." For example, he would ask students to read papers aloud to catch errors, and for another peer review, he would have students cut up each other's draft and rearrange the pieces. He noted that UTK's writing program's required two conferences interfered with the scheduling of peer review days. Instead, he had one peer review day listed on his syllabus and then incorporated "mini peer reviews before conferences." These mini peer reviews were different from his previous experiences because students were not required to bring in completed rough drafts. In his syllabus, I did not discover any days dedicated to mini peer reviews, but I did observe a mini peer review that was labeled as group work on the syllabus. When I visited for the second classroom observation, I observed him assigning students to peer review rough drafts for the Position Paper for a Public Audience. For peer review, Spencer also did not require students to bring in completed drafts; his students would

"bring in two pages" of the draft to review. Spencer did not describe how he taught the peer review process, but his syllabus showed that he had one day dedicated to it. As for the other participants, they did not report peer review as part of teaching writing as a process; however, their syllabi showed that they included it in the course design. In fact, Clara had one day dedicated to it, whereas Ava, Cornelius, and Liz had three to four days scheduled for peer reviews. Overall, these participants either reported including or scheduled days within the course for peer review so that students could receive additional feedback on their writing.

As Mike mentioned in his interview, conferences were required by the writing program and were incorporated into all eight participants' syllabi; however, only three participants (Joseph, Liz, and Mike) recalled them as part of encouraging a writing process. Mike noted, as reported earlier, that the conferences interfered with his assigning of peer reviews. He did not describe how the conferences helped students in learning a writing process or how he approached conferences. Joseph, on the other hand, described his conferencing process. He noted that he met with students for "15-20 minutes and chatted" about the assignment. In these conferences, he reported discussing students' "major concerns" and the organization of their completed drafts. He experienced that conferences were valued by his students, reporting "after we did the conferences, unanimously, the students said that it was something that was really helpful and helped them see where they needed to make changes." Liz, too, described her conferencing process. She reported sitting down with students, explaining expectations, and asking questions. She also co-created with each student a "direct plan for how to adjust" writing.

Liz valued conferences and expressed a desire to put composition courses on a "flex schedule" so that she could hold more individual conferences with students. She believed that students benefited more from the individualized feedback than generalized writing instruction. While Mike did not describe his conferencing process, Joseph and Liz found conferencing to be beneficial for providing individualized feedback to their students.

From these reports, participants employed various pedagogical practices to teach writing as a process. Out of all the participants, Joseph and Mike were the only ones who reported all four strategies. By reporting multiple writing processes for students to explore, they demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings because they understood how prewriting, group work and/or writing workshops, peer reviews, and conferences contributed toward developing students' writing processes. In fact, both participants reported adapting peer reviews to teach students different revision techniques; they also reported requiring students to work on smaller writing assignments that transferred into the final draft.

As for Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer, they demonstrated an appropriation of surface features. They either reported and/or were observed applying at least two of the four discussed pedagogical practices. Additionally, these participants had documented inclusions of peer review and conferences, as required by the writing program. Some of these participants did not report these inclusions in their interviews, and it is possible that they did not connect these pedagogical practices with teaching writing as a process. In fact, Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Liz, and Mandy, through data triangulation, incorporated all four writing process strategies in their syllabi, but they

only reported and/or were observed incorporating two in their pedagogical practices. Spencer, through data triangulation, incorporated three writing process strategies, i.e., prewriting, peer review and conferences, in his syllabus. However, he only reported incorporating prewriting and peer review as for how he encouraged writing as a process. Even though these participants experienced great comfort in teaching writing as a process, their theoretical understanding of how their pedagogies implemented that instruction was underdeveloped. They did not report adapting their pedagogical approaches to demonstrate different writing processes for different writing contexts, as Mike and Joseph reported and/or were observed. Instead, they reported teaching a generic writing process by employing writing opportunities that were typically associated with a writing classroom, such as prewriting activities, group work, or writing workshops.

Generally, all participants demonstrated a surface-level understanding of what teaching writing as a process entailed, such as requiring students to compose multiple drafts, as described in the course outcomes on the standardized syllabus. However, when it came to participants' pedagogical practices in teaching writing as a process, six of eight participants demonstrated at least a surface understanding of pedagogical practices knowledge through their self-reports. As for the other two participants, they demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings for teaching writing as a process because they taught multiple writing strategies for different writing contexts.

Discourse Community Knowledge

Because these participants were entering a new discourse community, i.e., UTK's writing program, I wanted to measure the extent to which they shared the discourse and

values of the writing program. In Interview 1, I asked participants about what they determined to be the writing program's values after attending the pre-service orientation. I also asked participants to define their understanding of transfer and rhetoric. In Interview 2, I revisited this line of inquiry, asking participants to define transfer as well as what participants liked or disliked about the program's emphasis on transfer theory. Additionally, I asked participants about their primary objectives for teaching the first FYC course at UTK. From these questions, I examined the extent to which participants appropriated the discourse community knowledge. Participants detected surface features of the writing program's values, such as audience awareness or promoting transfer. When it came to defining key terms like rhetoric and transfer, participants demonstrated a surface-level understanding of these terms, but all eight participants did not share the same definitions. For effective communication, writing pedagogy educators should assess GTAs' definitions to work from a shared definition. As for valuing teaching for transfer, participants shared this value, but most participants' primary teaching objectives did not emphasize this objective. These data demonstrate that first-year PhD GTAs and writing pedagogy educators need to share their pedagogical vocabulary and values.

Interview 1

Perceived Values of UTK's Writing Program. Within 1-2 weeks after pre-service orientation, I asked participants about what they perceived to be the writing program's values. Participants' responses ranged from audience awareness to scaffolding, community, or developing writing.

The most recurring response was audience awareness, which was reported by Ava, Liz, and Spencer. For example, Ava reported discourse community and audience as important values for UTK's curriculum, especially in comparison to her previous teaching experiences. She stated, "So, it seems important to be aware of audience and to really bring that into your paper, both analyzing and writing." Liz, too, compared the emphasis on audience to previous teaching, particularly because she found "that [it] does not get taught in secondary school as well as it should." For this reason, she reported appreciating UTK's writing program's "heavy emphasis on audience." Spencer also reported audience as a value of the writing program. He reported experiences of seeing students' "light bulbs come on" when class discussions shifted to constructing messages for different audiences. He also found that audience went hand-in-hand with genre, which Ava also reported. Spencer reported that in conjunction with audience, students needed to develop genre awareness, i.e., an awareness that writing situations call for specific genres and conventions. As with changing audiences, the genre changes with purpose; he provided examples of writing in a newspaper versus an email. Ava, on the other hand, cited the required assigning of various genres, such as annotated bibliographies, position papers, and open letters. Ava found that this requirement pointed to a value of genre within the writing program. While Ava and Spencer mentioned genre as a dual value, they connected it to audience, which Liz reported. They all perceived the emphasis on audience as the primary value of UTK's writing program.

The second most recurring response was scaffolding, which was reported by Joseph and Mandy. They both found that pre-service orientation emphasized scaffolding.

Joseph connected this emphasis with transfer. Through scaffolding, he found that transfer was possible because the assignments were built into each other, requiring students to apply ideas to "larger types of writing and fields of research and reading." Joseph reported that scaffolding provided students with a "base of knowledge" that could "transfer over into different areas." He believed that this base of knowledge was foundational for developing students' "repertoire of writing" and rhetorical thinking. While Joseph found the scaffolding beneficial for his students, Mandy found the emphasis on scaffolding as beneficial for teaching. She cited the scaffolding workshop from the pre-service orientation, specifically about how it introduced her to "things that are unique to UT" such as the Debate Analysis assignment. She found this workshop helpful but did not expand upon how it helped her. Both Joseph and Mandy experienced the scaffolding workshop as a demonstration of the UTK's writing program's values.

While Joseph and Mandy found scaffolding as an important value of the writing program, Clara, Cornelius, and Mike provided diverse responses that did not overlap. Clara perceived the values of the writing program to consist of the community, as in the departmental staff, graduate students, and the general population of students. She reported, "Like the writing program itself and the English Department itself is a lot about community and community at the university." She cited various resources, such as the Counseling Center, from pre-service orientation that were aimed toward developing students and GTAs inside and outside the composition classroom. While Clara perceived community, Cornelius identified values of developing writers' academic, professional writing. He found the "biggest takeaway" from pre-service orientation was the teaching

and prevention of plagiarism, particularly its impact on students within and beyond the classroom. Mike, on the other hand, did not answer the question; instead, he discussed how teaching discourse communities was going for his class. While Mike did not report any perceived values, Cornelius and Clara found either plagiarism or community as the writing program's values.

From these findings, participants' immediate perceptions of UTK's writing program's values were varied and far-reaching, from a combination of discourse community, genre, and audience to scaffolding assignments. Participants perceived these values from UTK's pre-service orientation's workshops and discussions as well as the standard instructional materials. Ava, Liz, and Spencer identified audience or discourse community as a value, which reflected the rhetoric-based emphasis of the curriculum. They connected audience and even genre to the assignment prompts, and for this reason, they demonstrated an appropriation of surface features. Joseph, too, appropriated surface features by connecting scaffolding assignments to transfer theory, which was the other emphasis of UTK's curriculum. Mandy, on the other hand, appropriated a label of scaffolding. She found that it connected assignments, but she did not report any recognition of transfer within the scaffolding. As for Clara, Cornelius, and Mike, their reports demonstrated a lack of appropriation. Clara and Cornelius reported resources or workshops that emphasized values disconnected from the writing program's curriculum, and Mike's lack of report cannot provide insight into how he perceived the writing program's values.

Defining Rhetoric. As previously discussed, rhetorical theory is one of UTK's curricular emphases. To better understand how participants understood rhetoric, I asked each participant to define the term. Four participants (Cornelius, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) defined rhetoric as an approach to persuasion. Cornelius used Aristotle's "art of persuasion" to define the term; similarly, Spencer defined it as "communication that uses certain strategies" to either persuade or "affect the audience in some way to get them to bend toward the rhetor's way of thinking." Mandy defined it similar to Cornelius, too: "Rhetoric is the art of arranging words and arguments, mostly to persuade people." Mandy added that rhetoric can be used for "anything." More generally, Mike defined rhetoric as "what language is." He explained that language had a "rhetorical, persuasive aspect" to it. All of these definitions demonstrated participants' understanding of rhetorical theory as persuasion.

Not too dissimilar from Mandy's definition, the second most recurring definition of rhetoric was the presentation of an argument, which was reported by Ava and Clara. Ava defined it as "how the speaker is presenting their thoughts on whatever topic." She later defined thoughts as the writer's logic, credibility, and emotions or the writer's appeal to an audience's emotions and values. Clara defined the term more generally as "the building of an argument or understanding argument and logic." Both Ava and Clara qualified their definitions prior to providing them. Ava reported not knowing the term until she had taught composition for the first time at a previous institution, whereas Clara said that she would attempt a definition. While they qualified their responses, their definitions connect rhetorical theory to Aristotelian appeals and argumentation.

Liz and Joseph, on the other hand, defined rhetoric based on authorial positionality or audience engagement. Liz defined the term as discourse and communication. Specifically, she stated that "it's understanding your place as the speaker or the writer […] in relation to the subject and in relation to your position on that subject and your relation to the audience." For Liz, rhetoric could be found in any medium. Joseph, however, defined the term as a "series of ways in which we engage with texts, and a text engages with an audience, a culture, a sometimes as small as a classroom, right." He explained that the "series of ways" consisted of strategies for constructing "speech in reading and writing to convey ideas and messages." For both Liz and Joseph, rhetoric was discourse or speech, and rhetorical theory entailed the understanding of positionality of writer or audience in relation to the message.

From these findings, rhetoric was reported to be an act of communication, whether that was aimed to persuade or engage audiences or develop a message. Table 13 provides a comprehensive overview of how each participant defined rhetoric. All of their definitions pointed to components of rhetorical theory emphasized by UTK's curriculum. For example, the first assignment asked students to identify and analyze Aristotelian appeals. In subsequent assignments, students were asked to persuade audience through how they arranged their arguments, considered their positionality, and thus engaged their audiences. Participants detected key features of rhetorical theory and did not provide a flexible definition of rhetoric as more than either appeals to persuasion, classical arrangement, or mediation of thought. For this reason, all participants demonstrated an appropriation of surface features of rhetorical theory.

Table 13

Interview 1: Participants' Definitions of Rhetoric

Participant	Persuasion	Building an Argument	Positionality or Engagement
Ava		X	
Clara		X	
Cornelius	X		
Joseph			X
Liz			X
Mandy	X		
Mike	X		
Spencer	X		

Defining Transfer. In addition to rhetorical theory, transfer theory also informed UTK's writing program's FYC curriculum. To better understand participants' comprehension of transfer theory, I asked each participant to define the term. The most recurring definition was learning of writing skills that can be applied to future writing contexts, also known as Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward reaching transfer. Clara, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer provided this definition. Mandy, Mike, and Spencer provided very similar definitions; they defined transfer as the process of taking learned concepts or skills and applying those to new, future writing contexts. While Mandy's definition was more general, Mike and Spencer used classrooms as an example, i.e., taking skills from one class and applying those to a future class. While Spencer defined it as forward

reaching transfer, he also believed that writing skills were generalizable. When he expanded upon his definition, he added that transfer was when students "[m]ake the thing look like the thing," i.e., learning generalizable "tools" for future application. As for Clara's definition, she actually used the terminology "forward reaching" and "backward reaching" in her definition. She stated, "So, kind of the way I view it is that it's our job to kind of think of how [students] can apply this, to get in front of the student, and then it's the student's job to be able to go back in their memory and say this is what I learned in this place and this is how it is applicable." Clara added that she was unsure about the correctness of her definition, but she believed it entailed reaching back for knowledge and experience as well as thinking forward to future application. From these definitions, participants' perceived transfer as a linear process moving from one context to the future with Clara as the exception. Clara's definition included backward reaching transfer, which would make the process recursive.

The second most common definition was the learning of general writing skills that can be applied to other writing situations. Ava, Cornelius, and Liz provided this definition. Ava and Liz's definitions were similar in nature. For them, transfer was the process of developing students' writing skills for use in any writing context or, as Liz added, "any learning experience." Cornelius expanded the definition to be more general: "Teaching a skill that can be applied to other aspects of education, of life in general." These participants perceived transfer as general writing skills that can be applied to any communicative context.

Joseph, on the other hand, defined transfer as adaptation of ideas and learning. He

stated, “I guess the way I see it is building sort of foundation of ideas which can be adapted and used in other contexts, right.” Joseph emphasized building the foundation of reading, thinking, and writing and then determining how that knowledge could be applied or adapted to fit familiar or unfamiliar contexts. He was the only participant to perceive transfer as a cognitive process in which knowledge and experiences needed to be abstracted to be adapted.

From these findings, participants’ definitions of transfer involved the learning of skills to be applied to a different context. Table 14 provides a comprehensive overview of how participants defined transfer. While there are some similarities in definitions, participants’ responses pointed toward different aims and/or processes of transfer theory. Clara’s perception of transfer was a recursive process that entailed the reflection and forward thinking to apply learning, whereas Mandy, Mike, and Spencer limited transfer to the forward reaching application of learning. Ava, Cornelius, Liz, and even Spencer, to a degree, also found that learning should be applied to future contexts, but that learning was generalizable. These participants’ definitions demonstrated an appropriation of surface features of transfer theory. Joseph, on the other hand, demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings because he emphasized abstraction and adaptation. Joseph’s definition of transfer theory entailed thinking critically about similarities and differences in contexts, and that recognition determined how learning should be adapted to fit a context.

Table 14

Interview 1: Participants' Definitions of Transfer

Participant	Forward Reaching and/or Backward Reaching	General Writing Skills	Adaptation
Ava		X	
Clara	X		
Cornelius		X	
Joseph			X
Liz		X	
Mandy	X		
Mike	X		
Spencer	X		

Interview 2

Defining Transfer. After participants were teaching the first FYC course for approximately two months, I inquired about their definitions of transfer again. Because I inquired into their rhetorical knowledge as a separate knowledge domain in Interview 2, I did not ask participants to define rhetoric as I did in Interview 1. The focus for discourse community knowledge was on participants' understanding of transfer theory after teaching the curriculum for approximately two months.

The most recurring definition was similar Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward reaching and backward reaching transfer, though not all participants provided both

answers. Ava, Clara, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer defined transfer as the future application of learning or skills. For example, Ava noted that transfer was taking "methods of writing or brainstorming or revision and understanding of genres" to apply to "a similar situation in another class." Similarly, Joseph reported a definition that involved "taking skills" such as "argumentation and discussing strategies and applying them to your history courses or your speech courses." Similar to these examples, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer reported definitions that entailed taking learning and applying it linearly to future writing contexts or classes. Mandy noted that it required "being able to see where it [i.e., the learning] will be useful to you in the future." While Clara reported forward reaching transfer in her definition, she also included backward reaching transfer. She added that transfer included the process of "recall[ing] the information that from a different academic space or academic situation" to be used in a writing or learning context. For Clara, transfer was a recursive process of applying learning. After teaching the curriculum for approximately two months, these participants defined and understood the purpose of transfer as forward and/or backward reaching transfer.

While six of eight participants reported forward and/or backward reaching transfer, Cornelius reported transfer as adaptation. He defined it as "taking what we're teaching them so that they can rework it for later use." This reworking entailed demonstrating and recognizing knowledge that then can be "manipulate[d]." Cornelius did not explain the process of adaptation or how knowledge could and/or should be manipulated. He emphasized reworking, or adapting, knowledge in his definition.

Liz, too, defined transfer differently from her peers; she defined it as general writing skills. For her, transfer consisted of "learning a set of skills" that could be applied "to any type of written dialogue that you are asked to perform." Liz noted that the sets of skills she was referencing were those associated with writing, not "trade skills" like "welding." While she was specific in referencing writing skills, these were still generalizable and applicable to "any type" of writing.

From these reported definitions, the most prevalent understanding of transfer was forward and/or backward reaching transfer. Cornelius and Liz were the only participants that provided alternative definitions. Table 15 provides an overview of participants' definitions of transfer from Interview 2. From these definitions, all participants demonstrated an appropriation of surface features of transfer. Whether participants reported forward reaching application or adaptation, the definitions provided partial representations of the theory. This level of appropriation was mostly consistent with Interview 1, with the exception being Joseph. In Interview 1, he reported that transfer theory entailed abstraction and adaptation; however, in Interview 2, he did not report adaptation. Instead, he altered his definition to emphasize forward reaching transfer, which does encourage abstraction of learning. However, this change demonstrates that he does not have a concrete conceptual understanding of transfer theory because this definition limits abstraction to be forward reaching instead of being flexible for repurposing knowledge. For this reason, his overall understanding of transfer theory is in-between the appropriation of conceptual underpinnings and of surface features. Ava and Cornelius also amended their definitions. Ava and Cornelius first provided general

writing skills as their definitions of transfer; however, in Interview 2, Ava changed her definition to be forward reaching transfer, and Cornelius changed his to be adaptation. They neither reported nor were asked about these changes in definition. While their definitions changed, their degrees of appropriation did not because the participants did not demonstrate a conceptual understanding of the theory. As for Clara, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer, there were no changes in definitions or degrees of appropriation between interviews. Table 16 provides a comparison of Interview 1 and Interview 2 definitions of transfer as well as degrees of appropriation.

Participants' Perceived Values in Teaching for Transfer. In addition to asking participants to define transfer, I also inquired into the extent to which they liked teaching a transfer-based FYC course. Unanimously, participants found teaching transfer as valuable. Participants reported either loving it or finding it important, valuable, or appropriate. The most common reason for why a transfer-based curriculum was perceived as valuable was its purpose in legitimizing the course. Ava, Clara, Joseph, Liz, Mike, and Spencer reported that transfer was valuable because it provided a purpose for FYC courses. Students, they hoped, would see that the course was not a "hurdle," as Spencer described, and was applicable to other courses or life in general. Ava stressed the practical application of transfer-based FYC courses and noted that she appreciated the "freedom" to incorporate disciplinary writing into the classroom. Clara found the transfer-based FYC courses legitimized the field of English, making it an important, relevant discipline. While Cornelius and Mandy did not mention the value directly,

Table 15

Interview 2: Participants' Definitions of Transfer

Participant	Forward Reaching and/or Backward Reaching	General Writing Skills	Adaptation
Ava	X		
Clara	X		
Cornelius			X
Joseph	X		
Liz		X	
Mandy	X		
Mike	X		
Spencer	X		

they noted its value to students. Cornelius found this approach as "appropriate" because he had realized through nonacademic experiences that skills were not enough; to be successful outside of the academy, learning needed to be adapted. Mandy noted that "everybody needs" to learn how to research and write, and she found that "transfer is the way you can make it happen." For these participants, transfer theory legitimized their positions within the field and provided a curriculum that was needed and thus potentially valuable to their students. For them, their teaching was not limited to the field of English;

Table 16

Comparison of Participants' Definitions of Transfer

Participant	Interview One		Interview Two	
	Transfer Definition	**Degree of Appropriation**	**Transfer Definition**	**Degree of Appropriation**
Ava	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Clara	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Cornelius	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	Adaptation	Surface Features
Joseph	Adaptation	Conceptual Underpinnings	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Liz	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	General Writing Skills	Surface Features
Mandy	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Mike	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Spencer	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features

Note. Degrees of Appropriation were shortened to contain the key label.

instead, their teaching informed students about communicating within and beyond the university.

While participants valued transfer, there were some reports about what participants disliked about teaching a transfer-based curriculum. The most reported dislike was associated with participants' frustration or doubts in believing the possibility of transfer. Ava, Mike, and Spencer reported experiencing either frustration, conflicts, or doubts. Ava, for example, reported that she was frustrated because it was not discernible whether the teaching and process of transfer resonated with students. She stated, "I don't know that it always sinks in the way that I want it to." Because she cannot determine if students recognized situations in which knowledge or skills could be reused or transferred, she experienced frustration. Mike and Spencer reported similar experiences. Mike and Spencer expressed their doubts in whether transfer was possible. Mike reported, "I'm conflicted about the extent to which it really works, which kind of goes back to what I was saying earlier about, like I'm not really sure how much I actually got out of my own experience going through a 102 class and how much just happened later on." While Mike noted that transfer gave writing instructors something to "strive toward," he doubted that it worked based on his learning experiences. Similarly, Spencer also doubted the effectiveness of transfer based on his experiences as an undergraduate. As a student, he reported recognizing college classes as "their own self-contained thing." For his students, he reported skepticism in whether they "buy into it" because he believed they "look[ed] at classes in a separate sphere; there's no overlap." While he, too, found teaching for transfer important, he doubted whether students appreciated the process.

Ava, Mike, and Spencer reported disliking teaching transfer-based FYC curriculum because there was not a degree of certainty that transfer was possible; moreover, they experienced frustration when it came to determining the extent to which students believed that transfer was possible and applicable to other courses.

While frustration and/or doubt was the most recurring dislike, there were two other dislikes that were equally represented: 1. Not enough disciplinary writing opportunities, and 2. Limited structure of the curriculum. Cornelius and Liz reported that they disliked how there were not enough disciplinary writing opportunities in the first FYC course, though Liz noted that there could be more available in the second FYC course. Cornelius disliked that the first course emphasized MLA and genres found within the humanities. He noted that math or engineer students would not be able to apply what they were learning in his class to their disciplines. He reported that the structures of writing were different, and he experienced frustration when he could not teach students "specific papers" in which they would compose in their respective disciplines. He also noted that he did not "know enough about their field to be able to do that." For Cornelius, teaching this transfer-based FYC course was too general. Liz, too, reported that the first course did not provide enough disciplinary writing opportunities. She stated, "102 sounds like it's straight up transfer across disciplines, but 101 I don't think is as much." Liz and Cornelius disliked that transfer in the first FYC course did not provide students opportunities to write in their respective disciplines, and they found the generality of the course as problematic for transfer.

While Cornelius and Liz disliked the generality of the course, Joseph and Mandy reported that the structure of the course was too limiting and potentially boring. Joseph first reported that he was unsure if there were anything he disliked about teaching for transfer, but then he responded that "by default" the course was "very structured," i.e., one assignment built into the next and so forth. For this reason, the course design could be perceived by "some teachers" as limiting, which "forces them into a box that they have to assign." Joseph noted that this dislike was not a personal view, but he began the response by stating, "if I had to pick something." Therefore, it is unclear the extent to which Joseph experienced this dislike. Mandy, on the other hand, reported that the course design was limiting. She reported experiencing the "unity of the class," i.e., the building and scaffolding of the assignments within a theme, as boring "at times" for her and her students. While she noted that unity contributed to transfer, she believed that it possibly could mislead students in thinking that learning was only applicable to the course topic. While Joseph and Mandy reported that the scaffolding was helpful for transfer, they disliked the overall course design as it limited instructors' freedom in design and topic choice.

Most participants reported to dislike either the possibility of transfer or the limited structure or disciplinary of the course design. Clara, however, was the only participant to report no dislikes in teaching a transfer-based FYC curriculum.

From these findings, participants unanimously valued and found teaching a transfer-based FYC course important and needed by both the profession and the students. While they all found value in teaching transfer, they also reported some concerns or

dislikes in teaching it. The most recurring dislike was the uncertainty in knowing if transfer were possible for students, which caused participants to experience frustration or doubt. The juxtaposition in finding transfer valuable for its applicability with the experiencing doubt about its effectiveness alluded to a potential conflict for these participants. For this reason, it is unclear the extent to which Ava, Mike, and Spencer found teaching transfer valuable. Other dislikes were the generalizability of the first FYC course because it did not provide disciplinary writing opportunities. While Cornelius noted that the skills he was teaching could be reworked for disciplinary writing, he experienced frustration in not being able to provide his students with those opportunities as well as not having the knowledge and experience in those disciplinary writing contexts. Liz found that the first course was not enough for students to transfer, and she was unsure as to whether students would experience such opportunities in the second FYC course. She was unsure because she had not taught that course yet. As for Joseph and Mandy, the course design limited instructors' and students' freedoms to explore topics, which could be perceived as boring. While the course design was limited, they both conveyed an understanding and need for scaffolding and unifying the course to enable transfer. Ultimately, participants' reported dislikes for teaching transfer were qualified by first stating that they all believed transfer was a good idea and an important curriculum for FYC courses; however, some responses pointed to a potential conflict.

Participants' Primary Objectives for Teaching First FYC Sequence. After inquiring about the extent to which participants liked teaching a transfer-based FYC course, I inquired about participants' primary objectives for teaching the course. The

most frequent response was transfer, which was reported by Ava, Joseph, and Spencer. Ava reported that she aimed to incorporate and encourage transfer in her classroom. She stated, "I was super excited when I came here, and you guys were all over the transfer thing." She reported that she was excited because this emphasis depicted composition as a valuable discipline. Joseph did not report transfer explicitly, but he described it as his primary objective for teaching. He aimed to cultivate students' skills for future application in other courses, majors, hobbies, or interests. He wanted to ensure a classroom environment that created "the best opportunity to develop these skills, retain these skills, and feel comfortable voicing" when students did not understand a concept. Spencer, on the other hand, mentioned transfer but was more ambivalent about it as his teaching objective. He stated, "I don't want to say my primary objective is transfer, but that's what it should be. It's kind of inevitable. The way I teach, I make that come through." Spencer perceived his teaching as emphasizing transfer, which he did not want to admit. In addition to this response, he also reported developing students' skills in reading and "building up that healthy skepticism." While it is unclear to the extent which Spencer identified his primary objective as transfer, Ava and Joseph reported transfer as their primary objectives for teaching in UTK's FYC curriculum.

While some participants reported transfer, three participants reported primary objectives of developing writers' awareness of processing and assessing writing. Clara, Cornelius, and Mike reported objectives that were aimed toward developing student writing. Clara reported wanting to teach students that "writing is a thinking process," a response that she had emphasized throughout the first two interviews. Additionally, she

wanted her students to know that "productive failure is important" toward developing writing skills. Similar to Clara, Mike wanted his students to "develop a sense of how writing works," particularly when writing is or is not working and why. Mike reported that this objective stemmed from his "own experiences with writing." He noted how he was unsure as to how his writing worked well, so that was a skill he wanted to develop within his students. While Mike and Clara wanted their students to become aware of their thinking and writing, Cornelius wanted his students to become aware of their ideas. He reported his primary objective as teaching students "to express their own ideas," but he did not expand upon what that entailed. These participants' primary objectives were to develop their students' awareness as to how they thought, expressed, or assessed their writing.

Liz and Mandy also wanted to develop their students' awareness but in analysis and evaluation. Liz reported her primary objective as developing students' "analytical and evaluative skill[s] in writing." She also wanted her students to develop a "greater understanding of effective and appropriate reasoning and evidence," and from that reasoning, she wanted her students to be able "to make recommendations on their analysis and evaluation." Mandy, too, wanted her students to "be able to analyze debates and understand what's going on and then be able to contribute to them in a reasonable manner." She reported wanting her students to learn how to develop "well-structured arguments" for academic audiences. She reported that this development was her primary objective because students were "going to have to do [that] no matter what their discipline is." She believed that analysis and argumentation were valuable skills, and she

wanted her students to develop these skills to determine "why something is persuasive or isn't" because "they might not get [that] anywhere else." For Liz and Mandy, developing students' argumentative and analytical skills were primary objectives for teaching because those skills developed students' understandings of situations or contexts.

From these findings, only three participants reported transfer as a primary objective, when participants unanimously reported valuing the teaching of transfer. Moreover, Spencer's reported primary objective was unclear and conflicted with earlier reports of skepticism about the possibility of transfer. I also found it surprising that participants did not report teaching students rhetoric as a primary objective, though Mandy hinted toward that by developing students' analysis of persuasion. The reported objectives of developing analytical and argumentation skills aligned with the overall purposes of major writing assignments within the first FYC course, so these objectives demonstrated a desire for students to retain the learning from those assignments. As for the reported objectives of developing students' awareness of thinking and writing, these objectives connected with participants' experienced comfort in teaching writing as a process, which was integrated into the standard course design. Overall, participants' reported primary objectives reflected components of the course design.

Conclusion

My purpose in this chapter was to investigate how GTAs transitioned into a new teaching context, particularly paying attention to what they perceived as beneficial from UTK's pre-service orientation, how they adopted the required master standardized syllabus, and how they negotiated their prior and current learning to teach UTK's FYC

curriculum. Beginning with UTK's pre-service orientation, it functioned in two key ways: 1. It familiarized participants with available resources, and 2. It conveyed the writing program's expectations for teaching the curriculum. However, most participants experienced these workshops as review of content with which they were already familiar, and they perceived the pre-service orientation as repetitive and boring. Similar to their prior WPE experiences, participants recalled workshops that demonstrated best practices or provided useful resources, and they reused or adapted instructional materials and demonstrated activities to help them to teach in a new curriculum. In addition to adapting these materials, some participants converted to the required standardized syllabus without establishing compatible connections between prior experiences and current teaching expectations. There were three participants, however, who did not convert to the curriculum. Instead, they adapted their prior teaching experiences and instructional materials to fit the new teaching context. This adaptation helped them to survive their first semester teaching in an unfamiliar context. In both scenarios, participants detected surface features of the curriculum that were similar to their past experiences, and they did not explore the underlying theories of those features to note any dissimilarities. Instead, they felt reassured in their pedagogical abilities by noting and relying on the surface-level connections they made.

As for participants' pedagogical knowledge, they developed in their understanding of discourse community and curriculum knowledges after experiencing teaching the curriculum for approximately two months. This growth was evident in the evolution of definitions and identification of curriculum values. Even though participants

developed in these areas, their pedagogical knowledge demonstrated a need for further theoretical development because they were mostly detecting surface features that were made apparent through the act of teaching the curriculum. As for their degree of teaching comfort in the new context, participants were more confident and comfortable in teaching writing as a process, though not all participants could articulate how they incorporated it into their course design. Participants reported discomfort in teaching genres that were nuanced, slippery, and too similar or unfamiliar, but data revealed that participants' theories-in-use embodied a surface-level theoretical understanding of how genres function rhetorically. Participants' rhetorical knowledge was contingent upon their prior exposure to rhetorical theory and the degree to which they were familiar with it. To develop participants' pedagogical knowledge, writing pedagogy educators need to assess their knowledge and discourse to develop their theoretical knowledge and thus their pedagogical practices. Without this development, GTAs will implement perceived surface features of the curriculum and will not consider how the discourse community's values shape the curriculum and thus their pedagogical practices.

Keeping participants' current teaching experiences in mind, I next ask participants to reflect about their overall experiences in teaching at UTK. Through reflection, participants' assumptions, perceptions, and values could change. In the following chapter, I revisit the five pedagogical knowledge domains and report their reflections, noting any pedagogical development.

CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS 3:
PHD GTAS' REFLECTIONS ON TEACHING AT UTK

In the previous chapter, I provided data about participants' current teaching experiences in UTK's FYC writing program. Specifically, I inquired about participants' recollections and impressions of UTK's pre-service orientation as well as how they developed their instructional materials. I also asked participants about their current pedagogical practices in relation to five teaching knowledge domains: curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. I reported data about participants' comprehension of UTK's curriculum objectives and values, their dis/comforts in teaching rhetorical theory and genre, their encouragement of teaching writing as a process, their definitions of transfer, and their primary teaching objectives. I asked participants about these particular areas because I wanted to examine the extent to which they comprehended and adapted the writing program's curriculum values and academic discourse.

In this chapter, I revisit these five pedagogical knowledge domains because I wanted participants to reflect on some of their prior answers and overall teaching experiences. I first re-examined participants' curriculum knowledge, particularly their reflections on perceived curriculum objectives and values. I also asked participants about any challenges experienced in teaching the curriculum to identify any dissonant experiences. Lastly, I asked participants to reflect on what they learned about the curriculum through teaching it and to identify, if anything, what they still needed to learn.

This data provided insight into participants' comprehension of the curriculum's structure and values as well as the extent to which participants learned about curriculum values by experiencing it.

After inquiring about participants' curriculum knowledge, I then re-examined their rhetorical knowledge. I reminded participants about reported dis/comforts in teaching rhetorical theory and asked them if those reports changed as they continued to teach the course. I compared their reports from Interview 2 with Interview 3 to determine any change or growth in teaching rhetorical theory. This data provided insight into participants' rhetorical knowledge and the extent to which that knowledge informed their pedagogical practices. Additionally, I asked participants about any perceived benefits in teaching rhetorical theory. I did not provide them with their previous responses; instead, I wanted to examine if participants reported the same benefits in both interviews to determine if those benefits were consistent. Participants' reported benefits also provided insight into the extent they perceived value in teaching rhetorical theory, which was one of the curriculum emphases of UTK's writing program.

In addition to rhetorical knowledge, I also inquired about participants' experiences with teaching genres. I first asked participants to reflect on their overall experiences in teaching the required genres at UTK. Because the writing program required four major writing assignment genres, participants did not have much freedom in designing their own writing assignments. By asking participants to reflect on their overall experiences, I could learn about whether participants encountered positive or dissonant experiences in teaching the required genres. I also reminded participants of

their reported dis/comforts from Interview 2 and asked participants to reflect on whether those reports were still accurate after experiencing the course in its entirety. I compared and contrasted their reported dis/comforts from both interviews to determine any change in teaching the required genres. This data provided insight into participants' genre knowledge and the extent to which that knowledge informed their pedagogical practices to teach the curriculum as designed.

To further understand how participants taught for transfer, I asked participants about their pedagogical practices knowledge, which focused on how participants experienced teaching writing as a process. As I did with both rhetorical and genre knowledges, I reminded participants about their experienced dis/comforts in teaching writing as a process from Interview 2. I compared the data to determine participants' familiarity with these pedagogical practices as well as their understanding about what teaching writing as a process entailed. This data provided insight into participants' pedagogical practices knowledge and the extent to which that knowledge informed their understanding of writing as a process, particularly how that teaching connected to transfer theory (other ideology of the writing program). To further understand participants' comprehension of how writing process was an essential part of transfer theory, I asked participants to reflect on their experiences of teaching the course, which was scaffolded by the Composition Office. This data also provided insight into whether participants had positive or dissonant experiences in teaching the course as designed.

Lastly, I inquired into participants' discourse community knowledge. I wanted to examine participants' comprehension and embodiment of the writing program's

academic discourse and values, particularly transfer theory. First, I asked participants to reflect on their overall experiences in teaching transfer in their respective courses. Again, I wanted to determine if participants had positive or dissonant experiences in teaching transfer. Moreover, I wanted to determine if participants reported any value in teaching transfer. I also asked participants to define transfer to determine how participants perceived and used the term. I then compared this data with participants' definitions provided in Interviews 1 and 2. This data provided insight into the comprehension and degree of appropriation of transfer theory in participants' pedagogical practices. Lastly, I asked participants to reflect on their primary teaching objectives. I did not provide participants with their Interview 2 responses because I wanted to determine if reports changed after reflecting on the course. I also asked if they planned to hold those objectives the next time they were to teach the course, and this question was designed to encourage reflection further. This data revealed the extent to which the discourse community as well as the other knowledge domains informed participants' pedagogical objectives. Participants' reported primary objectives also provided insight into their understanding and implementation of UTK's writing program's curriculum.

Curriculum Knowledge

In Interview 3, I was interested in learning more about participants' overall experiences with UTK's writing program's curriculum. Specifically, I wanted to understand participants' comprehension of the curriculum's objectives and values. To obtain this insight, I reminded participants of their prior responses from Interview 2 and asked them to reflect about the extent to which those answers still represented how they

perceived the curriculum's values and objectives after teaching the entire course. To further understand their curriculum knowledge, I also asked participants about any experienced challenges they encountered. Their responses revealed dissonant experiences that stemmed from participants' either unfamiliarity with the curriculum or conflict in negotiating prior experiences in a new teaching context. Lastly, I inquired about what they learned through teaching the first FYC course and what, if anything, they still needed to learn about the curriculum. This data provided insight into the extent to which participants comprehended the curriculum's structure and values. In what follows, I report participants' perceptions of the writing program's curriculum objectives and values, their experienced challenges in teaching the curriculum, and what they reported learning and needing to learn from teaching the curriculum.

Participants' Perceived Curriculum Objectives and Values for UTK's Writing Program

After teaching one more writing assignment and completing the semester, participants, unanimously, reported no change in their reported curriculum objectives and values from Interview 2. As in the previous interview, the reported curriculum objectives ranged from transfer to rhetoric or analysis and research. While participants' perceptions of the writing program's curriculum objectives and values remained unchanged, some participants provided a rationale for maintaining their answers.

The most recurring curriculum objective was transfer, which was reported by Ava, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer. Ava reinforced her prior claim that the curriculum's objective was to teach for transfer. She stated that the last assignment, the Position Paper for a Public Audience, encouraged transfer because it "pushed [students] to go outside"

the English course and "go more across the curriculum." Ava's understanding of the curriculum was verified by this last assignment because it encouraged students to research and write for an audience outside of an English classroom. Spencer, too, found that the last assignment verified his understanding of the curriculum's focus on transfer. He reported seeing more students employ Aristotelian appeals in their assignments, and he stated that the change in genre helped students shift to considering writing in genres beyond an English paper. As for Joseph and Mandy, they experienced that their prior responses were reified by the Composition Office's winter workshop, which focused on teaching the second FYC course. From that workshop, Joseph reported learning that teaching students transferrable core thinking and writing skills would prepare them "to move on to 102 and other writing courses." Mandy, too, found that the winter workshop "hammered [transfer] home." From that workshop, she learned that students could apply the genres learned in the first FYC course to the second FYC course, where they would write in "different academic genres." Overall, these participants' comprehension of the curriculum objectives was verified by experiencing either the course design or WPE, and these participants received this verification late within the semester, which was when the last assignment and the winter workshop took place. From these experiences, participants understand the curriculum objective as teaching transferrable writing skills, such as rhetorical and/or genre awareness, that students could use beyond the English classroom.

While some participants reported transfer, Clara, Cornelius, and Liz reported no change in identifying rhetoric as the curriculum objective. Clara continued to perceive the writing program's curriculum as the "building and crafting arguments." When I asked her

why she continued to identify that response as the curriculum objectives, she explained that this process was "the way [the course] pans out with the stepping from different genres." While she reported no change, she did discuss genres more in Interview 3 than rhetorical appeals, which she had emphasized in Interview 2. While Clara emphasized genres as part of her reflection, Cornelius continued to support his previous response of building and dissecting readings and assignments through, what he termed, rhetorical "elements." He explained that he found this emphasis to be the curriculum's objective because that was how he learned to write. While Cornelius did not change his response, his explanation did draw a connection between his prior educational experiences to what he perceived to be the writing program's curriculum objectives. Liz, on the other hand, connected the curriculum to the design of the course. She did not change her previous response that the curriculum emphasizes "context-based" writing, discourse communities, audience, and message. She found this emphasis to still be the case, particularly in light of teaching the position papers for academic and public audiences. While she continued to support this response, she did report feeling doubtful about her approach to and understanding of the curriculum. She stated, "I don't know if that was just me thinking we need to focus on audience and discourse community and analysis, but I felt like it [i.e., the argumentative assignments] suffered at the end, and I don't know why yet." She reported that these assignments suffered because students struggled to integrate evidence in comparison to her previous experiences in teaching and evaluating argumentation. Overall, these participants neither changed nor developed their initial perceptions of the writing program's curriculum, and they did not mention transfer as an additional

curriculum emphasis. While Clara's and Cornelius's respective rationales uncovered new insights or connections, the rationales did not change the degree to which they appropriated the curriculum knowledge, which was discussed in Chapter Five.

Lastly, Mike, too, did not change his previous response of "analysis and research" as the writing program's curriculum objectives. When asked as to why his perception remained unchanged, he responded, "Just doing one more unit doesn't really…It's just kind of a different variation on other things I was doing, so it doesn't feel like suddenly there was a big change or anything like that." Throughout the interview process, Mike's initial understanding of the curriculum objectives changed from "don't know" to "analysis and research," and he maintained this last response in Interview 3. Mike's overall perception of the writing program's curriculum demonstrated a lack of appropriation because he neither mentioned transfer nor rhetoric as the curriculum objectives.

Participants' Reported Challenges in Teaching Curriculum Objectives and Values

I asked each participant about challenges, if any, they experienced in designing or teaching the curriculum to meet the objectives and values that they previously identified. The most reported challenge was the unfamiliarity of the course design, writing assignments, and required genres. Six of eight (Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, and Mike) participants reported feeling either unfamiliar or barely "ahead of the curve" in teaching the syllabus and assignments. Ava reported being unfamiliar with the course theme, which was about the moon base. She reported selecting this topic because she thought they would be interested in it, but she did not know much about it. She compared

herself to a "piano teacher" who is "one lesson ahead of the student they're trying to teach piano to." Similarly, Cornelius also reported feeling the need to "play catch up" and learn "ahead of the curve." He noted how he was unfamiliar teaching stasis and Op-Eds because he did not teach those assignments at his previous institution. Though he found similarities between his past and current teaching contexts, he reported that the programs were different, and he needed to learn what his current program prioritized in teaching FYC. Joseph also found teaching the Debate Analysis and the Position Paper for a Public Audience assignments as challenging because he was unfamiliar with the genres. He called them "tricky" because he had no previous teaching experiences in these genres and did not know how to connect the assignments with the ones with which he was more familiar. Mike, too, reported the Debate Analysis as challenging because he was unfamiliar with it and had never taught it. Clara also reported challenges due to being unfamiliar with the curriculum. She reported that curriculum was "all brand new genres, all brand new assignments," and for this reason, she experienced "constant feeling of flailing in the water, drowning." She noted, "I don't remember it being even that difficult the first time I got dropped into a class in my master's." Because she did not design the course, she reported not being able to foresee any potential issues or questions that her students may experience because she was unfamiliar with the curriculum design. Mandy also reported challenges in foreseeing how assignments connected. While she reported understanding the curriculum on an "intellectual level," she reported not having the "experience and understanding of it until" she taught it. For this reason, Mandy was unfamiliar with how to explicitly teach the assignments for transfer. The common

challenge for all of these participants was being unfamiliar with either the subject matter or the required assignments. These participants did not find compatible connections between past and present experiences to help them negotiate their unfamiliarity with the curriculum.

The second most recurring challenge was the course theme, which was reported by three participants. Ava, Liz, and Spencer reported experiencing challenges with the course theme. For Ava, the course theme was a second challenge in addition to feeling unfamiliar with topic. She found that the course theme limited her ability to teach for transfer, and she stated that if the course theme could be more flexible, then students could connect the subject matter and writing styles to other disciplines. Liz and Spencer, on the other hand, experienced challenges with the course theme in regard to maintaining students' engagement. Liz found that her students suffered from "thematic fatigue." She reported feeling "tiresome" for both herself and her students in maintaining interest in the course theme. For this reason, she allowed students to write about any topic for the Position Paper for a Public Audience, and because of this decision, she reported that her students' writing improved, specifically in source integration. While Spencer did not report changing the assignment's topic, he did report designing lesson plans to offset students' "tun[ing] out." He aimed to keep students "off balance[d]" to keep them engaged in the course, and he reported doing that by incorporating videos, being cautious about relying on too many terms, and encouraging in-class writing. While Liz and Spencer felt challenged in maintaining student's engagement in the course, Ava reported

that the course theme limited transfer. None of these participants perceived the course theme as a conduit for teaching transfer and rhetorical theories.

Based on these findings, most participants experienced challenges in teaching the curriculum due to unfamiliarity with either the subject matter, course design, assignments and/or genres. Only two participants reported experiencing challenges with maintaining students' engagement due to course theme, and these challenges are typical for most teaching scenarios. Nevertheless, most of these participants spent more time learning about the curriculum by experiencing it, and as they were learning, they were having to negotiate prior experiences in light of the new curriculum's expectations and objectives. Their unfamiliarity with the FYC curriculum presents a potential problem with the implementation of curriculum objectives.

Concepts Participants Learned and Still Need to Learn about the Curriculum

I asked participants two final questions to assess their curriculum knowledge. The first question was, "Is there anything you learned about the curriculum through teaching it?" And the second question was, "What do you feel you still want to know or understand about the curriculum?" Participants' responses were mostly diverse, but there were some common answers, such as learning unfamiliar subject matter.

In regard to the first question, participants reported a range of responses, from preparing more (Ava) to incorporating more conferences (Liz), to not assuming students understand the material (Cornelius), or to reaching out for advice from the Composition Office (Joseph). Clara was the only participant who reported that she did not know what she had learned about the curriculum from teaching it; she found that the experience had

not “sunk in” with her at the time of Interview 3. While these responses were diverse, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer reported learning about stasis theory through teaching the curriculum. Mandy reported that she had “never heard of it before teaching this class.” Through teaching the assignment, she learned what it entailed and how it functioned in debates. Spencer, too, reported learning more about stasis theory. He stated, “Having to teach stasis analysis, I don’t think it was ever totally clear until I had to teach it.” He found that through teaching it, he better understood what it entailed and could convey that information “intelligently.” Mike, on the other hand, learned what he needed to emphasize about stasis theory after teaching it. He reported leaning about how to teach the theory to students and what questions or issues they may encounter. For these participants, stasis analysis was an unfamiliar subject matter, and by teaching it, they learned more about the theory and how to convey it to students. While participants’ responses were quite diverse to this question, these three participants’ experiences are noteworthy because the experience contributed to their understanding of an unfamiliar assignment that was an integral part of the curriculum’s design.

Similar to the first question, participants’ responses were quite diverse in identifying what they still needed to learn about the curriculum, but there were four who reported a similar need. For example, Ava reported needing to practice teaching the curriculum to determine what does and does not work, whereas Mike reported being unaware of anything he still needed to learn. Liz reported needing more opportunities to teach for transfer; she found the first FYC course to be too thematic and “humanities-driven,” and she did not know how to “integrate” transfer into the course design. Mandy,

on the other hand, reported needing to learn more genre options for the Position Paper for a Public Audience. Some of these reported needs demonstrate how unfamiliar the curriculum's design and objectives were to these participants. Ava and Mandy were still learning the curriculum, particularly what to expect and what genres to assign, and Liz did not perceive how the first FYC course encouraged transfer. For these participants, they needed a stronger foundation in the curriculum design. They needed it to connect with their prior experiences and understanding of transfer or genres.

While these participants provided a variety of responses, there were four participants who reported needing to learn more about stasis theory. Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, and Spencer reported needing to learn more about stasis theory. Clara reported that, even after teaching it, she did not understand stasis theory. She stated:

> I don't really understand how it is that much different than a critical rhetorical analysis, and if it is, then I'm not understanding what that primary difference is other than the vocabulary used with the conjecture and the definition and the quality and policy, which seems to be the crux of the stasis analysis.

Because she understood rhetorical theory, Clara conflated the purposes of the Comparative Rhetorical Analysis with the Debate Analysis. This conflation helped her to teach the unfamiliar assignment. Clara's reported need demonstrates that she did not conceptually understand stasis theory or how it functioned within the course design. Cornelius also reported feeling "fuzzy" about stasis theory, though he did not explain why he felt that way. As for Joseph and Spencer, they reported they needed to learn how to better teach stasis theory. Joseph reported needing to spend more time understanding stasis analysis, particularly in "rethinking" his assignments "to try and better fit the goals" of the Debate Analysis. He wanted to "fine-tune" these teaching skills so that he

could help students understand the theory. Spencer, too, reported needing a "better handle" on the debates provided in class. While he reported understanding it better after teaching it, he noted that he was "not quite as nimble" in managing multiple points of view and interpretations about the debate. While Joseph and Spencer experienced a need to further develop their pedagogical skills in teaching stasis theory, Clara and Cornelius reported needing to better understand the theoretical concept that was unfamiliar to them.

While participants gave a variety of responses about the concepts they either learned or needed to learn about the curriculum, the one central theme was developing comprehension of stasis theory, which was unfamiliar to most of the participants. As reported in Chapter Five, only two participants, Ava and Spencer, had previous knowledge of the theory prior to teaching at UTK. While Spencer had prior knowledge of it, he was still one of the participants who reported learning more about it through teaching it as well as needing to develop his teaching of the theory. Similar to Spencer, Joseph, too, reported learning more about stasis theory, and he also desired to develop his teaching of it. Mandy and Mike were unaware of the concept prior to teaching it, but they learned about it by teaching the curriculum, whereas Clara and Cornelius, who were also unaware of the theory, found that teaching it was not enough for them to understand it. These participants' curriculum knowledge and current teaching experiences were influenced the most by what they perceived to be unfamiliar. They did no express interest in learning or needing to learn the writing program's curriculum objectives and values.

Liz, however, was the exception. She reported needing more opportunities to teach for transfer in the first FYC course. In Chapter Five, she did not report transfer as a

curriculum objective in either Interview 1 or Interview 2, where she emphasized rhetoric. Her response to needing to learn how to integrate transfer into the curriculum points to a disconnect in seeing rhetorical theory as transferrable or in understanding how the curriculum's design promoted transfer through Beaufort's (2007) five knowledge domains. Liz's response demonstrates that she did not identify knowledges in rhetoric, genre, writing process, discourse community, and subject matter as elements of transfer because she was unaware of how the curriculum was designed. Therefore, she reported needing more opportunities to provide students with disciplinary writing, which was how she perceived transfer operating within a FYC course. While the other participants' responses emphasized needing to learn unfamiliar subject matter, Liz's need was to learn the writing program's curriculum, particularly how the course design facilitated transfer.

Rhetorical Knowledge

After completing a semester of teaching, I wanted participants to reflect on their experiences of teaching rhetorical theory, which was one of the FYC curriculum ideologies. In Interview 3, I reminded participants of earlier reported dis/comforts in teaching rhetorical theory, and I asked if those experiences were still accurate. From this interview, I found that most participants remained unchanged in their initial reports of comfort and discomfort. I also asked participants about any perceived benefits they found in teaching rhetorical theory. Most participants reported that rhetoric was beneficial for teaching transfer, which was a development from their Interview 2 responses. In fact, most participants connected rhetoric to transfer theory. In what follows, I report

participants' reflections about comfort and discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory as well as any perceived benefits of teaching rhetoric.

Comfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory

After reflecting on teaching rhetoric throughout the semester, five participants maintained their Interview 2 responses. In both interviews, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer reported experiencing comfort when teaching familiar rhetorical concepts, such as Aristotelian appeals, audience awareness, and purpose. In addition to these comforts, Joseph, Mandy and Spencer also reported feeling more comfortable with stasis theory after teaching it in both interviews. Clara also remained consistent in experiencing comfort when teaching argumentation, particularly teaching students to examine and break down arguments to discover main claims. For these participants, their reported experiences of comfort stemmed from familiarity, i.e., they had experienced these rhetorical concepts as either a student or an instructor. In fact, Cornelius, Mandy, and Mike made direct mentions of prior teaching experiences in explaining why teaching these concepts were familiar, and Spencer noted how he ensured his knowledgeability in the subject matter prior to teaching it by reading the textbook and doing research. Even when it came to stasis theory, Joseph, Mandy, and Spencer reported feeling comfort when teaching it because they had experienced it and were thus more familiar with the theory and what to expect when teaching it. Overall, participants reported being more familiar throughout the term with rhetorical concepts, such as Aristotelian appeals, audience, and purpose, or in generally teaching argumentation.

While most participants did not report any change in their experienced comfort, two participants (Ava and Liz) did report significant change. In Interview 2, Ava reported feeling comfortable teaching stasis theory because she had previous teaching experience with it. However, in Interview 3, she reported feeling "not as confident in it as" she had reported earlier. When she taught stasis at UTK, she reported that she was comfortable explaining stasis theory, but after reviewing her students' writing, she found that students struggled with the concept. She reported feeling "not sure that they got it," which she deemed a "blow to [her] teaching confidence." Ava's reported comfort stemmed from her confidence in the subject matter, and when students' writing did not reinforce her confidence, she changed her reported comfort. Through reflection, she found that her most confident teaching of rhetoric was in Aristotelian appeals because she did not "ever get confused in [her] own head as to what [she's] talking about." Ava's prior teaching experiences with stasis theory did not match her current experience, causing her to reevaluate what she felt confident and comfortable in teaching rhetorical theory. Her re-evaluation of comfort led her to reporting Aristotelian appeals because she felt more secure in her knowledge and teaching of that subject matter.

Liz, too, reported change due to confidence. In Interview 2, she reported feeling comfortable in teaching anything related to "persuasion." However, when she reflected about that previous response, she responded, "No, I felt like I was shocked." She found that teaching argumentation had "always been a real strength" in her pedagogical practices. However, she found two potential causes for the change. The first was that the curriculum's theme inhibited her teaching of argumentation, and she found when she

"opened up the theme" in the Position Paper for a Public Audience assignment that students' approaches to argumentation were significantly better. The second potential cause was that her discomfort in teaching stasis theory affected her preparation for teaching persuasion in the last two assignments. Because she felt more prepared and confident in teaching persuasion, an area she had previous teaching experience in, she was "over-comfortable and overconfident." When she received her students' position papers, she found that their writing was not meeting her expectations, which were informed by her prior teaching experiences. She found that since most students did not meet those expectations, then it was a problem with her teaching of argumentation. Like Ava, Liz's initial report stemmed from prior teaching experiences, and when the current students' writing did not reinforce those prior experiences and expectations, then there was shift in confidence and thus in her reported comfort in teaching rhetorical theory.

From these reports, most participants did not report any significant changes in their experienced comforts in teaching rhetorical theory. Five participants, who reported no change in initial reports of comfort, reasoned that their comfortability stemmed from familiarity and experience. As previously discussed, Cornelius, Mandy, and Mike referenced prior teaching experiences, and Spencer noted that he prepared his teaching of rhetoric by reading textbooks and doing research. Joseph discussed the process of experiencing teaching the new course and becoming more familiar with it through that experience. Clara, however, did not provide any reasoning as for why she felt comfortable teaching argumentation in Interview 3. As for Ava and Liz, they reported a change in their reports due to a shift in confidence. They both had prior experiences in

teaching either stasis theory or argumentation prior to teaching at UTK. When approaching teaching these topics, they reported feeling confident, but when students' writing did not reinforce that confidence, they changed their initial responses. Ava reported that her confidence shifted toward teaching Aristotelian appeals, but Liz did not report any rhetorical concepts in which she felt comfortable. While she did not report any, I did not find that she experienced discomfort in teaching all rhetorical theory. I discuss her reported discomfort in teaching rhetoric in the following section. Overall, participants' comfort in teaching rhetorical theory was situated in their familiarity and thus confidence in the subject matter.

Discomfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory

In addition to inquiring about participants' comfort in teaching rhetorical theory, I also inquired as to whether their reported discomforts in teaching rhetoric changed since Interview 2. Four of eight participants reported no change in their initial reports of teaching discomfort. Ava, Liz, Mike, and Spencer reported no change. Three of these participants (Liz, Mike, and Spencer) reported discomfort in teaching stasis theory in both interviews. Liz affirmed that she still felt uncomfortable teaching stasis theory, but she later added that she did not feel uncomfortable in teaching it. She reported that she did not have a strong "framework" for teaching it and that she had "a lot of work still left to do" in developing her pedagogical approach to it. Mike, too, reported feeling the same discomfort but noted that the question was difficult to answer because he "did not know" whether his discomfort had changed or not, at least until he had to teach the subject matter again. While Mike did not know, Spencer maintained his reported discomfort in

teaching the mapping of a debate from Interview 2. He found that mapping a debate was "tricky" because students wanted absolute answers. Because he was negotiating multiple points of view, he experienced discomfort in communicating the nuanced interpretations of the debate. For these participants, their discomfort with stasis theory stemmed from its complexity and unfamiliarity; these participants had no prior experience in teaching the theory and reported learning about it through teaching it.

While Ava did not report discomfort in teaching stasis theory, she did report a discomfort in teaching the rhetorical situation in Interview 2. In Interview 3, she reported that she still found teaching this concept a discomfort because she had "a hard time talking about rhetorical situation." She reported that while she could talk about Aristotelian appeals, she experienced confusion when connecting the terms to the rhetorical situation, as suggested by the Composition Office's pre-service orientation and required textbooks. Because she was unfamiliar with the terms and connections, she experienced discomfort. She reported never using these terms or concepts in her prior teaching experiences, so this concept was new for her.

While four participants did not change their initial responses of experienced discomfort, four participants did change their Interview 2 responses. Clara had initially reported a discomfort in teaching Aristotelian appeals because those terms were a "gap in [her] knowledge." In Interview 3, she did not report these appeals; instead, she reported a discomfort in teaching stasis theory. While she reported that she could explain the terminology associated with the theory, she experienced discomfort in not knowing "the shape that the essay is supposed to take." She also noted that the assignment was "a

different kind of argument," and she was not familiar with it. When she experienced this discomfort, she reported turning to a peer at a previous institution for advice. Clara reported that the peer validated her frustration and pointed out that the problem lied in the fact that instructors could not choose the genres they wanted to teach, and she stated that this advice "calmed [her] anxiety of feeling that [she] had no idea what [she] was doing." She added, "[T]here is something important about an instructor choosing their own genres or having the ability to do that, so that we can use our best assets to bring out their best assets, if you're still teaching toward the course objectives." Through this explanation, I found Clara's reported discomfort with stasis theory as both rhetorical and genre problems. She linked rhetorical theory with genre, and she experienced discomfort in knowing the structure and conventions of the Debate Analysis. She also reported being unfamiliar with the theory itself, even though she reported being able to explain the terms. Clara's discomfort stemmed from unfamiliarity, and she sought advice from an outsider to help her make sense of the conflict she was experiencing.

Stasis theory was also a reported discomfort by Cornelius in Interview 2. However, in Interview 3, he minutely altered his response. He reported that he was "less" uncomfortable teaching it and believed that he would "be much better next semester with it." Cornelius's discomfort with stasis theory improved, though not a reported comfort, because he experienced teaching it. He found that his students' questions "forced [him] to delve deeper into it to be able to answer them." He reported that this experience better prepared him to teach the concept the next time he were required to teach it. Cornelius did not report any additional discomforts, only the amelioration of this discomfort.

Cornelius's reported improvement was made possible by experiencing the discomfort and learning more about the unfamiliar theory.

Joseph, too, changed his initial reported discomfort. In Interview 2, he reported discomfort in teaching rhetorical concepts like "*kairos*" and "*exigence*." In Interview 3, he did not report these terms. Instead, he reported that he felt no discomfort. He stated, "I don't feel like there's anything that I'm uncomfortable teaching in the future, if I were to [teach] 101 again." He also noted vaguely that there were topics in which he would need to "refine" or "smooth" his pedagogical approaches, but as for rhetorical concepts, there were not any that he reported.

Unlike Joseph's transition, Mandy moved from not experiencing any discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory in Interview 2 to reporting a discomfort in Interview 3. She reported a discomfort in being unfamiliar with genres associated with the Position Paper for a Public Audience. She reported that she wanted to be more familiar with potential genres that could be used for this writing assignment. While she had read internet blogs before assigning them, she experienced discomfort in teaching blogs due to unfamiliarity. This response is important to note because Mandy connected rhetorical theory to genre. She reported a change in discomfort, but it was not associated with rhetorical concepts or theories. Instead, she focused on her discomfort with public writing genres. Mandy may have conflated rhetoric with genre, or she could have provided this response because she just completed teaching and grading the Position Paper for a Public Audience. It is unclear as to how Mandy distinguishes rhetoric from genre.

From these findings, participants either changed or maintained their Interview 2 responses in reported discomforts with teaching rhetorical theory. Four participants (Ava, Liz, Mike, and Spencer) did not change their initial responses. For Liz, Mike, and Spencer, their discomfort stemmed from the comprehending the complexity of stasis theory and teaching this concept, which was unfamiliar to them. Ava, too, experienced discomfort in teaching rhetorical situation because she did not have any prior experience with the terminology and the teaching of the concept. As for the four participants who changed their responses, two participants' responses demonstrated how they connected rhetorical theory to genre theory. Mandy initially reported no discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory, but in Interview 3, she reported a discomfort in teaching an unfamiliar genre. For her, the genre was unfamiliar in teaching, not personal experience, because she had reported reading blogs prior to assigning them. Clara's Interview 3 response also emphasized a discomfort with genre but with the Debate Analysis assignment. She reported feeling comfortable with explaining the terms associated with stasis theory, but she was unfamiliar with the genre. She even sought outside advice to help her make sense of the discomfort and found solace that the issue stemmed from being constrained in the genres she was allowed to assign by the Composition Office. While she initially reported unfamiliarity with Aristotelian appeals, she did not mention this discomfort in Interview 3. Cornelius's change was less drastic, as he reported feeling "less" uncomfortable in teaching stasis theory, and he found that the experience of teaching it had prepared him to teach it again. Joseph, too, found the experience of teaching rhetorical theory throughout the curriculum had diminished any discomfort he had previously reported. For these

participants, experienced discomfort in teaching rhetoric stemmed from either complexity or unfamiliarity. Some participants' experiences with the curriculum had either ameliorated or altered their initial reported discomforts. For most participants, the act of experiencing the curriculum improved their perceived confidence and discomfort in teaching rhetorical theory.

Perceived Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory

In Interview 2, I asked participants if they perceived any benefits in teaching rhetorical theory. Unlike the previous questions about experienced dis/comfort in teaching rhetorical theory, I did not remind participants of their previous responses. Instead, I wanted to compare and contrast their responses to see if they perceived (dis)similar benefits to teaching rhetoric, a core value of the FYC curriculum. In Interview 3, participants identified a perceived benefit of teaching rhetoric because it either facilitated transfer or developed students' skills. Six participants identified the former, whereas two identified the latter. Participants' responses were more convergent than initial reports, demonstrating a comprehension of how rhetoric facilitated writing transfer (see Table 17).

As previously noted, six of eight participants perceived teaching rhetoric as beneficial for facilitating transfer. In Interview 2, only four participants (Ava, Cornelius, Mandy, and Spencer) perceived this benefit. Ava had explicitly stated transfer, whereas the other participants implied it. In Interview 3, Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer reported transfer, either explicitly or implicitly. Clara, Mandy, and Spencer explicitly reported transfer. Clara noted that the rhetorical situation was "useful for

Table 17

Comparison of Participants' Perceived Benefits of Teaching Rhetorical Theory

Participant	Interview Two	Interview Three
	Perceived Benefits	**Perceived Benefits**
Ava	Transfer	Develop Students' Skills
Clara	Develop Students' Thinking and Voice	Transfer
Cornelius	Transfer	Transfer
Joseph	Develop Pedagogical Practices	Transfer
Liz	Develop Students' Writing	Develop Students' Skills
Mandy	Transfer	Transfer
Mike	Develop Students' Thinking and Voice	Transfer
Spencer	Transfer	Transfer

transfer purposes" and critical thinking because it could be applied "to all objects, all things, all pieces of writing." While she reported this value, she did not describe how the rhetorical situation applied to "all things." Spencer, too, reported valuing the teaching of rhetoric based on personal experiences. He reported that rhetoric was "one of the reasons why [he's] motivated to teach [students] transfer." He stated that rhetoric or rhetorical strategies were applicable to other classes and "real life." He reported that teaching students "nuts and bolts" of writing, such as arranging a paper and integrating evidence, helped them write papers, which they would need for "real life" experiences. Mandy, too, identified a specific rhetorical strategy that would be useful for students' real lives; she reported that teaching stasis theory was beneficial for transfer because students could

"take that into politics and academic debates and even maybe their personal arguments." She found that stasis theory would improve students' communication when faced with a debate or argument. These participants explicitly connected the value of teaching rhetoric with the objectives of teaching transfer.

Whereas these participants explicitly stated transfer, Cornelius, Joseph, and Mike implied it by referencing the application of rhetorical knowledge to other courses or life, in general. Cornelius and Mike perceived benefit in teaching Aristotelian appeals because they were applicable to all writing situations. Cornelius reported that teaching Aristotelian appeals and audience showed students how rhetoric was "not just theory, but something that [they] can see practiced over and over and over again, and know that it's not just […] a one-off, but something that's inherent in all writing." Mike, too, found that Aristotelian appeals and the rhetorical situation applied to other writing contexts, and if students could learn to reflect on these rhetorical concepts, then they could identify how to use them in writing. Joseph, too, reported returning to Aristotelian appeals to teach students "how to shape their papers." These appeals functioned as a "foundation" to students' writing and thinking skills, and if students used them, then they could identify genres of writing situations that they encountered. While these participants do not explicitly reference transfer, their perceived benefits of teaching rhetoric lie within how it informs students' writing, no matter the disciplinary context. By teaching these skills, participants found that their students could transfer their rhetorical knowledge to inform or shape their writing processes. For this reason, they valued the teaching of rhetoric to facilitate transfer.

While these participants perceived teaching rhetoric as beneficial for facilitating transfer, two participants (Ava and Liz) reported rhetorical theory as beneficial for, what I coded as, developing students' skills. In Interview 2, Ava had reported that rhetoric facilitated transfer, and she was the only participant who explicitly connected rhetoric to transfer as a benefit for teaching it. In Interview 3, however, she changed her response to "*ethos*." Ava reported that teaching students about *ethos* was a beneficial skill to learn because students did not know how to "recognize" or "maintain their credibility." Ava reported that it was important for her to teach students about authority and credibility to help them mature. Whereas Ava's emphasis on *ethos* was to develop students' professional, embodied communication, Liz reported that stasis theory was "very valuable skill." She reported that teaching stasis theory developed students' skills "to identify and express where the argument really is," but she did not report how that skill could be used in other classes or life, in general. For Ava and Liz, they perceived teaching particular rhetorical concepts as beneficial for developing maturity or analytical skills. By developing these skills, students could either improve their credibility or recognize issues within a debate.

Through reflection, more participants reported a connection between rhetoric and transfer theories. I found this connection to be important because most participants did not report this connection when discussing their curriculum knowledge. Only one participant, Spencer, reported both rhetoric and transfer as curriculum ideologies for the FYC writing program, but these responses revealed that participants noticed how rhetoric, at least surface features of it, could be used to facilitate transfer. Through

reflection, three participants explicitly reported the connection, whereas three implied it. These participants are picking up on the connections between the theories but have not consciously (with the exception of Spencer) affiliated those connections to the curriculum's design and objectives. As for Ava and Liz, Ava had made the connection, but through reflection, she amended her initial response. This change could be due to a personally held pedagogical objective or a disconnect in connecting the two theories; it is unclear as to why this change occurred. As for Liz, she emphasized the benefit of teaching stasis theory, a concept she had reported struggling to teach. Perhaps, she found benefit in teaching this skill because she spent more time concentrating on teaching it, as she had reported previously in Interview 3 (see "Discomfort in Teaching Rhetorical Theory"). Either way, Ava and Liz did not perceive any connection, at least consistently, about how rhetoric could facilitate transfer. Nevertheless, all participants perceived benefit in teaching rhetorical theory, as it helped students become better communicators.

Genre Knowledge

In Chapter Five, I reported participants' rationales for the genres they assigned as well as any experienced dis/comforts in teaching genres from Interview 2. In this chapter, I provide participants' reflections on their overall experiences with teaching the genres they reported that they assigned. In Interview 3, participants reported either positive or dissonant experiences in teaching genres throughout the fall term. I also reminded participants of their reported dis/comforts from Interview 2. I asked participants about the extent to which their reported dis/comforts remained part of their experience in teaching the FYC curriculum. Through reflection, some participants changed their initial reports

about what they felt comfortable or uncomfortable teaching in regard to genre. These changes in reports stemmed from a conflict with either prior or current teaching experiences. In what follows, I report participants' reflections on teaching genres at UTK as well as any reported dis/comforts in teaching those genres.

Reflections on Overall Experiences with Teaching Genres at UTK

After teaching the four required major writing genres (Comparative Rhetorical Analysis, Debate Analysis, Position Paper for an Academic Audience, and Position Paper for a Public Audience), participants reported either a positive experience with teaching the assigned genres or found that they needed to develop their teaching of or familiarity with the genres. Four participants reported the former, whereas four participants reported the latter.

Joseph, Liz, Mandy, and Spencer reported positive experiences in teaching the required genres. When asked about how the experience had been, they responded with either "nice," "really comfortable," "good," or "really liked it." Joseph reported that teaching the genres was nice because it provided a clear structure for not only his students but also for himself and fellow teachers. He reported that he "felt equipped to teach here [at UTK]" because of this structure, which was provided via pre-service orientation, CourseSites, and standardization of instructional materials. Joseph compared his experience to prior teaching experiences, noting that his prior experiences gave him more "freedom to pick what genres" he taught. This freedom, however, created an unequal teaching community because his experiences with genres were drastically different from his peers. Because of those differences, he could not share his experiences

and learn from peers' experiences with the genres, which, for him, was a pedagogical development process he valued. Whereas Joseph valued the community, Liz and Mandy reported positive experiences because teaching different genres "switched" gears for both teachers and students. Liz reported that she felt "really comfortable teaching genres" because it changed the course focus, even though the course operated within a theme. She noted that, from her research, teaching genres via a thematic approach was "sort of ideal," but she questioned the extent to which the theme helped students learn genre knowledge. Nevertheless, she valued the switching of genres because it changed the class's focus. Mandy, too, reported that teaching genres was good because the switch of genres, but she found the switch beneficial because it demonstrated how writing occurs in different genres, which was particularly noticeable in the last two writing assignments. She reported that her students' reflection essays noted that they learned how to switch mediums and discourses to fit the required genres. Mandy valued that her students recognized the differences in genres, which was what Spencer reported liking about teaching genres. He stated that students typically do not "think about" genres, but once they are taught to recognize them, they "grasp" it and apply it to their writing. Generally, Spencer found teaching genres as "useful" for his students. These participants had positive experiences in teaching the genres they reported in Chapter Five. For Mandy, Liz, and Spencer, genres were a mean of developing students' interest and knowledge, whereas for Joseph, teaching genres meant a community of fellow peers and structure. For all of these participants, their positive experiences stemmed from recognizing how

genres functioned beyond form and structure. They recognized how genres shaped communities, focus, and writing.

While four participants reported positive experiences, Ava, Clara, Cornelius, and Mike reported that they needed to develop their pedagogical approaches or knowledge of the genres they reported teaching. Ava, Clara, and Cornelius compared their teaching of genres at UTK to their prior teaching experiences. Ava reported that teaching genres at UTK was "not great" because she was unsure the extent to which she should discuss genres, particularly the types and conventions. She reported discussing genre more towards the end of the semester, but she wanted to introduce it earlier in the term. The reason she did not introduce genres earlier was because she experienced a conflict with her prior institution's values, in which the program emphasized "10 or 11 different genres in a semester." At UTK, she reported not feeling "100% sure what genres [she] was supposed to discuss with [students]." She also reported feeling "overwhelmed by [her] back knowledge" as she was teaching the genres required by UTK's writing program. These overwhelming prior experiences affected how Ava taught genre at UTK, and this conflict led to a dissonant experience, in which she reported feeling confused.

Whereas Ava was overwhelmed by prior experiences, Clara and Cornelius reported dissonant experiences that stemmed from being unfamiliar with the required genre(s). Clara reported that her experience with genres went "as best as it could." She noted that Debate Analysis genre was "brand new" for her, and for this reason, she did not understand the shape or conventions of the assignment. She reported a desire for good and bad examples of the assignment, but she also noted that she needed "to watch that

student make it through the process" of writing that example. While the Debate Analysis was a new genre for Clara, the genres, in general, were new for Cornelius. He noted that he did not teach "under the guise of genres" at his previous institution, so he, too, did not know what to expect from the genres of UTK's curriculum. He found that his current teaching of genres required a "new vocabulary" and flexibility because the genres were new and not concrete. Clara and Cornelius encountered a teaching situation in which they needed to learn about the genres to teach them to their respective students. Because the genres were unfamiliar, they reported dissonant experiences as they attempted to teach that which was foreign but required.

While Ava, Clara, and Cornelius reported conflicts with either prior experiences or unfamiliar genres, Mike reported that his experience "wasn't too bad" and noted only a "couple hiccups" in teaching genres, which he found were related to transfer. His experience with teaching genres was influenced by students' abilities to comparatively analyze genres and apply that learning, i.e., the similarities and differences associated with each genre, to their writing. While he noted that the Position Paper for an Academic Audience and the Position Paper for a Public Audience were complementary, students struggled adapting their style and source integration into the genre. He reported that he wanted to work on students' recognition of genres' similarities and differences. Whereas Ava, Clara, and Cornelius experienced a need to develop their familiarity with the required genres, Mike's reported experience recognizes how genres were associated with the teaching of transfer. Because he made this connection and reported no unfamiliarity

with the required genres, he was able to report a desire to develop his pedagogical practices to teach the curriculum.

Overall, half the participants reported positive experiences with teaching genres because the genres provided either a focus change, useful skills, or shared structure. The other four participants found that their teaching of genres needed adjustment, particularly in fine-tuning approaches to teaching genres. Ava, Clara, and Cornelius noted that their prior teaching experiences with genres informed their current (mis)understanding of genres required by UTK's writing program. Ava noted conflicts in teaching, particularly the extent to which she needed to teach genres, and Clara and Cornelius desired to become more familiar with genres they had not previously taught. Mike, on the other hand, reported wanting to refine his pedagogical practices to facilitate transfer. He was the only participant who reflected on how his teaching of genres met the curriculum's objectives. Overall, participants' experiences are noteworthy because they contextualize participants' reported dis/comforts.

Reported Comfort in Teaching Genres

In Interview 3, I reminded participants of their earlier reported comforts in regard to teaching genres at UTK. Through reflection, five participants (Clara, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) reported no change in initial responses. Clara maintained that genres were a part of the rhetorical situation, and she reported that she felt comfortable teaching this overlap between genre and rhetoric because she was most familiar with writing "critical rhetorical analyses." She reported that the process of writing in that genre was "ingrained in [her] mind," which was why she experienced comfort. Joseph, too,

maintained that he was most comfortable teaching students to think critically about research and writing processes when teaching genres. In Interview 3, he noted that knowing genre conventions helped with these processes, especially when the genres "build into one another." As for Mandy and Spencer, they maintained experiencing comfort when teaching genre conventions. Mandy reported that she was comfortable teaching conventions because she was most familiar with analysis, and conventions can be identified via analysis. Spencer also reported feeling comfortable teaching genre conventions through analysis of examples, which he found was the "easiest way" to teach students about genres. Mike, on the other hand, maintained that he experienced comfort when teaching the broad definitions and differences between genres, which he found as useful knowledge. He perceived that genres shared "common" techniques but broad differences, and students could benefit from recognizing these (dis)similarities. These participants did not change their initial reports of what they felt comfortable teaching in regard to genres. Clara's and Mandy's respective reported comforts stemmed from personal familiarity and perceived writing or analytical strengths, whereas Joseph, Mike, and Spencer perceived their comforts in teaching genres as a means of providing students foundational, valuable writing skills. These participants did not change their reported comforts because they perceived these to be teaching and/or writing strengths.

While five participants did not change their initial reports, Ava, Cornelius, and Liz made slight adjustments to their prior responses. In Interview 2, Ava reported feeling comfortable teaching broad definitions and differences of genres, but in Interview 3, she reported changes in that reported comfort. Ava found that while she "felt pretty

comfortable" in teaching broad definitions and differences, she discovered a discomfort in the extent to which she taught that information. She reported not knowing "how many genres [she] really wanted to cover or how much [she] really needed to go in-depth" about genres. This not knowing stemmed from her previous report about experienced conflict between prior teaching experiences and current curriculum expectations. Cornelius, too, changed his previous response. He first reported comfort in teaching students the modes of writing that best fits their rhetorical purpose, but in Interview 3, he reported feeling confident teaching students the differences between genres. He noted that these differences became "easier for [him] to show" to students, particularly when teaching the two position papers. Cornelius neither acknowledged nor dismissed his prior response, only noted what he felt "more confident" in teaching genres. While Cornelius reported what he had become more confident in teaching, Liz reported feeling less confident in teaching genres through analysis of arguments' structure and evidence. Liz noted that she had not previously considered how stasis theory informed argumentation. The role of stasis theory in argumentation was new for Liz, and she adjusted her teaching to incorporate this learning. For this reason, she was less comfortable in teaching the argument genre. Otherwise, she still felt comfortable teaching students to identify the structure and evidence of argumentative genres. For these participants, they changed their initial responses for a variety of reasons. Ava changed her report due to conflict with prior teaching experiences, whereas Liz adjusted her answer to incorporate new learning into how she taught argumentation. Cornelius, on the other hand, reported more confidence in teaching genre differences by experiencing the curriculum. Through

reflection, these participants changed reported conflicts to reflect their experiences in teaching new genres required by the curriculum.

From these findings, most participants did not change their initial reports. Clara, Joseph, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer did not change their experienced comfort in teaching genres due to one of two reasons: 1. They were already familiar with a genre or an approach to analyzing a genre, or 2. They perceived value in teaching students that particular content about genres to develop students' writing and thinking skills. While these participants did not change their responses, Ava, Cornelius, and Liz did change their reported comforts. Even though Ava did not know the extent to which to teach genre, she still maintained feeling comfortable teaching broad definitions and differences of genres. However, she struggled to determine the curriculum expectations of teaching genre because she was more familiar with teaching in a genre-based FYC program. At UTK, she found that genre did not take a central role, which put her on unfamiliar teaching ground. Liz, too, felt confident in teaching the structure of argumentation, but in her prior teaching experience, she had not encountered stasis theory, particularly how it could provide entry and structure into an argument. Through reflection, Liz adjusted the extent of her previously reported comfort to consider stasis theory's role in teaching genre conventions and structures. This inclusion demonstrated a development in her understanding of genres associated with argumentation. Cornelius, however, did not explicitly change his initial report, only added a component of teaching genres in which he reported feeling more confident. Through teaching the last two major writing assignments, he had become more comfortable in teaching genre (dis)similarities,

particularly through examples of student writing. Cornelius's report demonstrates a growth in understanding features of genres. Through reflection, most participants maintained experiencing comfort that aligned with their teaching strengths or values. As for those who reported changes, their experiences demonstrated either how they negotiated their prior experiences or learned more about the genres through teaching them.

Reported Discomfort in Teaching Genres

Similar to the previous section, I asked participants to reflect about their previous reported discomforts in teaching genres in UTK's writing program. In response to this question, five of eight participants reported no change in their initial reports. Ava, Clara, Cornelius, Mandy, and Mike reported no change. In Interview 2, Ava reported difficulty in teaching the nuances of closely related genres, and in Interview 3, she maintained experiencing that difficulty. She noted how she understood the differences but struggled in articulating those to her students. Clara also maintained that teaching the slipperiness of genres was still a teaching discomfort. She was hesitant to confirm that initial response because she reported "growing" in that area of teaching; however, she also reported that genres were "always going to be that way," i.e., slippery. Cornelius, too, maintained that he still experienced discomfort in teaching the nuances between genres, even though he reported an increase in teaching confidence. He found that the problem stemmed from his familiarity with experienced, valued writers who pushed or bent genres. For this reason, he experienced discomfort in providing students any absolute renderings of genre. Mike, too, experienced discomfort in conveying the nuances of similar genres. He maintained

that it was difficult for students to grasp the slippery nature of genres, and he found this nature to be part of "genres in general." Mandy, on the other hand, maintained her discomfort in teaching unfamiliar genres, such as the Debate Analysis and Blog (Position Paper for Public Audience), which she began alluding to when discussing rhetorical knowledge. She explained that this discomfort stemmed from her position of authority. Because she was in that position, she worried about teaching these genres incorrectly and being "proved wrong" by either a student or fellow teacher. Overall, these participants did not change their initial reports because they experienced difficulties in conveying the intricacies and expectations of genres to students, and because there was no absolute method for constructing genres, they experienced discomfort.

While five participants' responses remained unchanged, three participants changed their Interview 2 reports. Joseph, Liz, and Spencer either adjusted or altogether changed their experienced discomfort in teaching genres. In Interview 2, Joseph reported experiencing discomfort when teaching the Debate Analysis genre because it was unfamiliar, and in Interview 3, he reported "getting better with it" after teaching it. While he noted he was improving in his understanding of the genre, he also conceded that he needed to spend more time preparing to teach that particular unit. Though, on the whole, he reported feeling "comfortable teaching genres in general." While Joseph's reported discomfort slightly improved, Liz's altogether changed from experiencing discomfort in teaching the differences between similar genres, such as Comparative Rhetorical Analysis and Debate Analysis, to teaching the genre of the Debate Analysis. She reported experiencing discomfort in teaching stasis, particularly in teaching how it functioned in

argumentation. This discomfort stemmed from a conflict in prior experiences of teaching argumentation without stasis. To teach the curriculum, she had to adjust her teaching to incorporate stasis theory into argumentation. This adjustment and unfamiliarity causes her to experience discomfort. While Liz had not previously considered stasis theory in the genre of argumentation, Spencer had not considered any discomforts in teaching genres until he reflected about the experience. In Interview 3, he changed his initial response from being generally comfortable in teaching genre theory to experiencing discomfort in teaching academic writing genres to students. He noted that he experienced difficulty in guiding students "to grasp onto what academic writing is." He reported that the difficulty was in introducing students to the kinds of discourse, reasoning, and style associated with the genre. Because the genre consisted of a combination of dry, elevated writing, students struggled to grasp it. Spencer found the teaching of academic writing genres challenging from this experience. Overall, participants reported either a slight or altogether change of initial discomforts in teaching genres. While Joseph reported improving in teaching the Debate Analysis, he conceded that he needed more preparation. Liz and Spencer reconsidered their teaching of academic argumentation—whether that was the incorporation of stasis analysis or the explanation of academic writing—, and these changes challenged and stretched their pedagogical approaches. These participants responses changed due to their classroom experiences and teaching the curriculum.

From these findings, most participants did not change their reported discomforts in teaching genres. Most of these participants experienced discomfort in teaching, i.e., articulating, the nuances of perceivably similar genres, whereas one participant reported

discomfort in teaching unfamiliar genres. Only three participants changed their Interview 2 responses. One participant reported improvement by becoming more familiar with teaching the curriculum, whereas the other two participants encountered pedagogical challenges that stretched their approaches and understanding of teaching academic, argumentative genres. These reported discomforts reveal a need for participants to develop their genre knowledge and experiences with unfamiliar or close genres.

Pedagogical Practices Knowledge

In Chapter Five, I reported about participants' experiences and knowledge in teaching writing as a process. From that data, I learned the extent to which participants experienced dis/comfort when teaching writing as process as well as how they encouraged it in their classrooms. In Interview 3, I asked participants to reflect about their previously reported experienced dis/comforts in teaching writing as a process. Through reflection, participants, unanimously, reported no change in experienced comforts, but in experienced discomforts, only one participant reported change. To better understand participants' experiences, I also asked participants to reflect on their experiences with teaching a curriculum that was designed and scaffolded by the Composition Office. Most participants reported positive experiences, but three noted room for improvement or change because the course design was unfamiliar and new. In what follows, I report participants' experienced dis/comforts as well as their overall experiences in teaching the scaffolded curriculum.

Reported Comfort and Discomfort in Teaching Writing as a Process

In Interview 3, I asked participants to reflect on their prior reported experiences of dis/comforts when teaching writing as a process. I asked participants to reflect on these reports because I wanted to see if their experiences shifted through reflection. In regard to teaching comforts, all participants' prior reports remained unchanged. Clara, Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, and Mike maintained that they experienced comfort when teaching writing as a process, in general. Ava confirmed that she was most comfortable teaching prewriting activities like brainstorming, and Mandy maintained that she was comfortable teaching revision because writing can always be revised. Spencer, too, confirmed that he felt most comfortable teaching students prewriting activities like outlining their ideas through the use of templates. Most of these participants expressed confidence in teaching these processes. For example, Ava taught brainstorming because she was "good at plumbing for things," and Clara reported teaching writing as a process as her "favorite part" because it taught students a "thinking process," which she valued most in teaching. Mike, too, reported feeling passionate about teaching writing as a process because it was an important skill for students to have. Spencer, however, was the only participant who reported not feeling very confident in teaching writing as a process; nevertheless, he experienced comfort in teaching students how to "make the thing look like thing." Overall, these participants' responses and rationales did not change after reflection, and they did not report any additional comforts.

Similar to reported comforts, most participants did not change their initial reports of discomfort. Clara, Joseph, and Mike reported feeling comfortable teaching anything involving writing as a process and did not report any experienced discomforts related to

the subject. Ava, on the other hand, maintained her earlier report of experiencing discomfort when teaching revision. She expressed hope in ameliorating this discomfort by incorporating more student-teacher conferences, but she noted that she struggled to find an appropriate work space to hold such conferences.[14] While she was being proactive about addressing this discomfort, she was still unsure if this solution would improve it. Like Ava, Spencer also maintained his initial report of experiencing discomfort when teaching revision. He found this area of teaching to be his weakness, and he noted that he "resist[ed] teaching it" because he did not perceive anyone wanting to revise "multiple drafts." The act of writing multiple drafts was foreign to him and did not reflect his writing process, which he described as "reiterative." Mandy, on the other hand, experienced comfort in teaching revision but discomfort in providing the appropriate amount of individual feedback on student writing. This struggle stemmed from conflicting experiences of being a tutor in the Writing Center and a teacher in the classroom. She experienced discomfort when negotiating how much help she should provide students without being too prescriptive or overwhelming students. Cornelius, too, reported maintaining his initial discomfort in teaching reflection. He experienced this discomfort because "it's hard for [him] to reflect." He called reflections an "uncomfortable genre," but he reported not knowing why that was the case. Nevertheless, he still found teaching reflection as beneficial for his students. For these participants, their reflection neither informed nor changed their initial reports of discomfort in teaching writing as a process. For some of the participants, they experienced no

[14] She reported not liking her office, which was far away from the English Department and struggling to find seating in the library, where several other GTAs held their office hours.

discomfort due to confidence in subject matter. The other participants, however, experienced discomfort in teaching either revision or reflection as part of a writing process because participants reported feeling constrained by either teaching resources or personal experiences.

While most participants did not change their initial reports of experienced discomfort, one participant, Liz, did. In Interview 2, she reported not experiencing any discomfort because she was comfortable teaching anything related to a writing process. Through reflection, she amended the answer to experiencing discomfort when teaching reflection. She reported not knowing if there was a pedagogical practice to teach reflection or if that practice was to just tell students to reflect. She noted that she needed to think more about that experience to provide further insight. Nevertheless, through teaching the curriculum, she discovered this insight because the curriculum encouraged reflection as part of teaching writing as a process. Because she was unfamiliar with how to teach reflection, she experienced discomfort. Liz did not explain why she was unfamiliar with how to teach reflection, but this discomfort may stem from a lack of modeling or prior experiences, as was the case for Cornelius (see Chapter Five).

From these findings, participants were generally most comfortable in teaching writing as a process through prewriting and drafting activities. They reported being familiar with writing processes, and some participants reported valuing teaching it to their students. For these reasons, three participants continued to experience comfort in teaching writing as a process, whereas three other participants experienced discomfort in teaching revision. Ava, Spencer, and Mandy reported experiencing discomforts in

teaching revision. Ava identified value in teaching it but needed to determine how to incorporate it more, whereas Spencer did not identify value in teaching it because he did not practice a writing process that involved multiple drafts. Mandy, on the other hand, was comfortable teaching it but experienced discomfort in negotiating how much individualized feedback she could provide to each student. Mandy's and Ava's respective experiences stemmed from conflicts in negotiating time management, but Spencer's discomfort stemmed from an interpersonal conflict with the ideology behind writing process theory. As for Cornelius and Liz, they experienced discomfort in teaching reflection as part of a writing process. Cornelius's experience stemmed from discomfort in talking about himself, but he also noted in Interview 2 that the discomfort stemmed from not seeing the teaching of reflection being modeled by prior professors. Liz's discomfort, too, stemmed from not knowing the appropriate pedagogical practices to teach reflection, and though she did not explain why she experienced this discomfort, I assume she had no prior experience in seeing those practices modeled or explained. While most participants experienced general comfort in teaching prewriting and drafting strategies, these specific reported discomforts were pedagogical challenges in which participants struggled to negotiate, either practically or interpersonally.

Reflections on Scaffolding Pedagogical Practices

In Chapter Five, I triangulated participants' reports of how they encouraged and promoted writing as a process with classroom observations and instructional materials. I learned that most participants incorporated a variety of pedagogical practices, such as prewriting activities, group work and/or writing workshops, peer reviews, and

conferences, in their courses; however, most of these participants did not articulate that these practices were part of how they encouraged and promoted writing as a process. One possible reason why most participants did not report all of these activities was because the Composition Office designed the standardized syllabus to encourage writing as a process, and participants were required to appropriate this syllabus. For these reasons, some participants did not think critically about their pedagogical practices and how the scaffolding encouraged writing as a process. To develop a better understanding of how participants understood the scaffolding of daily activities and major writing assignments as designed by the Composition Office, I asked participants about their overall experiences in teaching the scaffolded assignments and daily activities. For the most part, participants (5 of 8) had a generally positive experience with how the course was scaffolded, but three participants reported conflicts with how the course was scaffolded. This data provided insight into how they experienced a curriculum designed by the writing program as well as the extent to which participants understood how writing as a process facilitated transfer.

Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mike, and Spencer reported positive experiences in teaching the scaffolded assignments of the first FYC course. Based on their interview responses, I coded that participants reported positive experiences for one of three reasons: 1. Scaffolding promoted transfer; 2. Scaffolding developed participants' pedagogical practices; or 3. Scaffolding met students' needs.

Joseph, Mike, and Spencer reported, implicitly, that scaffolding promoted transfer of learning. In Joseph's case, he reported that scaffolding went well due to his inclusion

of “reflective writing and in-class writing” activities. He reported using these activities to connect the major writing assignments and thus promote transfer. Like Joseph, Mike reported the scaffolding going well due to the connections among assignments. He specifically discussed how the previous units built into the last assignment, which taught students to reflect on “differences and similarities” among their assignments. Spencer, too, noted how the previous assignments built into the final task, teaching students to “switch something,” like audience, genre, and language. He found that students’ “light bulbs” went on by recognizing the differences and similarities among the assignments, as Mike also noted. For these reasons, Joseph, Mike, and Spencer found that the scaffolding went well because it encouraged students to recognize how their learning of one assignment applied to the following assignments.

Cornelius, on the other hand, noted that the scaffolding helped him develop his pedagogical practices. Specifically, the scaffolded syllabus provided activities and information that helped him teach subjects, e.g., Debate Analysis, with which he was less familiar. The scaffolding broke down the assignments into “small bite size pieces” that allowed him to “stay ahead of the curve” as he was teaching the curriculum for the first time. Because he was provided a structure of each unit, he was able to learn the expectations associated with each assignment. This scaffolding helped Cornelius understand and teach writing processes of unfamiliar genres. He also perceived that the scaffolding of writing processes made the task of writing easier for his students. For these reasons, he found the scaffolding to be helpful.

While Cornelius found that scaffolding developed his pedagogical practices and knowledge, Liz reported that scaffolding writing assignments "went really, really well" because it helped her meet students' needs. She reported that her students were "on the same page," i.e., students' writing skills were "almost even keel." For this reason, she did not need to adjust the scaffolding to fit her students' needs. She was able to maintain the structure of the scaffolding and thus the curriculum's design because students were perceived to have similar writing skills. Because she perceived the scaffolding as meeting students' learning needs, she reported positive experiences. This alignment of scaffolding and students' needs reinforced her pedagogical practices of teaching writing as a process.

For these participants, they reported positive experiences with the scaffolding provided by the syllabus for one of three reasons. For three participants, the scaffolding promoted transfer, which helped students recognize how learning can be applied to future writing contexts. This recognition was most notable for participants in the shift between the last two major writing assignments. Another benefit of the scaffolding was informing and developing pedagogical practices, as Cornelius reported. He was able to learn more about teaching unfamiliar genres due to the breakdown of writing processes of each unit. Liz, on the other hand, found that the scaffolding met students' needs and writing skills, which meant that she did not have adjust her pedagogical practices. Whether scaffolding helped participants to develop their pedagogical practices or students' writing and thinking abilities, these participants ultimately found the scaffolding in the syllabus to be helpful.

While five participants had positive experiences with the scaffolding, three participants experienced either some difficulty or conflict. Ava, Clara, and Mandy reported wanting to adjust the scaffolding to better fit their pedagogical experiences. Ava reported that she "could have done better" with the scaffolding. She noted that she needed to spend more time "pre-planning" lessons for each week. She stated, "When you're going assignment to assignment or day-to-day, I guess, sometimes you lose track of the larger picture that you're trying to fit within." She believed that better pre-planning as well as advice from her significant other would help her teach the larger picture of the assignment. Ava did not explain why she struggled to maintain the focus of each assignment, but I surmise that the issue stemmed from the syllabus being prepared for her to teach. Clara made this distinction in her report. She stated, "Working off of the master syllabus, right, you already have a discussion that's there for you, to help facilitate that thinking process." For Clara, this scaffolding also went "okay," and she reported wanting to adjust the scaffolding to include some discussions and activities that she designed. Mandy, too, encountered some difficulty with the scaffolding as the semester progressed. She reported that scaffolding "went much better in the beginning of the semester than it did at the end of the semester." By the end, she struggled negotiating the pre-planned activities with wanting to assign additional work. Not wanting to overload her students, Mandy decided to not incorporate additional activities or writing assignments. Instead, she noted that she would come up with better scaffolding to incorporate more writing activities and homework into the daily lessons for the next time she teaches the course.

For these participants, teaching from the scaffolded syllabus was not a positive experience. Ava reported losing sight of the major objective for each scaffolded lesson, whereas Clara and Mandy desired to incorporate more of their lessons into the course design. Because the syllabus was designed for them, they encountered teaching conflicts because the scaffolding and assignments were not of their own making. Participants desired to implement their prior knowledge in the scaffolding of their courses, but the standardized syllabus prevented them from adapting their prior pedagogical practices associated with teaching writing as a process in their classrooms. For this reason, these participants did not have positive experiences with how the syllabus was scaffolded.

Discourse Community Knowledge

In Interview 3, I wanted participants to reflect about their overall experiences with teaching a rhetoric- and transfer-based FYC curriculum. Because transfer was a curriculum ideology, I was interested in learning if participants and the writing program shared any values and/or academic discourse. For this reason, I asked participants to define transfer throughout all three interviews. I learned that participants' definitions of transfer did not drastically change throughout the semester, and their responses provided insight into how they understood and employed the theory. In addition to learning participants' definitions of transfer, I was also interested in their primary teaching objectives. While I learned from Interview 2 that participants unanimously found value in teaching for transfer, only three participants identified that focus as their primary teaching objectives (see Chapter Five). In Interview 3, I revisited this question of what participants identified as their primary objectives for teaching the first FYC course. I also

asked participants to reflect about the extent to which those values would change if they were to teach this course again. I designed these questions to encourage reflection and to potentially uncover any shared values between the writing program and the participants. From participants' responses to these questions, I learned that more participants aimed to teach for transfer but through different pedagogical approaches and objectives. Moreover, most participants would not change these reported objectives the next time they were to teach the first FYC course, but two participants did report some changes. The data revealed that participants' primary objectives either superficially aligned or did not align with the curriculum's ideologies. In what follows, I report participants' definitions of transfer and their primary objectives for teaching the first FYC course.

Defining Transfer

In all three interviews, I asked participants to define transfer. Their definitions provided insight into their comprehension of the theory. I did not provide participants with their previous definitions because I wanted to measure the extent to which their definitions changed or remained the same throughout the experience of teaching the first FYC course. Throughout all three interviews, five participants' responses remained the same, and three participants' responses shifted throughout the semester. The core definitions of transfer remained the same throughout all interviews, i.e., participants' defined transfer as either Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward and/or backward reaching transfer, general writing skills, or adaptation. In what follows, I provide participants' definitions from Interview 3 (see Table 18).

Table 18

Interview 3: Participants' Definitions of Transfer

Participant	Forward Reaching and/or Backward Reaching	General Writing Skills	Adaptation
Ava	X		
Clara	X		
Cornelius		X	
Joseph			X
Liz		X	
Mandy	X		
Mike	X		
Spencer	X		

Five of eight participants defined transfer as Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward and/or backward reaching transfer. Most of these participants defined transfer more as forward reaching than backward reaching because they described transfer as a linear process of moving, or transferring, knowledge or skills from one context to another. Across all three interviews, Clara, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer defined transfer as forward and/or backward reaching. In Interviews 1 and 2, Clara was the only participant who defined transfer as forward and backward reaching transfer and understood it as a recursive process. By Interview 3, she dropped the terminology and defined it generally as "the movement of knowledge and understanding from one space to another." It was

unclear from this response if the movement was recursive or linear. Clara's definition resembles the other participants' linear comprehension of transfer's definition. For example, Mandy defined it as "being able to apply the things that you have learned in the past to new situations." Mike similarly defined it as taking learning from "one context and applying it in a new context in the future." Spencer, too, found that transfer involved learning foundational "tools" like rhetorical theory to use as students move "forward" in their academic classes or careers. For these participants, transfer was the movement of knowledge from one context, like an English classroom, to another context, like a history class or the workplace. These participants, for the most part, were consistent in how they defined and understood transfer theory.

In addition to these participants, Ava also defined transfer as forward and/or backward reaching transfer, but her definition was not consistent across all three interviews. In Interview 1, she first defined it as general writing skills, and in the next interview, she adjusted that definition to be forward reaching, i.e., learning skills or processes that could be applied to future courses. In Interview 3, she defined transfer as "the ability to take a process or a skill that you learned in one context and apply it to a different context." This definition resembles the one she provided in Interview 2, making this definition consistent across two interviews. This definition represents how Ava understands transfer as forward reaching, and she came to this definition after teaching the curriculum for two months.

While most participants defined transfer as forward and/or backward reaching transfer, two participants, Cornelius and Liz, defined it as general writing skills in

Interview 3. Across all three interviews, Liz consistently defined transfer as the learning of general writing skills. In Interview 3, she defined it as "understanding the key components that go into writing, both identifying it and actually the process of it, and being able to do that for any discipline and any particular discourse." Like her previous definitions, Liz understood transfer to be the process of learning of general writing skills that could be used in any writing context. I found this consistent definition as interesting because her definition did not align with her perception of UTK's transfer-based writing curriculum. As previously reported, Liz found that the first FYC course did not provide opportunities for students to write for transfer, but students were learning rhetorical skills, writing processes, and different genres, which she had not considered as general writing skills or "key components." Liz's interview responses reveal a disconnect between understanding transfer theory and recognizing its role in a FYC course.

Cornelius, on the other hand, had not consistently provided a definition of transfer throughout the interviews. In Interview 1, he defined transfer as general writing skills, and then changed that definition to adaptation in the second interview. By the final interview, he returned to his original definition. He defined transfer as "being able to use a learned set of skills in different environments and for different purposes." These skills would be generally applicable, like Liz's definition, to other writing contexts. In Interview 3, Cornelius did not mention adaptation of skills as he did in the previous interview, and it is unclear as to why he returned to his initial definition. Because he defined transfer as general writing skills in two interviews, I found that this definition represented his understanding of transfer theory. Both Cornelius and Liz understood

transfer as a general principle of learning skills to be applied to any writing situation or purpose, not a linear process of applying knowledge or skills.

While Cornelius and Liz defined transfer as general writing skills, Joseph defined transfer as adaptation. Similar to Cornelius's experience, Joseph first defined transfer as adaptation, but he changed the definition in Interview 2 to reflect forward and/or backward reaching transfer. In Interview 3, he returned to his initial definition of transfer as "skills, techniques, lessons, ideas, concepts that can be taken from one location and moved to another and adapted to fit within a context that is different than the context in which you learn it." For Joseph, transfer was taking knowledge, in its broadest meaning, and adapting it to fit different contexts. He provided examples like knowing the differences in having formal academic versus informal friendly conversations and then taking that knowledge and adapting it to fit general education courses. Transfer, for Joseph, was not a linear process in which skills could be applied to future contexts, and skills were not generalizable. Instead, transfer involved abstraction of learning and critical thinking to determine how best to fit the learning to a different context. Because Joseph provided this definition in two interviews, adaptation best represented his understanding of transfer theory.

By analyzing how participants defined transfer across all three interviews, I have identified their most reliable definition and determined the degree to which they appropriated the definition of transfer (see Table 19 in Appendix F). Clara, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer demonstrated throughout all three interviews that they understood surface features of transfer, particularly the forward reaching aspect of the theory. Their degree

of appropriation did not change throughout the process of teaching and reflecting on transfer theory. Ava's most consistent definition of transfer was forward and/or backward reaching transfer, and for this reason, she, too, demonstrated a surface appropriation of the theory. Both Liz and Cornelius defined transfer as general writing skills, and because they believed that writing could be somewhat generalizable, which is a theoretical line of inquiry about transfer, they demonstrated a surface appropriation of the theory. They did not describe how the knowledge was generalized and applied, and for these reasons, they did not demonstrate a conceptual understanding. Joseph, on the other hand, was the only participant who consistently reported adaptation as transfer's definition. Because Joseph's definition pointed toward critical thinking skills, such as abstraction, and discussed how that knowledge must be adapted to fit a different context, he demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings. Joseph's definition of transfer brought forth components of Perkins and Salomon's (1988) forward and backward reaching transfer and amended it to reflect that learning, in the most general sense, was not generalizable but malleable. For this reason, he demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings. The other participants, though, all demonstrated at the very least comprehension of surface features of transfer theory, which means that they comprehended surface features of transfer. Because they understood and recognized surface features, participants aimed to teach the transfer-based curriculum, but their teaching of curriculum values was limited to emphasizing those surface features that they recognized. Participants' reports, instructional materials, and classroom observations did

not demonstrate that they conceptually understood the curriculum, and for this reason, they could not implement the curriculum objectives fully.

Participants' Primary Objectives for Teaching First FYC Sequence

In Interview 2, participants unanimously reported finding value in teaching transfer, but only three participants reported transfer as a primary objective for teaching. Three other participants reported developing writers' awareness of processing and assessing writing, whereas two participants reported primary objectives in developing students' analytical and evaluative thinking and writing skills (see Chapter Five). When participants reported these primary objectives, they had been teaching the curriculum for two months, so I wanted to see if those primary objectives changed after concluding the course. In Interview 3, I asked participants to identify their primary teaching objectives, and I also asked participants if those objectives would change or remain the same for the next time they were to teach the course. From coding their responses, I found that their initial primary objectives changed to three recurring themes: 1. Providing students' skills for transfer; 2. Developing students' rhetorical knowledge for transfer; and 3. Developing pedagogical practices (see Table 20).

The most recurring primary objective was to provide students skills for transfer, which was reported by Ava, Cornelius, Liz, and Spencer. For example, Ava reported that she wanted "to give [students] tools that would improve their writing process overall." She provided examples of tools, such as developing outlines and writing topic sentences or thesis statements. She reported that these skills would help students develop "a more

Table 20

Comparison of Participants' Primary Teaching Objectives

Participant	Interview Two	Interview Three
	Primary Objectives	**Primary Objectives**
Ava	Transfer	Provide Students Skills for Transfer
Clara	Develop Students' Thinking and Writing Processes	Develop Pedagogical Practices
Cornelius	Develop Students' Thinking and Writing Processes	Provide Students Skills for Transfer
Joseph	Transfer	Develop Students' Rhetorical Knowledge for Transfer
Liz	Develop Students' Skills in Analysis and Evaluation	Provide Students Skills for Transfer
Mandy	Develop Students' Skills in Analysis and Evaluation	Develop Students' Rhetorical Knowledge for Transfer
Mike	Develop Students' Thinking and Writing Processes	Develop Students' Rhetorical Knowledge for Transfer
Spencer	Transfer	Provide Students Skills for Transfer

thorough writing process when they go forward." Ava's primary objectives were to provide students with skills that could be applied in future writing contexts. Cornelius also reported his primary objective as giving students "the basic skills to write an essay and to help them feel more confident in their own writing abilities." He neither defined those skills nor provided any examples, but he reported that transfer was an "inherent" part of teaching. Similarly, Spencer did not provide any concrete examples of "strategies" that he wanted his students to learn and apply. He only noted that the strategies were "foundational for every class" that students would take. Liz, on the other hand, provided specific skills that she wanted students to develop, such as "getting ideas down onto paper," "use sources they've found appropriately and effectively," "to place themselves within a discourse," and to understand the importance of audience. The skills that participants alluded to or provided were aimed at developing students' writing skills for future use. These participants wanted their students to develop general and/or transferable writing and thinking skills that would help them write papers in subsequent classes. Based on these responses, participants aimed to teach transfer.

While these participants wanted their students to develop general and/or transferable writing and thinking skills, three participants (Joseph, Mandy, and Mike) wanted to develop students' rhetorical knowledge for transfer. Joseph reported wanting to ensure that "students understood rhetorical strategies" by the end of the semester. He noted that he wanted students to feel "comfortable thinking critically, writing academically, and being able to take those skills, and, again, transfer them to something beyond just [his] 101." Similar to Joseph, Mandy also reported aiming to develop

students' "rhetorical background knowledge" because "they need to be able to transfer it forward and become aware of the fact that they do have a rhetorical situation and a rhetorical purpose in all the writing that they do." Mike, too, reported that he wanted students to develop an unconscious awareness of rhetorical knowledge for use in future classes. He expressed a desire for students to embody rhetorical knowledge and persuasive writing and not necessarily get caught up in the terminology. Instead, he wanted students to apply that knowledge to other contexts. For these participants, teaching rhetorical knowledge functioned as a means for teaching transfer. If students had this rhetorical awareness, then they could apply that learning to future writing contexts or other courses.

While most participants reported primary objectives for students, one participant, Clara, reported a primary objective to develop her pedagogical practices. She reported, "My primary goal was for me to learn, which might sound kind of shitty because it should be to teach them, but it was for me." In both Interviews 2 and 3, Clara described her teaching and class dynamic as a "shit show" (see Chapter Five). She reasoned that she had this experience because the curriculum was "unfamiliar," and she was "uncomfortable" teaching "something new" because she did not know if she were teaching it correctly. To become comfortable with teaching the curriculum, she needed to experience it, which was why she reported her objective as developing her pedagogical practices. She did not report any primary objectives for her students, and from this response, her primary objective did not align with implementing the curriculum's objectives and values.

After inquiring about participants' primary objectives, I asked each participant if these reported objectives would apply to the next time they were to teach the first FYC course. Six of eight participants (Cornelius, Joseph, Liz, Mandy, Mike, and Spencer) reported that they would keep these objectives for the next time they were teach the course. Two participants, Ava and Clara, reported changing their objectives. Ava, who aimed to provide students with writing tools or skills, reported wanting to "focus more on transfer." She noted that she found the theory important for students to learn, and she wanted to make transfer more explicitly discussed, "instead of just counting on them to fill in those blanks." She reported that she would explicitly teach for transfer by incorporating "metacognitive writing," which would require students to think of how learning and skills would apply to other courses. Ava reported wanting to focus more on transfer because she was now more familiar with the course and could "amend assignments" to meet these objectives. Because the course was new, Ava did not emphasize transfer as much as she had desired but planned to incorporate it more the next time she were to teach the first FYC course.

Clara, too, reported wanting to amend her primary objectives because she was more familiar with the course, though she did not mention transfer as the new objective. Instead, she reported that her "primary goal leading up to [teaching the course] is to plan a little better" to meet her strengths, which would allow her to "build a stronger foundation for the class." When I asked her about primary objectives for teaching students, she noted that she would incorporate reflections into the course, but then she returned to discussing the role of developing her strengths. She stated, "Then, playing to

my own strengths is going to come through for my students." If her students saw her confidence in teaching the subject matter, then they would learn, and if she were not confident, then students would know. So, while Clara reported wanting to change her primary objectives, she still held onto her reported objective, which was to develop her pedagogical practices to reflect her strengths.

From these reported primary teaching objectives, three participants (Ava, Joseph, and Spencer) aimed to teach for transfer, whether that was teaching generalizable writing skills or rhetorical awareness, in both interviews. Through reflection, their reported objectives became more specific. Ava and Spencer aimed to teach transfer by providing students with generalizable writing skills that could be used in future writing contexts, whereas Joseph aimed to teach students rhetorical knowledge that could also be used in future writing contexts. It should be noted that Joseph's primary objectives aligned with both curriculum ideologies, even though he did not report both as curriculum objectives. Spencer, on the other hand, reported both curriculum objectives, but his primary teaching objective encouraged the transfer of "strategies." From this response, it was unclear as to whether those strategies entailed rhetorical knowledge, but his overall comprehension of transfer demonstrated a teaching emphasis of rhetorical and genre knowledges. Based on his comprehensive responses, Spencer's primary teaching objectives aligned with both curriculum ideologies. Ava, on the other hand, reported transfer of skills as her teaching objective, and she often identified the curriculum emphasis as transfer. For these reasons, her objectives only partially aligned with the curriculum ideologies. Based on these reports, Ava, Joseph, and Spencer comprehended that the curriculum emphasized

transfer, and they aimed to teach the curriculum as it was designed, though that teaching was often limited to their surface understanding of transfer and rhetorical theories.

While these participants consistently aimed to teach transfer, there were four participants who amended their primary objectives to reflect the curriculum's objectives and values. Cornelius, Liz, Mandy, and Mike amended their prior reported objectives, which were to develop either students' thinking and writing processes or students' skills in analysis and evaluation. Through reflection, Cornelius and Liz reported that their objectives were to provide students with generalizable and/or transferable writing skills for transfer, whereas Mandy and Mike reported aiming to develop students' rhetorical knowledge for transfer. Cornelius's and Liz's primary objectives aligned with how they defined transfer, which was general writing skills. Moreover, their reported teaching objectives did not align with what they reported the curriculum objectives to be, which was an emphasis in rhetoric. Through teaching, Cornelius and Liz did not become aware of how rhetoric and transfer worked in tandem within the curriculum design, but they understood that these theories were important to either identify or teach. Mandy and Mike, on the other hand, did connect the ideologies with their reported primary teaching objectives. Mandy reported that the curriculum objective was to teach transfer, and she reported aiming to teach transfer by developing students' rhetorical knowledge. While she did not report both ideologies as the curriculum's objectives, she did develop an awareness that they were both important for teaching the curriculum. Mike, too, demonstrated an awareness of the curriculum's emphasis to include both rhetorical and transfer theories, which was surprising. In all three interviews, Mike struggled to identify

the curriculum objectives, but through reflecting on his teaching objectives, he aimed to teach rhetorical awareness to promote transfer. From this response, he understood that these theories were valued by the writing program, but he did not consciously connect them to identify curriculum ideologies. Nevertheless, this reported objective aligned with both ideologies. Like Ava, Joseph, and Spencer, these participants aimed to teach the curriculum as designed, but their comprehension and implementation of the curriculum was limited to teaching surface features of both ideologies.

While most participants aimed to teach at least one of the curriculum's ideologies, Clara was the only participant who did not report a teaching objective that aligned with the curriculum's objectives. In Interview 2, Clara reported her primary teaching objective as developing student's thinking and writing processes (see Chapter Five), but in Interview 3, she only emphasized the developing of her own pedagogical practices. She neither reported nor elaborated how that development connected to the writing program's curriculum, and even though she reported the curriculum's emphasis to be rhetoric, her reported primary objective did not align with that curriculum objective. For these reasons, Clara demonstrated an appropriation of a label because she could define transfer and identify rhetoric as a curriculum objective, but she did not embody these objectives in her reported pedagogical objectives.

From these findings, most participants demonstrated an appropriation of surface features of the curriculum's objectives and values. Most participants' (7 of 8) pedagogical values aligned with the writing program's. One participants demonstrated an appropriation of a label because she knew terminology but did not necessarily report how

those concepts informed her teaching objectives. Based on these findings, most participants were implementing surface features of the curriculum. Participants were limited in their abilities to teach the curriculum as designed due to dissonant experiences when either they struggled to negotiate prior experiences or encountered unfamiliar subject matter and teaching requirements. The elements of the curriculum that participants implemented correlated with their perceived teaching and writing strengths. Participants experienced comfort and confidence in teaching subjective matter that they were familiar either teaching or writing. From this data, participants aimed to teach the curriculum as designed to the best of their experiences, knowledge, and training, and they were developing a shared academic discourse with the writing program through their experiences of teaching the curriculum.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided participants' reflections about their experiences teaching in this new curriculum for UTK's writing program. I have provided rich data about how participants perceived the writing program's curriculum objectives and values as well as any dissonances that they may have experienced in teaching this curriculum for their first time. Moreover, I included data about what participants learned and still needed to learn to better inform WPE. Additionally, I contextualized participants' reported teaching dis/comforts in regard to rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, and pedagogical practices by comparing participants' interview responses from Interviews 2 and 3. This data provides insight into these participants' knowledges about these concepts as well as the extent to which these concepts informed their pedagogical practices.

Additionally, I asked participants about their overall experiences in teaching required genres and writing as a process. The findings from these reports revealed whether participants had positive or dissonant experiences teaching the curriculum in how it was designed. Lastly, I inquired into participants' values, specifically the extent to which they valued and understood rhetorical and transfer theories. I asked participants about any perceived benefits to teaching rhetorical theory and how they defined transfer. With this data in mind, I asked participants what their primary teaching objectives were for teaching the first FYC course. I analyzed whether the values and definitions aligned or conflicted with their reported teaching objectives, and through this analysis, I could determine further the extent to which participants understood and implemented the curriculum.

Throughout Interview 3, most participants did not change their initial reports through reflection. Participants consistently noted that their experiences in the FYC curriculum were affected by the extent to which the curriculum's requirements and scaffolding were familiar. Participants' experienced comfort in teaching rhetoric, genres, or writing as a process when they were familiar with the concept and/or pedagogical approaches. This familiarity connected to their prior experiences and teaching strengths, which encouraged them to feel confident in teaching familiar subject matter. If participants reported negative experiences, it stemmed from unfamiliarity or conflict. Most participants struggled to negotiate their prior experiences in context of the new curriculum's objectives and values. These conflicts created negative or dissonant experiences as participants aimed to adjust their teaching to meet the demands of the new

curriculum. These participants often experienced that structure of the curriculum either did not fit their pedagogical identity or forced them to become quickly familiar with the subject matter in which they had no prior experiences in learning or teaching. For these reasons, some participants experienced discomfort in learning new genres or pedagogical approaches and reported wanting to improve their teaching by reusing prior experiences to make the course their own. Some participants reported needing more experience and knowledge in unfamiliar areas to help them better teach the curriculum as designed.

Nevertheless, all eight participants demonstrated goodwill in wanting to teach the curriculum as designed, and their interviews in conjunction with classroom observations and instructional materials further supported that goodwill. However, their teaching knowledge domains need further development, particularly in understanding the theoretical underpinnings of the curriculum and how those affect pedagogical practices when teaching rhetoric, genres, discourse course community, subject matter, and writing as a process. These participants needed to make more compatible connections to help them further understand how their prior experiences connected and informed their current teaching context. Instead, participants reported being in a position in which they were students of the curriculum with the authority to teach it, i.e., they were learning as they were teaching. That experience, in general, did not develop their conceptual understanding of the curriculum by the end of term. Instead, participants learned by teaching, which only developed an appropriation of the curriculum's surface features, and these surface features that they adapted tended to be ones that either connected to prior experiences or were explicitly provided by the Composition Office via pre-service

orientation or the standardized instructional materials. In the following chapter, I further discus these reflections in conjunction with participants' prior and current teaching experiences to make meaning of how GTAs reused and/or adapted prior experiences as well as UTK's WPE and FYC curriculum ideologies into their pedagogical practices.

CHAPTER SEVEN
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Compositionists have called for formal WPE to be recalibrated to consider graduate teaching associates' (GTAs') prior histories (Weiser, 1990; Bishop, 1997; Graham & David, 1996); however, such scholarship has not examined how GTAs "detect, elect, and connect" (Perkins & Salomon, 2012, p. 250) their tacit theories and prior experiences to transfer their learning successfully from a prior teaching context to a new one. Scholars have at length examined undergraduate writers' transfer of writing expertise and skills and have even developed conceptual models (Beaufort, 2007) or schemes (Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014) to address and recalibrate first-year composition (FYC) curricula. However, GTAs' transfer of learning from writing pedagogy education (WPE) and teaching has been underexamined. Because of this limited examination, WPE has not been recalibrated successfully to consider GTAs' learning processes.

For this reason, WPE needs to consider who GTAs are (Weiser, 1990; Yancey, 2002; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012; Driscoll, 2013). Some scholars have suggested surveys (Weiser, 1990) or heuristics (Yancey, 2002) for informing WPE design. These recommendations share a common goal of determining GTAs' prior teaching experiences and knowledge, but these methods do not consider how GTAs reuse or adapt their prior knowledge or identify the types of knowledge GTAs should possess to implement FYC curricula effectively. This dissertation aims to address this gap by examining how experienced, first-year PhD GTAs negotiated, reused or adapted prior and current WPE

and teaching experiences in their pedagogical practices for a new teaching context. Moreover, this dissertation provides a conceptual model, inspired by Beaufort's (2007), for assessing GTAs' theoretical knowledge and pedagogical practices. By analyzing GTAs' theoretical knowledge (i.e., curriculum, rhetorical, and genre), pedagogical practices, and discourse community values, writing pedagogy educators can design a learner-centered, collaborative WPE (Stenberg, 2005) that helps GTAs detect and connect curriculum objectives, develop theoretical knowledge, and adapt pedagogical practices. Through such education, GTAs will not only be exposed to a balanced WPE (Gebhardt, 1977; Ruszkiewicz's, 1987; Latterell, 1996) but also develop the academic discourse (Rankin, 1994; Estrem & Reid, 2012) to participate in various teaching contexts, which are idiosyncratic and localized (Yancey, 2002).

Prior to providing recommendations for recalibrating WPE to consider GTAs' learning processes and to develop their pedagogical knowledge, I first examine the extent to which GTAs enter a new teaching context with "existing, inherited models" (Restaino, 2012, p. 103) for teaching FYC. The data revealed that participants were neither "blank slates" (Neeley 2000; Reid 2004; Stenberg 2005) nor "wrongly inscribed" (Stenberg 2005). While they had prior experiences, their academic discourse and pedagogical practices were not sufficiently theorized, which inhibited their abilities to detect and thus connect curricula paradigms (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014). While participants detected similarities between their prior experiences and the requirements and expectations of their new teaching context, I discuss how most participants did not elect to explore those connections (Perkins & Salomon, 2012). Some participants converted

(Bishop, 1990; Welch, 1993) to the new context's ideologies and practices, whereas others adapted (DePalma & Ringer, 2011) their prior experiences to make sense of their new teaching context.

Because most participants did not elect to explore the bridges between prior and current experiences (Perkins & Salomon, 2012), they relied on lore and personal experiences more than formal WPE experiences, as Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012) found. After examining how participants transitioned into teaching at UTK, I comparatively analyze GTAs' pedagogical knowledge to demonstrate the extent to which GTAs reused or adapted prior experiences to inform their pedagogical practices. To better prepare experienced GTAs for teaching, I conclude by arguing for writing pedagogy educators to consider who GTAs are by recalibrating WPE to guide GTAs' adaptive transfer of pedagogical knowledge and to extend beyond the master's program and pre-service orientation.

Filling the Blank Slate: Exploring and Recognizing GTAs' Prior Histories

In 1990, Weiser criticized WPE that aimed to develop a generic writing teacher by not considering GTAs' needs and experiences. Scholars have echoed Weiser's call for writing pedagogy educators to consider who GTAs are (Yancey, 2002; Powell et al., 2002; McKinney & Chiseri-Strater, 2003; Stenberg, 2005). GTAs are not "blank slates" (Neeley 2000; Reid 2004; Stenberg 2005). They have prior knowledge and experiences with writing, and in the case of experienced GTAs, they typically have prior experiences in teaching and WPE. Reid, Estrem and Belcheir (2012) found that GTAs' prior

experiences could be neither removed nor replaced, and they warned writing pedagogy educators to not overlook these experiences. I took heed of this warning, and I examined GTAs' prior histories, particularly their prior WPE and teaching experiences. The data revealed that GTAs' histories were idiosyncratic, and while most of them had well-defined WPE opportunities, their pedagogical development was theorized insufficiently. Participants relied on lore (North, 1987; Estrem & Reid, 2012) and did not possess the academic discourse (Rankin, 1994) to rationalize practices or to distinguish the appropriate time to implement a particular pedagogical tool or theory.

For first-year PhD GTAs, they were provided limited WPE opportunities, such as a pre-service orientation or a summer pedagogy seminar, that were designed to prepare them quickly and efficiently for teaching FYC courses (Latterell, 1996). These WPE opportunities provided localized teacher preparation (Yancey, 2002), which ideally helped GTAs acclimate and transition into a new teaching context. However, do these opportunities consider GTAs' prior histories? Have writing pedagogy educators continued assuming what GTAs already know and what they need, as Weiser (1990) criticized? After examining participants' prior histories, I argue that such re-examination of GTAs' prior experiences need to be upheld. GTAs were provided typically one or more WPE opportunities during their master's programs (Latterell, 1996), as found in this study. Participants' prior WPE were diverse and idiosyncratic, ranging from a combination of field-approved GTA preparation initiatives, such as pre-service orientation, pedagogy course(s), practicum, tutoring, and mentoring, to no formal training. While some participants overlapped in the kinds WPE opportunities they

received, the core structure of the WPE for each participant was dissimilar. In fact, not a single participant overlapped with another one in the comprehensive design of the WPE that s/he received. Some of these WPE opportunities provided participants with a balanced WPE, as encouraged by Gebhardt (1977), Ruszkiewicz (1987), and Latterell (1996); however, other participants' WPE experiences were limited to either theory (Clara), practice (Ava), or nonexistent (Liz). Without knowing the diversity of these experiences, writing pedagogy educators can only design WPE for a generic GTA, which Weiser (1990) criticized. Moreover, the issue with these diverse experiences was that the subject matter was localized to the respective institution (Yancey, 2002), forcing GTAs to assemble, integrate, or adapt their prior WPE to the new context (Nowacek, 2011; DePalma & Ringer, 2011; Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014). To make a strong connection between prior and current teaching contexts, GTAs need to perceive dis/similarities in underlying structures of curricula and practices; however, their pedagogical practices and knowledge were limited theoretically because they valued WPE initiatives that provided generalizable pedagogical skills (e.g., first day activities or best grading practices), which inhibited their abilities to detect underlying structures of the curriculum.

Even though GTAs' prior WPE experiences were idiosyncratic and diverse, participants recalled WPE opportunities that provided lore (North, 1987; Estrem & Reid, 2012) as most formative to their pedagogical development. Similar to Estrem and Reid's (2012) findings, I found that participants' formal WPE held a "limited and sometimes peripheral" (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012, p. 48) influence on their pedagogical

practices. Lore was more valuable because it provided real-time, assembled survival strategies for teaching FYC (Bishop, 1997; Restaino, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014; Qualley, 2017). For example, participants who recalled pre-service orientation valued the "curriculum and programmatic interventions and pedagogical affordances" (Qualley, 2017, p. 73), i.e., the standardized syllabi, required textbooks, and practical workshops, that a writing program provided. These pedagogical tools helped GTAs survive their first year of teaching (Bishop; 1997; Restaino, 2012; Qualley, 2017). The practicum and mentorship were also recalled because these WPE initiatives provided the space to discuss, practice, and share teaching experiences and materials (Restaino, 2012). Even though they recalled these practical opportunities, they, too, held a limited, compartmentalized influence on participants' pedagogical practices. Participants could detect and connect what they practiced in practica to their classroom, but they did not comprehend the theoretical rationale for implementing such practices. Instead, participants assembled best practices (Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014) and low road transferred surface features of these affordances and personal experiences into their pedagogical practices (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, 2012; Chi & Van Lehn, 2012; Driscoll, 2013). This desire to survive teaching is problematic for developing GTAs' pedagogical practices. It leads to GTAs developing mechanized routines of reusing or adapting lore and personal experiences in their classrooms, which constrains their pedagogical development (Perkins & Salomon, 2012). GTAs need to be able to connect and adapt composition theory to their pedagogical practices to develop their pedagogical expertise (Parker, 1982; Perkins & Salomon, 2012).

When composition theory is disconnected from practice and not connected explicitly and compatibly to GTAs' prior or situated experiences (Parker, 1982), then it will remain a peripheral influence on pedagogical development (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). GTAs in this study could recall their exposure to composition theory, but their pedagogical practices remained insufficiently theorized (Estrem & Reid, 2012). They did not possess the academic discourse to theoretically explain why or when they implemented the pedagogical tools they did (Rankin1994). The WPE opportunities that provided practice introduced GTAs to perceived similarities in teaching contexts, but to what extent do those opportunities explicitly discuss the social, flexible nature of classrooms (Driscoll, 2013)? Classrooms are composed of students with varying needs and prior knowledges, and a pedagogical tool that works well in one course section may fail in another section. GTAs' low road transfer of pedagogical tools relies on perceived similarities among the sections they teach, and if they do not examine critically the underlying structure, then the reuse or adaptation of the pedagogical tool negatively transfers into the classroom (Chi & VanLehn, 2012; Perkins & Salomon, 2012). While I am emphasizing pedagogical tools here, the same is true for how GTAs' identify curriculum objectives and values.

Graham and David (1996) contended that GTAs' implicit theories and prior experiences affected the implementation of FYC curriculum, but I question the extent to which formal WPE explicitly connected theory to curricula values and pedagogical practices. From what I found in this study, participants' reliance on lore and personal experiences stemmed from their uncertainty with the curriculum values and expectations

of their prior teaching contexts (Wisniewski, 2014). When asked to identify and describe the curriculum objectives and values, participants did not possess the academic discourse to identify or the subject matter knowledge to describe their prior curriculum's theoretical framework (Rankin, 1994; Graham & David, 1996). In fact, only one participant, Spencer, was able to describe a pedagogical approach that corresponded to the curriculum objective he reported, but that report was limited to surface features (see Chapter Four). As for the other seven participants, they experienced a lack of appropriation of curricula objectives and values. They were either confused or uncertain about the conceptual underpinnings of the required assignments and overall curriculum design. To negotiate these dissonances, some participants reported teaching concepts and assignments that fit their values and lore, as Graham and David (1996) reported, and some participants demonstrated backward reaching transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1988) as it was likely that they transferred curricula terminology from UTK's WPE to make sense of their prior curricula knowledge and experiences. In both situations, participants demonstrated a need for WPE that provided the academic discourse and subject matter knowledge to develop their theoretical comprehension of curricula objectives and design. To develop GTAs' pedagogical knowledge and discourse, writing pedagogy educators should provide explicit instruction in the importance of composition theory, particularly how it informs curricula design, classroom dynamics, and pedagogical practices—which are social, flexible constructs. Without such development, then formal WPE will continue to hold a peripheral influence on GTAs' pedagogical development, which will have a

lingering effect on how FYC curricula are implemented and undergraduate students are taught.

While some participants recalled formal WPE that exposed them to composition theory, this exposure did not take root and inform their pedagogical practices. No matter if participants' WPE was well-defined or non-existent, participants did not have the academic discourse or the subject matter knowledge to detect, elect, and connect pedagogical practices with composition theory (Rankin, 1994; Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012). The data revealed how participants' lack of academic discourse inhibited their abilities to detect underlying structures like curricula objectives and values (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). For this reason, participants relied on lore, which led to mechanized laboring routines that helped GTAs survive teaching (Perkins & Salomon, 1988; Bishop, 1997; Restaino, 2012; Qualley, 2017). This low road transfer of lore is a possible reason for why prior experiences cannot be removed or replaced, as Estrem and Reid (2012) argued. To facilitate GTAs' pedagogical development, it is important to learn about GTAs' prior histories, as Weiser (1990) and other scholars have argued. Writing pedagogy educators can examine the extent to which GTAs' pedagogical practices are theorized and whether they possess the academic discourse to detect curricula objectives and values. By learning about GTAs' prior histories, writing pedagogy educators can guide new GTAs' transfer of learning, which will not only develop GTAs' pedagogical practices but will also benefit the writing program's FYC program. If participants struggled to identify the curriculum in which they were prepared to teach, then it is plausible that other GTAs also struggle in making this identification.

For writing pedagogy educators, the question remains, then, to what extent do these prior histories affect how experienced GTAs learn and adapt a new teaching context's WPE and curriculum design?

Encountering a New Teaching Context: Negotiating Prior Experiences and New Curriculum Objectives

It is important to know who GTAs are, particularly their prior WPE and teaching experiences because it provides insight into their pedagogical knowledge. When a first-year PhD GTA enters into a new teaching context, s/he negotiates prior knowledge and experiences in comparison to what is being taught and expected by the new context. While GTAs are making sense of their new teaching roles, writing programs are providing "curriculum and programmatic interventions and pedagogical affordances" (Qualley, 2017, p. 73), such as pre-service orientation workshops and standardized instructional materials, to ease GTAs' transition and ensure that implementation of the FYC curriculum (Latterell, 1996). However, writing programs with these top-down approaches typically do not assess how GTAs negotiate their prior experiences or navigate a new context's expectations. Instead, there is an institutionalized routine of preparing experienced instructors to pick up or be filled with best practices and theoretical knowledge associated with UTK's writing program's curriculum design (Farris, 2002; Yancey, 2002; Stenberg, 2005; Hardin, 2005; Belanger & Gruber, 2005). However, these GTAs are not blank slates, and they make sense of the new learning by comparing it to their prior knowledge and experiences (Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012). In this study, participants' prior histories influenced the extent to which

they adapted the new learning in their pedagogical practices. Specifically, their prior histories influenced how they identified relevant, useful WPE subject matter and how they detected curricula similarities and expectations.

Stenberg (2005) contended that WPE should be collaborative, recursive, dynamic, and student-centered, and UTK's three-day pre-service orientation, which was required, did not provide this dynamic, bottom-up approach to preparing first-year PhD GTAs. Instead, UTK provided workshops that provided subject matter and demonstrated best practices associated with the writing program's objectives and values. Participants made meaning of their pre-service experiences by detecting similar features of the new subject matter and best practices and connecting those features with their prior experiences (Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012). However, these connections were superficial because participants only recalled pre-service orientation workshops that were perceptually similar to their prior experiences (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). In their prior contexts, participants' pedagogical practices were informed mostly by lore and best practices, which helped them survive teaching but inhibited their ability to develop their theoretical knowledge. In the new context, the demonstration of best practices or the discussions that contained institutional lore triggered a "perceived need" (Wardle, 2007) to pay attention and low road transfer the subject matter and best practices of these workshops (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, 2012). Participants' prior knowledge and experiences informed their need to learn the procedures and rules of the new context, and they detected that their prior knowledge was localized to the prior teaching contexts.

They could not generalize their prior knowledge, only connect the need for acquiring information that they perceived as vital to helping them survive teaching.

Because participants recalled pre-service workshops, such as Resources or Beyond Ethos, Pathos, and Logos: A Rhetoric Crash Course for Teachers, that provided lore and best practices, their pedagogical practices remained insufficiently theorized. Moreover, their perceived need for additional WPE was superficially understood and valued. For participants, the subject matter of the pre-service orientation was familiar, and thus they described their overall experiences generally as boring and repetitive but reassuring. Participants felt that they already possessed the information provided from their prior teaching experiences, and because the subject matter was perceived as repetitive, they felt reassured that their pedagogical practices were sufficient for implementing the new curriculum. However, as Chi and VanLehn (2012) pointed out, learning was contingent on the extent to which learners perceived similarities between surface features and the underlying structure. Because participants only recalled workshops that emphasized lore, participants perceived either similar surface features between their prior and current teaching contexts or "merely adjust[ed]" (Parker, 1982, p. 417) their pedagogical practices if the lore was noticeably dissimilar and new. In both scenarios, participants did not explore the deep underlying structure of the new context's WPE and FYC curriculum, thus inhibiting their pedagogical development.

As was the case for their prior teaching contexts, participants' recollection and prioritization of lore reinforced mechanized survival routines for teaching. By not recalling workshops that introduced new theoretical frameworks, these participants'

pedagogical practices remained insufficiently theorized by this additional WPE opportunity. While many scholars have called for such extended WPE opportunities (Graham & David, 1996; Ebest, 2005; Stenberg, 2005; Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012), GTAs did not perceive a need for additional preparation. They only detected similar surface features of lore, which were perceived as valuable for their teaching survival. Continued WPE may not be effective if GTAs are prioritizing lore discerning surface features only. For WPE to be successful, writing pedagogy educators need to address explicitly the underlying theories that inform lore as well as provide a perceived need for learning and adaptively transferring composition theory into their pedagogical practices (Parker, 1982; Wardle, 2007).

Just like WPE, curriculum expectations and objectives for teaching the FYC cannot be picked up and implemented fully; instead, those values and goals should be adaptively transferred. GTAs can adaptively transfer such goals by developing their theoretical knowledge of curricula paradigms and practices. With this knowledge, they can learn through explicit instruction (Parker, 1982; Perkins & Salomon, 1988) and situated performances (Rose & Finders, 1998) how to detect curricula objectives values and how to connect those expectations and procedures to their prior experiences (Driscoll, 2013). However, WPE opportunities have not taught pedagogy for transfer; instead, there is an implied assumption that WPE will automatically transfer into GTAs' pedagogical practices, especially if provided pedagogical affordances, such as a standardized, annotated syllabus (Qualley, 2017). While standardization can help GTAs transition into a teaching context, it can also function as "cultural capital" (Dobrin, 2005)

to control the teaching of the curriculum and thus ensure consistent implementation (Graham & David, 1996). However, to what extent do these affordances ensure curricula implementation? To what extent do these pedagogical tools help GTAs detect, elect, and connect prior knowledge with the current teaching context?

Because WPE typically does not guide GTAs in detecting, electing, and connecting their prior knowledge with their current learning, GTAs must negotiate how to best integrate (Nowacek, 2011) or adapt (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013; Yancey, Robertson & Taczak, 2014) their learning experiences, which includes their comprehension of FYC curricula. With insufficiently theorized pedagogical practices, GTAs struggle to make sense of curricula objectives and values (Graham & David, 1996), and to fulfill their teaching requirements and duties, they either convert or converge (hereafter, adapt) to a writing program's pedagogical affordances and practices (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Welch, 1993; Qualley, 2017). However, when GTAs convert or adapt the question arises, to what extent do they comprehend the underlying theoretical paradigm of the affordances and thus the curriculum?

In this study, five participants chose to convert to the standardized curriculum, whereas three adapted prior experiences. In both cases, GTAs made these choices to best service their survival for teaching in a new context because the course, after all, was not their design, theory, or pedagogy (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Neeley, 2000; Restaino, 2012). The former converted to learn more about the curriculum's objectives by experiencing it, whereas the latter adapted prior experiences and practices to make sense of their new teaching context. For the five who converted, they did not attempt to detect or explore

how the standardized syllabus connected to their prior experiences. While it appeared that these participants adapted the pedagogical affordances, these participants detected surface features of the curriculum and low road transferred those features into their pedagogical practices (Perkins & Salomon, 2012). Without detecting and electing to explore connections between their pedagogical knowledge and the curriculum expectations, GTAs will not examine and connect the underlying structure of the curriculum, which is needed for successful transfer of learning (Chi & VanLehn, 2012; Perkins & Salomon, 2012). By converting to pedagogical affordances, GTAs will not be implementing the curriculum's objectives and values fully; instead, they will implement surface features that they perceive to be a vital part of teaching writing. Even though these GTAs aimed to implement this new curriculum, their superficial comprehension of the teaching context's goals and practices inhibited them from fully implementing the curriculum, which demonstrates that pedagogical affordances do not ensure consistent teaching of FYC curricula. GTAs' pedagogical knowledge needs to be theoretically developed so that they can detect and connect the conceptual underpinnings that inform the structure and practices of the FYC program.

While five participants converted to the standardized materials, there were three participants who attempted to reuse or adapt their prior experiences with the structure and design of UTK's standardized syllabus (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2013). Somewhat similar to Bishop's (1990) study, participants incorporated "preexisting histories and personal teaching style or preferences and was influenced by their current estimation of student needs" (p. 135). Participants' reuse of prior experiences was incorporated not

only because their identities were in flux, as Bishop (1990) contended, but also because they believed students benefited from the changes. These participants reused prior experiences and pedagogical preferences that were perceptually similar and ultimately familiar to help themselves negotiate and make sense their new teaching context (DePalma & Ringer, 2011). Participants wanted to teach the curriculum as designed, and they also wanted to be perceived as competent and confident teachers. However, the new teaching context presented a transfer of learning problem because the curriculum was unfamiliar and conflicted with their prior experiences.

To negotiate the new teaching context and experienced dissonance, participants explored the standardized materials and detected annotated activities that connected with their prior experiences, and when they connected these similarities, they adaptively transferred their prior pedagogical tools into the standardized syllabus, which helped the syllabus become of their making (DePalma & Ringer, 2011; Perkins & Salomon, 2012). For example, Ava noted that she had two years of prior teaching experiences and that she knew how to teach (see epigraph). Even with this prior experience, the new teaching context was unfamiliar, which meant that she did not have experience in teaching this particular curriculum. She conceded that it "probably would have been in [her] best interest to just leave everything," i.e., convert to the standardized syllabus (see Chapter Five), but that conversion would have put her in a position of not knowing how to survive teaching a new curriculum. She reported neither understanding what the daily activities entailed nor knowing the purpose of such assignments or tasks. If she were to have converted to the syllabus, then she felt that she would have failed in implementing the

curriculum. To bypass this failure, she reused prior teaching experiences, specifically those that were perceived as compatible with curriculum values, into her pedagogical practices at UTK. For example, she reused a "cultural eye" discourse community assignment, and the reuse of this assignment was perceptually similar to the annotated syllabus's assignment that emphasized the teaching of discourse community knowledge. Ava perceived this adaptation as resistance, but her responses in conjunction with maintenance of the overall course design demonstrated that she wanted to implement the curriculum. While Ava detected similar features like lessons and activities between prior and current teaching contexts, she did not have the theoretical knowledge or pedagogical tools to comprehend the conceptual design and rationale of the curriculum.

While Ava struggled with unfamiliarity of the curriculum, Clara's reuse of prior experiences within the standardized syllabus demonstrated a cognitive conflict in comprehending the overarching arc and purpose of the curriculum design. She reported that she "mashed up," a transfer process that Yancey, Robertson & Taczak (2014) termed as "assemblage" (p. 104), her prior experiences with UTK's standardized syllabus because the standard did not "fit the way [her] mind works." Clara's prior experiences with lack of transparency, an issue she encountered during her undergraduate writing courses, resurfaced when she received the pedagogical affordances from UTK. The layout of the standardized syllabus did not provide the "bare bones" (Clara) of what the writing program expected from her as a teacher, and this lack of transparency moved her to return to prior teaching experiences. In fact, she assembled her UTK syllabus by integrating classroom activities from prior teaching syllabi, and this assembled syllabus

created, for her, a more transparent overview of what she would teach. Clara did not report how the syllabi were in theoretical or ideological congruence; in fact, the degree to which the curricula and syllabi aligned was not discussed explicitly in the interviews and possibly not considered by Clara. Clara's assemblage was a means of survival, and for her to survive with a modicum of self-efficacy, she needed to reuse materials and even expectations to comprehend her new teaching context.

Both Ava and Clara encountered dissonance in comprehending the curriculum design and purpose. By reusing their prior experiences, they could retheorize their comprehension of the curriculum, and this retheorization, whether it aligned with curriculum objectives or not, was a solution to managing the issue of not understanding the new teaching context. While preserving their credibility factored into their decisions to adapt, participants' most salient reason for reusing prior instructional materials or practices was to learn the unfamiliar through the lens of the familiar. Unfortunately, this transfer of pedagogical knowledge and practices did not further their comprehension of UTK's curriculum, as they—like those who converted— detected and reused surface features of the curricula's objectives and practices. Participants' decisions to convert or adapt could be dependent upon their disposition towards standardized materials, as some scholars have noted (Bishop, 1990; Welch, 1993; Neely, 2000; Powell et al., 2002; Perkins & Salomon, 2012). Nevertheless, participants' choices were based in how they could best learn—whether through trial and error or reuse and adaptation—and implement the curriculum. Based on these findings, first-year GTAs need more pedagogical development in the area of curriculum knowledge, especially before they are

expected to teach it. Farris (2002) encouraged writing pedagogy educators to note GTAs' resistance or deviation as a marker for critical discussion and reflection about pedagogical practices. Writing pedagogy educators can open discussions with GTAs about their decisions to convert to or adapt pedagogical affordances, and these discussions could serve as "the impetus" (Farris, 2002, p. 122) for writing pedagogy educators and GTAs to examine theoretical knowledge and pedagogical practices critically, particularly the dis/similarities between prior histories and current teaching expectations. These explicit discussions that could guide GTAs' adaptive transfer of pedagogical affordances, which then could improve the likelihood of consistent implementation of the curriculum.

The goal of WPE and pedagogical affordances is to ensure consistent implementation of FYC curricula objectives and values (Graham & David, 1996). Much of composition scholarship assesses how curricula designs develop undergraduate students' writing expertise and skills, and to ensure the validity of that assessment, writing program administrators (WPAs) design WPE and pedagogical affordances to implement effective curricula. However, WPE and pedagogical affordances are not resulting in theoretical comprehension of the curricula objectives, practices, and values; instead, they are reinforcing low road transfer of surface features. GTA preparation programs and standardized instructional materials fail to consider GTAs' prior histories as well as their pedagogical identities and ideologies, and for this reason, GTAs detect and transfer surface features that they perceive as familiar and thus relevant to the

teaching of writing, which negatively affects their pedagogical development and the implementation of FYC curricula.

Some scholars have argued that GTAs who deviate from the curriculum by implementing surface features or adapting prior experiences are resistant to the writing program's objectives and values, which may be true for some GTAs. However, another possible explanation for resistance could be a failure of learning, i.e., experiencing pedagogical dissonance when prior experiences negatively transfer into pedagogical practices for a new curriculum (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). It is possible that GTAs' deviation represents their complex learning processes. As noted in this section, GTAs either converted to pedagogical practices valued by the writing program or adapted perceptually similar prior knowledge to help them implement the curriculum. Participants in this study were not willfully resistant to implementing the new curriculum, but their learning of pedagogical knowledge and practices was inertial(Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014). Participants did not perceive a need to adapt theoretical knowledge into their pedagogical practices, as they perceived lore as more beneficial to their laboring. Participants' limited pedagogical knowledge and thus their comprehension of the curriculum inhibited their ability to conceptually and technically implement it. Insufficiently theorized language and practices have affected GTAs' pedagogical development in both their initial WPE and teaching experiences as well as their current learning and transition into a new teaching context. If GTAs are not possessing sufficient theoretical knowledge to comprehend the what's and why's of their pedagogies, then what knowledges do they need to develop in order to connect prior histories with current

learning? What pedagogical knowledge do GTAs need to possess to implement FYC curricula effectively?

Conversion or Adaptation: To What Extent Did GTAs' Prior Experiences and Current WPE Inform Their Pedagogical Practices?

Beaufort (2007) created a conceptual model to examine wholesale writing expertise, and she identified five common knowledge domains that comprised writing expertise. Just as in writing transfer studies, the examination of how GTAs transfer pedagogies must be looked at holistically, too. Inspired by her conceptual model, I created five pedagogical knowledge domains that comprise pedagogical expertise: curriculum knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, genre knowledge, pedagogical practices knowledge, and discourse community knowledge. To answer the initial research questions, I examined these five common pedagogical knowledges to determine the extent to which prior and current teaching and WPE experiences were reused or adapted into GTAs' pedagogical practices. By determining the degree to which GTAs adopted the pedagogical objectives, practices, and values of a new teaching context, writing pedagogy educators can develop GTA preparation that aims to develop and transfer pedagogical theory and practice.

Curriculum Knowledge

UTK's writing program was grounded in two theoretical concepts: rhetoric and transfer. These theories functioned within the course design by first providing freshmen writers with rhetorical tools, such as Aristotelian appeals, audience awareness, discourse community knowledge, and stasis theory. This foundational knowledge was cultivated

through the first two major writing assignments: Comparative Rhetorical Analysis and Debate Analysis. Students then transferred their rhetorical knowledge into argumentative writing. First, their Debate Analysis informed them of where (i.e., at what issue) they needed to enter the conversation for their academic audience, and then they researched and rhetorically framed their argument for a particular discourse community. Students further demonstrated their audience awareness by transferring the argument that they composed for an academic audience into a genre (e.g., Op-Ed or Advertisement) for a public audience. This structure was how rhetoric and transfer informed the first FYC course. These skills later served as the foundation for the second FYC course, where freshmen writers encountered disciplinary writing and research methods, such as archival and qualitative. Reviewing this curriculum structure and purpose is important because seven of eight participants, i.e., first-year PhD GTAs, did not detect the connections between rhetoric and transfer theories as the curriculum objectives and theoretical paradigms from the pre-service orientation.

Farris (2002), Yancey (2002), and Stenberg (2005) criticized top-down approaches to preparing GTAs for teaching curriculum objectives and values. Their criticism emphasized that GTAs do not pick up or consume curriculum knowledge, and this problem of picking up a curriculum is a transfer problem. Perkins and Salomon (1988) warned that "transfer does not take care of itself" (p. 22). GTAs will not learn and apply curriculum knowledge that is not explicitly stated and compatibly connected to their prior teaching experiences. If there is not this mediation of learning and experiences, then WPAs "get what [they] teach for" (Smit, 2004, p. 134). They will get GTAs who

either pick up partial features of curriculum or deviate from the curriculum (Powell et al., 2002; Chi & VanLehn, 2012; Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014).

From UTK's pre-service orientation, most participants (6 of 8) detected partial or surface features of the curriculum. They comprehended that the writing program either emphasized transfer or rhetorical theories; they did not detect the dual paradigms of the curriculum. Participants who reported transfer theory understood the curriculum as teaching writing skills and tools that could be applied to future writing contexts, also known as forward reaching transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1988). These participants' curriculum knowledge manifested in their pedagogical practices in either their teaching of genres or in how they scaffolded lessons to build and connect learning. Participants' reported experiences and pedagogical practices reflected a superficial comprehension of transfer's role in the curriculum; they did not explicitly connect assignments or discuss how learning could be abstracted and applied to past or future experiences. Their teaching of transfer consisted of providing students with generalizable writing skills and familiar, identifiable genres that students would likely encounter in future writing contexts. Participants who reported rhetoric as the curriculum's underlying theory also understood its role in the curriculum as teaching students generalizable writing skills and tools, particularly in constructing their Aristotelian appeals and audience-awareness. Participants deduced this curriculum emphasis from teaching the required assignments, and their pedagogical practices emphasized rhetorical theory through class discussions about audience awareness and Aristotelian appeals. Participants developed their

curriculum knowledge and pedagogical practices based on multiple sources, as Estrem and Reid (2012) found.

Participants aimed to teach these underlying concepts by drawing from department-approved resources, personal experiences, and community more than pre-service orientation (Estrem & Reid, 2012). While participants drew upon pre-service orientation to help them teach unfamiliar subject matter like stasis analysis, UTK's pre-service orientation held a limited, peripheral influence on their pedagogical practices and curriculum knowledge (Estrem, Reid & Belcheir, 2012). Lore and best practices, whether departmentally sponsored or peer provided, was most influential in informing participants' pedagogical practices, which were not sufficiently theorized (Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014). Because of their reliance on lore and prior experiences, it was not surprising to find that participants detected surface features of only one curriculum paradigm. They valued resources like custom-designed textbooks and shared instructional materials because they reinforced their mechanized routines of teaching writing. When these resources were not enough, some participants turned to more experienced GTAs, who were knowledgeable about the curriculum, for advice about pedagogical practices to use or avoid (North, 1987). Some also reused prior teaching experiences, or what they deemed to be their best practices, into their teaching at UTK; this return to prior pedagogical practices helped them survive teaching in a new, unfamiliar context (Bishop, 1997; Restaino, 2012). Participants perceived that these affordances would develop their comprehension of the curriculum, but their reliance on lore inhibited their exploration of detecting and connecting

composition theory to their pedagogical practices and thus their development of curriculum knowledge. To fully develop and implement the curriculum, they needed guidance in negotiating and integrating new curriculum knowledge and expectations with their prior experiences.

While most participants detected partial features of the curriculum, there was one participant, Mike, who did not detect the curriculum values and objectives. He struggled to negotiate experienced dissonance in teaching a curriculum that was new and dissimilar to prior teaching experiences. When asked to identify UTK's curriculum objectives and values, he became frustrated with his lack of discourse; he stated, "Nothing's popping up at the moment. I'm trying to think what I'm doing in my life" (see Chapter Five). After experiencing the curriculum, his frustration turned to dissatisfaction. He reported that the emphasis of teaching "higher level stuff" went beyond his students' abilities, and he wanted to teach students "the basics," such as paragraph unity and grammar, which were emphasized in his prior teaching context. Mike's frustration and dissatisfaction mirror Restaino's (2012) participant, Nancy. She experienced a dissonance between prior experiences and curriculum expectations, but she had a "middle space" to adapt and test pedagogical practices to manage the dissonance. Mike, on the other hand, did not have that space. Instead, he converted to the standardized teaching materials to learn about the curriculum through the process of teaching it. Unfortunately, his curriculum knowledge did not develop because his need to survive teaching outweighed the learning of the curriculum. If he had the space to adapt, practice, and test prior experiences in this new teaching context prior to actually teaching the course, he could have developed his

curriculum knowledge as Nancy did. Instead, he found himself in a dissatisfactory cycle of laboring to survive (Restaino, 2012).

While Mike did not have that space to practice and test his curriculum knowledge at UTK, Spencer did; however, he had this opportunity during his MFA program. Spencer was the only participant who attended UTK for his MFA and PhD, which made the curriculum familiar. Spencer's formal and informal WPE provided the opportunities, or Restaino's (2012) middle space, to observe, adapt, and microteach the curriculum. However, even with this middle space, he did not immediately identify both curriculum paradigms. He first reported that the curriculum emphasized forward reaching transfer, which he implemented by teaching rhetorical and genre awareness. After teaching the curriculum, he amended his answer to consist of both ideologies. Spencer's concept of teaching writing transfer aligned with emphasizing two of Beaufort's (2007) knowledge domains. He reported that transfer was possible if students had rhetorical and genre awareness, which he emphasized in his pedagogical practices (see Chapter Five). While he did not mention Beaufort (2007), he was required to read *Beyond College Writing* in his pedagogy course. Is it possible that Spencer's change in curriculum knowledge stemmed from this prior experience? Or is it possible that he became aware of the curriculum's values, such as rhetoric and genre, through the process of teaching it? Either scenario is possible, and I cannot say for certain which experience shaped his curriculum knowledge. I can say that his extended familiarity with the curriculum informed his curriculum knowledge, and for this reason, he was the only participant who reported both underlying theoretical concepts of the curriculum.

With Spencer as the exception, participants did not detect both curriculum paradigms. Their pedagogical practices and interview responses demonstrated their limited or lack thereof curriculum knowledge. For participants to integrate and implement curriculum knowledge and values into their pedagogical practices, WPE needs to consider GTAs' prior experiences with curricula, particularly their ability to identify and define different paradigms and how they associate pedagogical practices with implementing those paradigms. With that prior knowledge, writing pedagogy educators can guide GTAs' detection and connection of pedagogical ideologies and practices for adaptive transfer. Stenberg (2005) contended that WPE is a collaborative, recursive endeavor, and scholars who specialize in writing transfer believe that teaching transfer follows this same process. If WPE continues to not address GTAs' prior histories, pedagogical values, and theories-in-use, then GTAs will continue to implement the curriculum partially or negatively. If GTAs are not implementing the curriculum fully, then composition scholars will continue encountering FYC writing transfer problems due to this limited curriculum knowledge. Therefore, it is vital for GTAs to develop the theoretical knowledge to detect curricula paradigms and connect those values with appropriate pedagogical practices.

Rhetorical Knowledge

Beaufort (2007) contended that rhetorical knowledge was important for teaching writing transfer. To communicate effectively and rhetorically, writers must consider their audience and purpose as well as the "social context—material conditions, timing, social relationships, etc. within the discourse community" (Beaufort, 2007, p. 20). Just as

writers must consider their rhetorical situations, instructors must do the same. GTAs must consider their rhetorical situation of the classroom, i.e., their authority, audience, purpose, timing, and material conditions, and this rhetorical situation, as it does with writing, may affect GTAs' pedagogies (Petraglia, 1995). For this reason, I examined participants' rhetorical knowledge, particularly how, if at all, they perceived their teaching contexts as rhetorical and if they perceived a need for teaching rhetorical theory.

Most participants (6 of 8) described their teaching contexts as rhetorical situations, either explicitly or implicitly. These participants recontextualized their conceptual understanding of rhetorical theory, particularly concepts like rhetorical situation and Aristotelian appeals, by applying it to their classroom (Nowacek, 2011). Nowacek (2011) contended that student writers were "agents of integration," (p. 38) who reshaped their activity systems to unintentionally or intentionally, i.e., through meta-awareness, transfer contexts and knowledge. Similar to these student writers, six participants considered, explicitly or implicitly, how rhetorical theory was integrated into their pedagogical practices. Participants' classrooms were social, flexible rhetorical spaces in which they needed to consider their purpose, message, and audience on a daily basis. GTAs reflected on their objectives as well as students' needs, and they adapted their pedagogical practices to fit those needs. In addition to considering their rhetorical situation, they also rhetorically framed their lectures and activities to construct their *ethos*. Participants' recontextualization of rhetorical theory demonstrated their conceptual understanding of the theory and how it can be abstracted and applied to pedagogical personas and practices.

While most participants perceived their classrooms as rhetorical spaces, two participants, Ava and Joseph, did not demonstrate this conceptual appropriation of the theory. Instead, when asked how rhetoric informed their pedagogical practices, they reported and were observed reusing and reinforcing rhetorical terminology that was present in the standardized syllabus. DePalma and Ringer (2011) contended that writers either consciously or intuitively adapted or reused previous learning in either a new or possibly unfamiliar writing context. As was true for those writers, Ava and Joseph were in a new, unfamiliar teaching context. In fact, Ava reported that she had no formal prior experience with rhetorical theory, and even though she did not have this prior knowledge, she perceived the need to incorporate rhetorical theory into her pedagogical practices because that was dictated by the standardized syllabus. Joseph, too, noted the inclusion of rhetorical theory in the standardized syllabus informed his pedagogical practices. Because rhetorical theory was perceived to be an important part of the course design, Ava and Joseph intuitively adapted the terminology into their lectures, lessons, and assignments. The inclusion and adaptation of the terminology helped them negotiate their incompatible prior teaching experiences to teach the curriculum as designed. Even though they did not have a conceptual understanding and application of rhetorical theory, they detected the importance of adapting it to be part of their pedagogical practices.

Participants intuitively adapted or consciously recontextualized rhetorical theory in managing their teaching contexts, and their prior knowledge and experiences with rhetorical theory determined the need for teaching rhetorical theory. Participants reported feeling comfortable and thus confident teaching rhetorical theory of which they had prior

knowledge or experience. For example, some participants reported feeling comfortable teaching argumentation because they were familiar with writing in that mode; other participants reported feeling comfortable teaching Aristotelian appeals because they had prior experience teaching it. Participants perceived themselves as confident, knowledgeable instructors when they taught familiar subject matter. Because participants were knowledgeable about the transferability of rhetorical knowledge to communicative contexts, they perceived a need to teach rhetorical theory (Wardle, 2007). They found that teaching rhetorical theory was beneficial for students because it applied to other courses and the "real world." This perceived need and familiarity functioned as, what Qualley (2017) termed, an internal driver that motivated GTAs to teach rhetorical theory. In fact, Spencer stated that rhetoric was "one of the reasons why [he was] motivated to teach [students] transfer" (see Chapter Six). Because participants valued rhetorical concepts in which they were familiar, they were more motivated to teach those concepts.

When participants were unfamiliar with a rhetorical concept, such as stasis theory, they were more likely to encounter dissonance. Participants noted that their subject matter knowledge was underdeveloped, and they experienced anxiety or nervousness when teaching unfamiliar content. Participants felt underprepared to teach unfamiliar content, and they needed more pedagogical and theoretical development. By turning to departmental resources, such as CourseSites and textbooks, participants had to "appraise and integrate new knowledge themselves" (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012, p. 55). Fortunately, for the writing program, these participants were thoughtfully, genuinely

engaged in implementing the curriculum; however, the degree to which they conceptually implemented teaching unfamiliar rhetorical concepts is potentially problematic.

Participants were motivated to learn unfamiliar content because they needed to survive teaching the required assignment. It is unclear from this study the extent to which their self-teaching theoretically informed their pedagogical practices, but what is clear is that they turned to practical pedagogical tools to inform their comprehension of rhetorical theory. If GTAs are responsible for educating themselves in core concepts that define curricula, then the question arises, to what extent are GTAs teaching theoretical concepts like rhetorical theory accurately and sufficiently? To ensure that GTAs are correctly implementing theoretical concepts, writing pedagogy educators need to assess the extent to which GTAs possess theoretical knowledge, and with that knowledge, educators can develop GTAs' academic discourse and knowledge of rhetorical concepts, such as stasis theory. Without this theoretical education, then GTAs may continuing relying on lore and pedagogical affordances, which means only surface features of theoretical concepts will be adaptively transferred into GTAs' pedagogical practices.

When GTAs encounter dissonance, they may choose to negotiate those experiences by educating themselves via pedagogical lore and affordances. Some GTAS, however, may choose to criticize the writing program and curriculum (Rankin, 1994; Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Dryer, 2012; Restaino, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014). This criticism stems from not thinking deliberately and critically about solving the problem (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014). For example, Clara experienced dissonance when teaching unfamiliar concepts like Aristotelian appeals and stasis theory. She expressed frustration

with and dissatisfaction toward the writing program and curriculum, which required her to teach these unfamiliar rhetorical concepts. She noted that there was a "gap in [her] knowledge" about rhetorical theory, and she perceived her students to be more knowledgeable about the subject matter than she was, which negatively impacted her self-efficacy. To manage this conflict, she sought advice from an outside peer and turned to criticizing the structure of the writing program's curriculum (Rankin, 1994; Restaino, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014). Her peer validated her anxieties, leading her to state: "[T]here is something important about an instructor choosing their own genres or having the ability to do that, so that we can use our best assets to bring out their best assets, if you're still teaching toward the course objectives." Clara struggled teaching "someone else's theory and pedagogy" (Neeley, 2000, p. 20), and her prior experiences were disconnected from the curriculum's objectives and practices.

Even though Clara detected similarities between her prior experiences with rhetorical theory and the new curriculum's design, she did not possess the language and knowledge to teach rhetorical theory confidently and comfortably. She was aware of the problem, but she did not elect to solve it, as her cohort did. This decision to not explore the disconnect inhibited her ability to learn rhetorical theory for pedagogical application (Perkins & Salomon, 2012). Instead, she faulted the writing program for forcing her to teach subject matter that was beyond her "best assets." Rankin (1994) suggested that GTAs like Clara should turn to a dialogic Other to examine the dissonance critically. Clara did turn to a peer for advice, but that conversation did not lead to a critical examination of Clara's theoretical assumptions and knowledge. Instead, it reified Clara's

feelings of dissatisfaction and revealed the belief that teaching one's best practices achieves course objectives. This revelation demonstrates Clara's and perhaps her peer's limited comprehension of the deep structure underlying the course objectives. If GTAs generally do not perceive the underlying structure of the curriculum that informs pedagogical practices, then turning to the dialogic Other to problem-solve a dissonance is not enough, as either lore or dissatisfaction will be reinforced. Writing pedagogy educators need to make the curricula paradigms explicitly clear to GTAs as well as demonstrate how pedagogical practices may conflict or align with those paradigms. Without this education, GTAs will continue to experience dissonance when teaching unfamiliar subject matter. They need the academic discourse and theoretical knowledge to understand why the dissonance exists before critically exploring how to solve it.

While participants encountered dissonance when teaching unfamiliar rhetorical concepts, they still perceived a need to teach rhetorical theory. As previously noted, participants reported that rhetoric was beneficial for students' writing and thinking development and for facilitating writing transfer. Participants were motivated, even in Clara's case, to teach rhetorical theory because they perceived a need for it. While perceiving a need for rhetorical knowledge is important for transfer (Wardle, 2007), it is not enough to transform their pedagogical practices; GTAs need to be able to detect curricula paradigms and connect those expectations with their prior experiences (Perkins & Salomon, 2012). The extent to which they detect the theoretical underpinnings of the curriculum determines the degree to which the curriculum is implemented. These GTAs came into a new teaching context, and when content was familiar, they were confident

and connected surface features of their prior experiences with the teaching demands of the new curriculum. However, when they encountered unfamiliar rhetorical concepts, they either educated themselves or criticized the program. As various FYC curricula require providing rhetorical education, GTAs are in need of developing this theoretical knowledge so that they can understand the theory and effectively integrate it into their pedagogical practices. To conceptually and technically provide this rhetorical education, writing pedagogy educators need to develop GTAs' rhetorical knowledge so that they can feel confident and knowledgeable in teaching the required subject matter and thus implementing curriculum objectives and values. With limited theoretical knowledge, GTAs will teach parts of the assignments and theoretical subject matter that they perceive as familiar and necessary, thus affecting the extent to which the curriculum is being implemented. Moreover, GTAs will struggle to teach beyond surface features and will continue to encounter dissonances.

Genre Knowledge

Genre knowledge was another domain of Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model for writing transfer. She contended, "Writers must also develop knowledge of genres whose boundaries and features the discourse community defines and stabilizes" (Beaufort, 2007, p. 20). Genres are shaped by their social or rhetorical contexts (Miller, 1984; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995), and they vary among discourse communities (Beaufort, 2007). The genres GTAs encountered at their previous institutions were localized to that particular discourse community; that is, genres were shaped by that institution's curriculum ideologies, objectives, and values. When GTAs relocated to a new teaching

context, they encountered a new curriculum and thus new genres. They may have assumed some genres as typical or universal for all FYC programs, but that was not the case for these participants. It is important to remember that FYC curricula vary from institution to institution (Beaufort, 2007). For this reason, I assessed participants' genre knowledge and how that knowledge connected to UTK's genre requirements. I questioned the extent to which participants comprehended the purpose of UTK's required genres as well as the extent to which their prior genre knowledge connected to their current teaching context.

Whether participants converted or adapted to teaching the standardized syllabus, most participants (6 of 8) taught the required genres without questioning the purpose and function of those genres within the conceptual framework of the curriculum. Restaino (2012) found this lack of questioning as uncritical reliance, but I contend that it demonstrated participants' trust in the writing program's procedures and practices. These participants exhibited goodwill towards curriculum standards and expectations by accepting the standardized instructional materials. Nevertheless, their rationales for accepting the materials were also connected to their instructional purpose and requirements set forth by the English Department. This acceptance and trust may be why only half of the participants recalled all four major writing genres while the other four participants recalled either two or three genres. When asked as to why they selected that particular genre, participants could not provide a rationale beyond "that was required by the curriculum" (see Chapter Five). However, they all recalled the fourth writing genre, which was not provided by the writing program. A possible reason that all eight

participants recalled this particular genre is that they were motivated to select and teach a genre that was of their choosing and not somebody else's (Neeley, 2000). However, future research would need to explore the extent to which participants' motivations affected their recollection, rationalization, and reflection for assigning genres of their choosing.

Even though participants had this freedom with the fourth genre, they deviated from the curriculum with this particular assignment. Powell et al. (2002) noted that GTAs deviated from master syllabi as a form of resistance. My participants, however, did not deviate from the required genres, but once they had the freedom to choose a genre, they deviated from the curriculum design. Half of the participants reported changing the subject matter of the Position Paper for a Public Audience. The purpose of the assignment was to teach students how to adapt an academic argument for a public genre and audience, and by changing this purpose, participants were no longer implementing the curriculum design. Instead, their students developed typified genre knowledge and did not experience how to transfer rhetorical and genre knowledges. Not only did participants not implement the curriculum, but they also did not seek approval for these changes, which happened organically as the semester progressed. Participants reported that they and their students were "burnt out" on the course content, so they amended their departmental-approved assignment sheets to broaden the subject matter and thus purpose of the assignment without seeking approval from the Composition Office. These participants changed their assignment sheets to continue surviving teaching the curriculum that was not of their own choosing (Bishop, 1997; Restaino, 2012); moreover,

this change points to a curriculum knowledge problem. If participants did not comprehend the purpose and structure of the curriculum, which determined the genres, then they deviated from the curriculum design. To ensure that GTAs teach the required genres, they need to be taught explicitly the purpose and function of those genres within the overarching curriculum design. Without that education, GTAs will not perceive a need for teaching particular genres beyond arbitrary assignment by WPAs.

Participants who deviated from the curriculum design also experienced dissonance in teaching the required genres for one of two reasons: 1. The genres were new, and participants did not have the discourse or experience to comprehend the unfamiliar genres (Welch, 1993; Rankin 1994); or 2. Participants' prior experiences with genres conflicted with the curriculum's requirements and expectations (Rankin, 1994). Clara and Cornelius struggled to teach some of the required genres; they were unfamiliar with the purpose and conventions of genres like the Debate Analysis. Clara desired models of the genre to clarify the expectations and conventions of the genre, and without such pedagogical affordances, she experienced conflict and wanted to teach genres in which she was familiar. Cornelius, too, struggled to teach the genres required by UTK's writing program. At his previous institution, he reported not teaching "under the guise of genres," and his transition into teaching genres required a "new vocabulary" that he did not possess (Welch, 1993; Rankin, 1994). He did not have the academic discourse to make meaning of his dissonance, and he struggled to comprehend the rhetorical nature of each genre. He desired absolute conventions to familiarize himself with the genres. Both Clara and Cornelius wanted pedagogical affordances, such as student examples or

handouts, to demystify the unfamiliar genres and to guide their pedagogical practices; however, they had to learn about the genres as they taught the assignments. They both aimed to teach the assignments as designed, even when experiencing dissonance, but when they had the chance to integrate familiar genres in the Position Paper for a Public Audience, they deviated from the course design to teach that which they knew.

While Clara and Cornelius experienced dissonance when they encountered unfamiliar genres, Ava and Liz reported dissonance when their prior experiences conflicted with the curriculum expectations and design, leading to confusion (Neeley, 2000). For example, Ava's prior institution emphasized the teaching of genres, and the required textbook for that curriculum was organized by types of genres. At UTK, the curriculum was not considered genre-based, but the teaching of genres was important for facilitating writing transfer (Beaufort, 2007). Ava detected the importance of teaching genres, but she experienced dissonance in determining the extent to which she should focus on genres. Ava reported feeling "overwhelmed by [her] back knowledge," which left her feeling confused and "not great" about her pedagogical practices. Liz, too, reported that her confidence suffered due to confusion, particularly in adapting stasis theory into her teaching of argumentation. Liz was familiar and reportedly very confident in teaching argument-based genres, but the inclusion of stasis theory did not connect compatibly with her prior experiences. Instead, she experienced discomfort and a loss of self-efficacy in teaching argumentation. When these participants deviated from the course design, they both regained clarity and self-efficacy in their teaching, which was good for them personally. However, their deviation did not develop their pedagogical practices as

they returned to best practices that did not emphasize the curriculum's objectives. Nevertheless, they attempted to bridge their experiences to implement the curriculum and to make the most of their prior genre knowledge and teaching experiences (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). They would have benefited from exploring the differences in curricula paradigms to help them connect their pedagogical knowledge and experiences. If these GTAs possessed the theoretical knowledge of why curricula emphasized particular components of genre theory more than other types of curricula, these GTAs would be able to detect the differences to adapt their pedagogical practices to fit the curriculum's objectives.

Farris (2002) proposed that GTAs' deviations could function as an impetus for discussing and developing GTAs' and the writing program's pedagogical knowledge and practices. For the four GTAs who deviated from the course design, writing pedagogy educators could open a dialogue with GTAs about their choices. By identifying and understanding disconnections, educators can guide GTAs in adaptively transferring their prior knowledge into a new teaching context. Without that guidance, GTAs are forced to negotiate their learning without the appropriate academic discourse or theoretical knowledge. Without that development, they will experience dissonance, confusion, and frustration. As seen in the cases of Ava and Liz, the reuse of best practices does not equate positive pedagogical experiences. GTAs intuitively know when a pedagogical problem exists, but they do not have the pedagogical knowledge or guided supervision to explore and solve that problem. Instead, they rely on pedagogical affordances, such as student examples and handouts, to help them survive teaching (Bishop, 1997; Restaino,

2012; Qualley, 2017). These survival strategies, however, only maintain their mechanized routines and stymie their pedagogical development.

Participants who reported positive experiences and comfort in teaching genres were also in need of pedagogical development. While these participants demonstrated through their pedagogical practices how genres function rhetorically, most participants did not possess the theoretical discourse to explain why they integrated rhetorical theory into their teaching of genres. For some participants, the teaching of genres was done by noting identifiable types and recurring conventions associated with those types. However, there were two participants who explicitly perceived genres as rhetorical, social constructs. In both cases, these participants were observed teaching broad definitions and identifiable conventions by connecting a specific genre to a particular rhetorical purpose and audience. These observations demonstrate most participants' tacit knowledge about genre theory, but it also conveys a need to develop that knowledge to be recognized more consciously.

While scholars have contended that GTAs need experience in writing and teaching disciplinary genres (Wardle, 2009), they also need an extended education in genre theory. If they understood why they integrated the teaching of rhetorical theory with their teaching of genre analysis, then GTAs possibly could convey the nuances more concretely to their students. Yet GTAs struggled in teaching these "nuances" because they did not understand the deep structure that informed those dis/similarities among genres or even within a genre. Because GTAs only detected similar surface features of genres, they could not explain with confidence the idiosyncrasy and rhetorical function of

genres, even though most participants' pedagogical practices demonstrated a tacit understanding of genre theory. For GTAs to teach genres as social and rhetorical more confidently, then their genre knowledge needs significant development beyond experience in writing in disciplinary genres. They need more than writing opportunities to develop their pedagogical practices; they need education in genre theory, and educators need to convey why this theory is important to writing development. Educators also need to connect how genre theory can inform pedagogical practices. Without this explicit instruction, GTAs will continue teaching surface features of genres by either teaching genre conventions and forms or by loosely associating rhetorical purposes and audiences with particular genre types. These GTAs will continue experiencing dissonance or low confidence when teaching genres because this knowledge is not developed beyond their tacit comprehension. And when teaching genres, their theories-in-use will in turn affect undergraduate students' genre knowledge and writing expertise because genres will remain a "slippery" subject.

Pedagogical Practices Knowledge

In addition to knowledges in subject matter, rhetoric, and genre, Beaufort (2007) contended that students should also develop writing process knowledge to facilitate transfer. She explained that students needed to become familiar with procedural knowledge associated with the discourse community. GTAs, too, must learn procedural knowledge to instruct their students. I have termed this procedural pedagogical knowledge as pedagogical practices knowledge. To understand participants' reuse and adaptation of prior and current experiences and knowledge, I examined their conceptual

understanding of how they structured their pedagogical practices to teach writing as a process in their classrooms. I found that participants employed various pedagogical practices that encouraged writing as a process. Though they employed these practices, they conceptually understood a reductive version of writing as a process. Because the standardized syllabus scaffolded the teaching of writing as a process, most participants did not recognize the extent to which they were teaching this procedural knowledge (Restaino, 2012).

Participants experienced comfort and confidence the most when teaching writing as a process. They were the most familiar with these practices from their experiences in writing classrooms, which informed how they comprehended a writing classroom operating. They described teaching writing processes as teaching students to write multiple drafts, i.e., working from prewriting to an initial draft, to revision, and then to a final draft (Restaino, 2012). Most participants exhibited what Restaino (2012) described as a "cursory knowledge" (p. 26) of teaching writing as a process, and their comprehension was not developed through their teaching experiences. Participants relied on the pedagogical affordances, or standardized instructional materials, to guide their teaching of writing as a process (Restaino, 2012; Qualley, 2017). This reliance was evident in their self-reports of how they described their teaching of writing as a process. Six participants reported two or three of the four writing program-approved pedagogical practices (i.e., prewriting activities, group work and/or writing workshops, peer reviews, and conferences), even though five of these participants were found through data triangulation implementing all four approaches. Participants did not conceptually identify

all of their pedagogical practices as teaching writing as a process. Some participants were observed implementing some of these practices, or their syllabi documented that they implemented those approaches. This limited acknowledgement could be due to the reliance on the standardized syllabus (Restaino, 2012). In fact, of these six participants, four explicitly acknowledged how the standardized syllabus scaffolded their teaching of writing as a process, and Liz even noted that UTK's process approach was "the best" that she had experienced. While these participants implemented sound pedagogical practices that encouraged writing as a process, most of them did not analyze and comprehend how those practices facilitated curriculum objectives and values. Without this critical examination, GTAs will struggle to develop their academic discourse to explain why they implement these particular pedagogical practices and describe how these practices meet curriculum objectives. Instead, these practices function as low road transfer that is automatically triggered because that is how a typical writing classroom functions (Perkins & Salomon, 1988).

On the other hand, there were four participants who critically assessed their experiences in implementing pedagogical practices provided by the writing program. When reflecting on their experiences teaching the curriculum as scaffolded, three participants, Ava, Clara, and Mandy, reported conflicts in negotiating their pedagogical values or negotiating curriculum objectives (Neeley, 2000). Ava and Clara reported that the standardized syllabus prepared the course for them to teach, even if they chose to reuse or adapt some prior lessons. When it came to teaching writing as a process, the standardized syllabus provided the scaffolding, and they did not have to think about their

pedagogical practices, only implement the ones provided (Restaino, 2012). Ava noted how the standardized syllabus removed the need for extensive preparation, thus creating what Restaino (2012) described as a thoughtless, endless cycle of laboring. This laboring affected Ava's comprehension of seeing and teaching for the larger picture of the process. Clara, too, was affected by the standardized syllabus, as it encouraged her to teach someone else's course, and she struggled to make the course her own (Neeley, 2000). Even though Clara desired to change the scaffolding in the standardized syllabus, she did not change it to fit her preferences, which was contrary to Graham and David's (1996) findings that GTAs implemented what they believed and valued. She and Ava aimed to teach writing as a process as designed by UTK's writing program, even though those practices did not align with their pedagogical needs and values.

While Ava and Clara encountered dissonance due to their pedagogical values, Mandy encountered dissonance in negotiating her prior experiences in context of UTK's curriculum objectives. Mandy converted to the standardized syllabus, and she incorporated, whether she conceptually comprehended it or not, all four pedagogical practices. This conversion positioned Mandy as a "blank slate," which she was not (Neeley, 2000; Reid, 2004; Stenberg, 2005). Mandy encountered dissonance in managing dual identities (Rankin, 1994). She had prior WPE experiences that included tutor training, and those experiences conflicted with her role as an instructor. She experienced discomfort when negotiating how much feedback to provide students throughout their writing processes. This discomfort was also present in her experience with the scaffolding of the curriculum, which she struggled to manage. Like Ava and Clara,

Mandy also wanted to implement her own pedagogical practices to teaching writing as a process, but she, too, refrained from making those changes. The writing program did not consider Mandy's (or other GTAs') prior experiences, which led to this conflict and critical reflection in teaching the scaffolding as provided in the standardized syllabus (Rankin, 1994; Bishop, 1997; Yancey, 2002; Stenberg, 2005). Mandy as well as Ava and Clara desired to connect their prior experiences to the curriculum design to make the course their own, and because they could not detect how to connect their learning, they encountered dissonance that limited their conceptual comprehension of the curriculum's scaffolding (Wisniewski, 2014).

While following the standardized syllabus led to an appropriation of surface features in teaching writing as a process, there were two participants, Joseph and Mike, who demonstrated theorized pedagogical practices when teaching writing as a process. It is unclear as to the extent to which they connected their prior knowledge with the writing program's curriculum objectives and values for teaching writing as a process. It is possible that they could have detected their conceptual understanding from pedagogical affordances and current WPE. Either way, from what I analyzed and observed, Joseph and Mike conceptually understood and technically implemented pedagogical practices that demonstrated how writing processes are contingent upon rhetorical situations. They varied their pedagogical practices to teach students different processes, such as tailoring peer reviews to students' learning styles (e.g., reading drafts aloud, reading drafts backwards, etc.) or incorporating directive prewriting opportunities that built into the writing of the final draft. Joseph and Mike employed all four pedagogical approaches

(i.e., prewriting, group work/writing workshops, conferences, and peer reviews) to develop students' writing processes as well as to facilitate students' writing transfer. Contrary to Restaino's (2012) findings, they did not thoughtlessly labor because the pedagogical practices were provided in the standardized syllabus. Instead, they detected the underlying contexts of each assignment and theoretically connected particular writing process activities to fit that context. Their ability to detect and connect demonstrated that their writing process knowledge was theoretically informed from their prior experiences, and this development enabled them to reuse and adapt prior experiences and current practices successfully in their classrooms (Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012).

While Joseph and Mike demonstrated an appropriation of conceptual underpinnings for their pedagogical practices knowledge, there was one participant, Spencer, who detected the conceptual purpose of the scaffolding and pedagogical practices, but his writing process knowledge was limited theoretically. Spencer comprehended that the writing program scaffolded the syllabus to encourage transfer, but his pedagogical practices did not include all four approaches to teach writing as a process. He adapted the required practices, such as peer reviews and conferences, into his pedagogical practices, but he "resisted" (see Chapter Six) teaching revision. Instead, he projected his own values and writing process onto his students (Rankin, 1994; Bly, 2000). He believed that students did not need to write multiple drafts because he did not follow this process; his writing process was more "reiterative" (see Chapter Six). While he connected his curriculum knowledge to comprehending the purpose behind the

scaffolding of teaching writing as a process, his comprehension of process theory was still limited theoretically. He did not connect how his "reiterative" writing process was a version of revision. His tacit theory of revision was the act of printing and revising multiple drafts, which demonstrates a superficial comprehension of revision. Spencer's pedagogical practices knowledge wavered between appropriating surface features and appropriating conceptual underpinnings of pedagogical practices knowledge. Extended WPE, particularly in the area of composition theory, would inform and develop his teaching so that he could transfer his writing process knowledge into his pedagogical practices more effectively.

While these participants were the few who conceptually connected the curriculum's emphases of transfer and rhetoric to their teaching of writing as a process, most of the participants uncritically relied and followed the pedagogical practices outlined in the standardized syllabus. When pedagogical affordances are provided, some GTAs will rely on them for surviving teaching because these affordances provide department-approved "best practices" (Bishop, 1997; Restaino, 2012; Qualley, 2017). Even though participants felt generally confident and comfortable teaching writing as a process, most participants recognized familiar surface features associated with writing as a process, thus demonstrating that their pedagogical practices and theories-in-use were theorized insufficiently. When GTAs do not detect, elect, and connect the underlying curriculum structure to the scaffolding and teaching of writing as a process, they will encounter dissonance and will not have the theoretical knowledge to explore how writing processes are contingent upon rhetorical situations (Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi &

VanLehn, 2012). Without this knowledge, they will struggle to problem-solve the dissonance, which will inhibit their pedagogical development and thus instruction of writing as a process. While most participants' writing process knowledge was theorized insufficiently, there were two participants who connected prior experiences to the curriculum's objectives and values. It is unclear as to how these participants detected or adaptively transferred their knowledge into their teaching, but it does demonstrate that adapting a standardized syllabus does not mean thoughtless laboring and underdeveloped practices. Instead, writing pedagogy educators need to further explore how prior experiences connect to the curriculum design to ensure that GTAs' pedagogical practices are conceptually informed and purposefully implemented. Through directive WPE and supervision, GTAs could learn the why's and how's that writing processes are informed by rhetorical situations; moreover, writing pedagogy educators should provide GTAs the space to question the practices provided by pedagogical affordances (Restaino, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014; Qualley, 2017), to explore how those practices connect, if at all, to their prior experiences, and to practice multiple theorized approaches to teaching writing as a process. GTAs have an idealized version of teaching writing as a process from their past experiences as students and teachers, and this lore cannot inform their pedagogical development sufficiently. They need explicit theoretical development in order to be flexible in their practices, to detect appropriate methods for specific contexts, and to develop their instruction beyond surface features.

Discourse Community Knowledge

In Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model for writing transfer, discourse community knowledge encompasses and informs subject matter, rhetorical, genre, and writing process knowledge domains. Discourse communities construct shared values and academic discourse. Moreover, they "establish the norms for genres" (Beaufort, 2007, p. 19) as well as the writing processes involved in those genres. To be rhetorically effective, writers must also consider their discourse community, particularly how their rhetorical purpose and appeals align with the community's goals. Beaufort (2007) contended that for writers to successfully transfer their writing expertise, they must adapt these discourse community's values. In WPE scholarship, scholars have discussed the importance of GTAs adapting to the discourse communities of the writing programs for which they instruct. When GTAs do not share values, they may adapt prior experiences to make sense of the new context or resist the writing program. GTAs may also convert to the writing program's values to ensure that they fulfill their fellowship requirements, but that conversion disregards their tacit theories and values. When values are not shared intrinsically, GTAs may encounter dissonance due to conflicting ideologies and values or not having the academic discourse to make sense of the teaching context (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Welch, 1993; Rankin, 1994; Bly, 2000; Neeley, 2000; Farris, 2002; Stenberg, 2005; Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012;Wisniewski, 2014). Because discourse community values inform curriculum ideologies and objectives as well as instructors' rhetorical awareness, assigned genres, and pedagogical practices, I found it important to examine the extent to which GTAs comprehended their discourse community and shared its values.

Because participants were not blank slates, they entered into this new teaching context with pedagogical values and procedures that were localized to their prior institutions (Yancey, 2002). For this reason, I hypothesized that participants would not appropriate conceptual underpinnings and values of a new teaching context from participating in a pre-service orientation. Surprisingly, four participants did appropriate surface features of the curriculum values. Ava, Liz, and Spencer noted how the pre-service orientation emphasized rhetorical knowledge. Ava and Liz perceived teaching rhetorical theory as a curriculum value because UTK emphasized that awareness whereas their prior WPE experiences did not. To make meaning of their current teaching context, they compared their prior experiences with the expectations of the new curriculum. Spencer, on the other hand, was more familiar with this emphasis from his prior WPE, which he received from UTK. These participants detected the curriculum's emphasis on the rhetoric, whereas Joseph detected the program's goal for teaching writing transfer. He detected this value from the pre-service orientation workshop on scaffolding, which demonstrated how assignments built into one another to facilitate transfer. Some of these participants connected their prior experiences to the new curriculum's expectations, but these connections were superficial. They only detected similar surface features between their past and current learning, which led to a partial, superficial comprehension the new writing program's values (Chi & VanLehn, 2012). For GTAs to comprehend the curriculum values, writing pedagogy educators need to explore GTAs' pedagogical values and make the program's values explicit. Through these critical discussions, writing pedagogy educators can help GTAs adaptively transfer their prior learning and

expectations into the new context. WPAs and GTAs want to implement the curriculum as designed, but if they do not share a discourse and values, then that objective will become obscured or partially implemented.

While some participants detected partial curriculum values, four other participants did not detect the curriculum values at all, which is more consistent with what Yancey (2002) and Stenberg (2005) found. Instead, these participants reported perceived values that generally represented writing programs, such as scaffolding assignments, departmental community, and developing writers. These values captured the function and social organization of a writing program; they described features of a prototypical writing program, which was comprised of a community that designed and scaffolded assignments to develop students' writing practices. These participants neither detected nor explored the idiosyncratic objectives and values of UTK's writing program from pre-service orientation. Instead, they made sense of this new teaching context by reducing the program's values to consist of superficial purposes and practices that were associated stereotypically with a writing program. These participants need extended WPE in identifying curriculum ideologies and discerning those differences to guide their comprehension and adaptation of the writing program's values.

Participants were introduced to not only curriculum values in pre-service orientation but also the writing program's theoretical, academic discourse. Scholars have contended that GTAs have undertheorized language to describe their pedagogical practices and understand their experiences (Rankin, 1994; Estrem & Reid, 2012). Not only do GTAs need to develop an academic discourse to understand their teaching

experiences but also to effectively communicate with their WPAs. By sharing an academic discourse, GTAs and WPAs can converse about curriculum ideologies and objectives, and through this communication, both parties could work together to resolve dissonances and discuss effective pedagogical practices. For this reason, I found it important to examine the degree to which participants shared terminology with the writing program.

Because UTK's writing program's FYC curriculum is situated in rhetorical and transfer theories, I asked participants to define "rhetoric" and "transfer." Most participants reported surface features of these terms in their definitions, which demonstrated that their limited theoretical knowledge of these paradigms (Estrem & Reid, 2012). Participants' comprehension of rhetoric was limited to their knowledge of either Aristotle's definition of rhetoric and his appeals or the rhetorical situation. Participants did not provide any complex definitions of the theory that demonstrated how rhetoric can shape genres and writing processes; their definitions conveyed their familiarity with either the purpose of persuasion or the procedure of arranging or positioning an argument. This comprehension of rhetoric aligned with UTK's first writing assignment, Comparative Rhetorical Analysis, and some participants had prior experiences in teaching rhetorical analysis through assignments like the one required at UTK. Beyond teaching experiences, participants either had limited or no exposure to rhetorical theory from their prior WPE. Based on these prior experiences, participants' academic discourse was limited and echoed classical features, such as arrangement and means of persuasion, of the theory. Their limited theoretical exposure and language

supports their experienced anxieties and dissonances when teaching stasis analysis. Because participants' academic discourse slightly aligned with the curriculum's employment of rhetoric, they did not outright resist socializing into the community, as Rankin (1994) found. Instead, they were more "thoughtful, engaged," as Estrem and Reid (2012) found, in teaching Aristotelian rhetorical theory in which they were familiar. They struggled to understand and implement the other components of rhetorical theory, such as stasis, *kairos*, *exigency*, and/or rhetorical situation. To share academic discourse and values with the writing program, these participants needed to develop their rhetorical knowledge further.

As was the case with rhetoric, most participants' comprehension of transfer was limited to surface features of the theory. Most participants perceived transfer as the teaching of writing skills that can be used in future writing contexts, or what Perkins and Salomon (1988) called forward reaching transfer. Participants who reported this definition did not report any low-road or high-road transfer processes, only that they were preparing students to take writing expertise from the English classroom to future writing contexts. While most participants provided this definition, two participants defined transfer as general writing skills (GWSI) (Petraglia, 1995; Beach, 2003). These participants aimed to teach students generalizable writing skills that could be applied to any writing context; they did not consider how rhetorical situations and discourse communities influenced writing processes, genres, and rhetorical situations (Petraglia, 1995; Beaufort, 2007). Because they did not consider how writing is socially contingent, they were unaware of compositionists' criticisms of GWSI in FYC curricula (Petraglia,

1995; Crowley, 1998). These participants partially understood the purpose and process for teaching transferrable writing expertise. With these partially constructed definitions, their teaching of transfer was focused on meeting these objectives, i.e., teaching either skills for future classes or generalizable skills, such as outlining arguments and typified genre conventions. These participants did not fully comprehend the social, adaptive, and complex theoretical framework of the theory. Because of their limited understanding of transfer, participants either questioned the possibility of transferring writing knowledge or expressed dissatisfaction with the limited structure of the course design (e.g., not enough disciplinary writing opportunities or lack of perceived pedagogical freedom) (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014). If GTAs do not understand the complexity of transfer theory and how it functions in FYC programs, then they will struggle to implement the curriculum fully, as seen in this study. GTAs do not possess the theoretical language or knowledge to comprehend the purpose of the assignments, the importance of the subject matter, and the significance of developing students' rhetorical, genre, and writing process knowledges. GTAs need to possess this knowledge to facilitate writing transfer, and if they do not have it, the question arises, to what extent are undergraduates' negative writing transfer experiences a byproduct of GTAs' limited pedagogical knowledge and practices?

While future research needs to examine the relationship between GTAs' theoretical knowledge and undergraduates' abilities to transfer writing expertise and skills, it is important to note that GTAs' definitions of transfer can develop through the process of teaching a transfer-based FYC curriculum. Throughout this study, Joseph and

Cornelius reported adaptation as a definition for transfer at least once. For these participants, students developed foundational skills that could be abstracted and then later adapted for or reworked into either familiar or unfamiliar writing contexts (DePalma & Ringer, 2011). This definition demonstrated theoretical development in noting the importance of detecting compatible connections and in abstracting knowledge for application. Their previous definitions were either GWSI (Cornelius) or forward reaching transfer (Joseph), and when they provided these definitions, they did not emphasize the need for connections and abstraction for learning to transfer. Instead, these definitions reductively implied a general application of skills to either any context or a future writing context. These participants did not have prior knowledge or experience in teaching a transfer-based FYC curriculum, but through their experiences at UTK, they retheorized their definitions, which is contrary to Bishop's (1990) and Welch's (1993) claims. They were able to retheorize their definitions by detecting the importance of learning rhetorical, genre, and writing process knowledges, which informed the FYC course design, to facilitate transfer (Beaufort, 2007). Even though these participants retheorized their definitions of transfer, their definitions and thus pedagogical practices remained insufficiently theorized, and like their peers, they struggled to implement the curriculum fully. While it is possible for GTAs to detect and retheorize their conceptual understanding of theoretical paradigms like transfer theory, successful theoretical development cannot occur without explicit guidance and practice.

Writing pedagogy educators need to guide theoretical development prior to GTAs entering a classroom, as Restaino (2012) suggested. While these participants adjusted

their definitions of transfer, they did not possess a solid theoretical foundation for what the theory entailed and how it should be implemented in pedagogical practices. GTAs are capable of exploring composition theory on their own and developing their theoretical knowledge; however, to what extent is that exploration practically-based? In this study, Cornelius and Joseph's definitions changed based on what they detected the curriculum to emphasize, but they did not cite transfer theory scholars who contributed to their theoretical development. Instead, they relied on their personal experiences to inform their definitions, which is a possible reason for why their definitions changed throughout the study. Writing pedagogy educators who rely on GTAs to seek theoretical scholarship to inform their pedagogical practices run a risk in producing GTAs who perpetuate theories-in-use that are more practically than theoretically informed. As noted in this study and other scholarship (Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012), GTAs do not value formal WPE; they rely on lore and personal experiences to inform their pedagogical practices. Without that theoretical development, GTAs will encounter dissonance and implement surface features of theoretical paradigms, and when GTAs encounter problems, they will criticize the writing program without exploring their own pedagogical foundations (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014).

Without possessing a shared academic discourse and values, GTAs may express dissatisfaction with writing programs' objectives, practices, and values (Rankin, 1994; Wisniewski, 2014). In this study, some participants did express dissatisfaction because there were limited disciplinary writing opportunities and a lack of freedom in redesigning the course. Yet, even with these criticisms, they unanimously perceived value in teaching

a transfer-based FYC curriculum, but their insufficiently theorized discourse and practices limited their teaching for transfer. For the most part, their pedagogical practices were connected superficially to the curriculum paradigms because they did not possess shared academic discourse and values, and participants' surface appropriation of discourse community knowledge was echoed in what they identified as their primary teaching objectives.

Initially, only three participants reported teaching transfer as their primary objective, whereas the other participants reported primary objectives that were typically associated with the profession, such as developing students' analytical and writing skills. Scholars have contended that reflection promotes ideological growth and can lead to a change in assumptions and values (Schön, 1983; Rankin, 1994; Farris, 2002; Wisniewski, 2014). As part of this study, I asked participants to reflect on their previously reported objectives, and through that process, most participants amended their primary objectives to partially align with the curriculum objectives and values. Participants reported teaching for transfer, and their objectives were determined by whether they believed transfer was possible through GWSI or teaching rhetorical knowledge (Driscoll, 2013). While it is possible that these participants reported transfer in fear of being evaluated, I contend that this change in primary objectives was genuine. Throughout the study, participants exhibited goodwill towards implementing the curriculum, even if they encountered dissonance. They perceived transfer theory as a means for validating their profession and scholastic interests, which functioned as an internal driver to adopt transfer as their primary teaching objectives (Qualley, 2017). Even though they adopted it as their

teaching objectives, their limited academic discourse and theorized practices superficially aligned with the writing program's values. When writing programs and GTAs share a discourse and values, then the execution of the curriculum design will be more effective. Without it, WPAs and GTAs will engage in an asynchronous relationship where curriculum objectives and practices will conflict.

While most participants adopted transfer as their primary teaching objective, there was one participant whose reported objective was more closely associated with her personal values than those of the writing program (Graham & David, 1996). In Interview 2, Clara reported that her primary objective was to develop students' writing and thinking processes, and in Interview 3, she amended that answer to developing her own pedagogical practices. Throughout the study, Clara encountered numerous dissonances in all five pedagogical knowledge domains. She struggled to connect her prior experiences with the new teaching context's practices and values, and for this reason, her objective was to improve her pedagogical practices. While Clara's unshared teaching values may be framed as resistance, her resistance "may be more inertial than consciously directed" (Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012, p. 55). Clara was a student who was learning about the curriculum by comparing and contrasting her prior experiences, but that prior knowledge did not compatibly connect and thus did not take root to reshape her pedagogical practices (Parker, 1982; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). As Graham and David (1996) suggested, Clara would benefit from specialized theoretical and pedagogical education to develop her academic discourse and pedagogical practices. Even though Clara had three pedagogy courses from her master's WPE, she struggled connecting those experiences as

well as UTK's pre-service orientation to her new teaching context. Clara's presumed resistance should be, as Estrem and Reid (2012) contended, "productively reframed as a normal stage of TAs' learning processes" (p. 462). For Clara to implement the writing program's values and the curriculum, she needed explicit instruction in making sense of her prior experience and knowledge. She also needed opportunities, like Restaino's (2012) middle space, to practice how those experiences and knowledge can be adapted to fit her new teaching context. She is, after all, a student developing her pedagogical practices, and for her pedagogical ideology to align compatibly with the writing program's values, she needs extended WPE and mentorship to facilitate such development.

While participants valued teaching for transfer, the degree to which they shared that value with the writing program was contingent on how they perceived the writing program's values. Participants' adaptation (or lack thereof) and implementation of those values were inhibited by their limited academic discourse and pedagogical practices. Most participants were driven to align their values with the writing program, but their limited conceptual knowledge affected their primary teaching objectives. For GTAs to share values with the writing program, they need extended WPE and mentorship to develop their academic discourse and pedagogical practices. Shared language and practices will help GTAs and WPAs problem-solve dissonances and thus develop GTAs' pedagogical practices. With shared values, GTAs and WPAs can work together to implement a consistent FYC curriculum, too. Without shared discourse and values, teachers may deviate from the curriculum to teach what they value (Graham & David,

1996) or implement surface features of what they detect should be taught. Therefore, it is important for writing pedagogy educators to open a dialogue with GTAs about programmatic vocabularies, values, and objectives to cultivate an adaptive, collaborative teaching environment.

Implications for the Conceptual Model for Pedagogical Knowledge

As with Beaufort's (2007) conceptual model for writing transfer, the pedagogical knowledge domains overlap and shape each other. When GTAs teach in a writing program, they are a part of a discourse community, and if those values were not shared, then it is possible that GTAs were not implementing the curriculum. In this study, participants valued transfer, even if they expressed concerns or doubts about the theory; they still valued how it legitimized their position and field within academia. Graham and David (1996) argued that GTAs will teach what they value and what they believe an instructor should accomplish in a classroom. In this study, however, participants shared value with the writing program in teaching for transfer. Their pedagogical practices and knowledge, however, were theorized insufficiently, which inhibited their ability to implement the curriculum fully. Even though participants genuinely aimed to implement the curriculum as the writing program designed it, they could only detect surface features of the curriculum objectives and values. Participants were forced to assess new knowledge and practices because the curriculum's paradigms and writing program's values were not expressed explicitly. To survive teaching, they either reused prior experiences for reasons of perceived similarity or partially adapted the new knowledge. In either case, participants did not possess the academic discourse of the writing program,

and their knowledge in each pedagogical knowledge domain was theorized insufficiently. No matter how well-defined the FYC curriculum and WPE were, participants struggled to compatibly connect theory to practice as well as prior experiences to a new teaching context.

Calls for an extended, balanced WPE (Graham & David, 1996; Ebest, 2005; Stenberg, 2005; Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012) are not enough to ensure that GTAs appropriately and consistently implement the curriculum. GTAs' pedagogical knowledge, like writing expertise, cannot transfer into teaching contexts without compatibly connecting prior experiences to new learning (Parker, 1982; Beaufort, 2007; Perkins & Salomon, 2012). To help GTAs adapt their prior experiences and WPE into new teaching contexts, writing pedagogy educators need not only to assess GTAs' prior experiences, as scholars have proposed (Weiser, 1990; Bishop, 1997; Yancey, 2002; Powell et al., 2002; Stenberg, 2005) but also to examine their pedagogical knowledge domains. In the following section, I provide recommendations for how writing pedagogy educators can make such assessments to recalibrate WPE.

Recommendations for WPE

Sternberg (2005) asserted, "[P]edagogy cannot be finished" (p. xviii). Supporting this assertion as well as the calls from fellow writing pedagogy scholars, I, too, call to extend WPE beyond a single course, beyond GTAs' master's programs, and, more importantly, beyond pre-service orientation (Graham & David, 1996; Stenberg, 2005; Ebest, 2005; Restaino, 2012; Estrem & Reid, 2012; Reid, Estrem & Belcheir, 2012). It is important to remember that first-year PhD GTAs are *students*, and they are still

developing their pedagogical identities, ideologies, and practices (Ebest, 2005; Reid, 2009; Restaino, 2012). They would benefit from having guided supervision as well as ongoing WPE opportunities for the duration of a GTA's PhD program. For example, writing pedagogy educators could implement a collaborative, dynamic practicum (Stenberg, 2005) that incorporates guided supervision and exposure to composition theory. Prior to the practicum, writing pedagogy educators could design a survey similar to Weiser's (1990) that asks GTAs about their experiences, knowledge, and pedagogical practices in each pedagogical knowledge domain. Then, educators can assess the data and design a "bottom up" (Neeley, 2000) practicum that incorporates composition theory that GTAs need to develop, requires reflective writing assignments to detect, elect, and connect (Perkins & Salomon, 2012) prior knowledge to new learning, and provides a middle space (Restaino, 2012) to practice reusing and adapting prior knowledge and experiences for new teaching contexts. Educators need to define theoretical paradigms that underlie pedagogical practices and curricula explicitly, and they need to demonstrate how to detect theoretical differences when surface features are perceptually similar. GTAs should also have the opportunities to practice identifying theoretical structures and selecting appropriate pedagogical practices via situated performances (Rose & Finders, 1998). By extending WPE in this manner, GTAs can learn to adapt their prior experiences to make sense of new teaching context. They can learn to theorize their practices, develop their ideologies, and implement curricula. For this growth and change to occur, GTAs need extended WPE and guided supervision that connects to their experiences, to *who* they are and *how* they learn.

The goal of this extended WPE is not to convert GTAs to new curriculum objectives, practices, and values. Instead, it is to equip GTAs with the theoretical knowledge and discourse to be flexible in identifying deep structures of writing programs, exploring how their prior experiences can strengthen their teaching in a new context, and to enrichen their pedagogical development. At the moment, GTAs' pedagogical development is static as they rely on personal experiences and lore to inform their pedagogical practices (Estrem & Reid, 2012; Wisniewski, 2014). When they encounter WPE beyond their master's programs, such as a pre-service orientation, they are still valuing and prioritizing lore and best practices to inform their pedagogical practices. For FYC curricula to be implemented fully and consistently, writing pedagogy educators need to identify and explain explicitly why composition theory is vital for effective teaching. Without providing a need for learning composition theory, GTAs will continue seeking strategies and tools for survival, as was evident in this study (Rankin, 1994; Bishop, 1997; Neeley, 2000; Restaino, 2012). While GTAs may have goodwill in wanting to implement the curriculum of their new teaching context, they have not had the critical space to negotiate and learn how to connect effectively and appropriately their prior experiences with the new curriculum objectives and values. In this study, GTAs did not resist implementing the curriculum in favor of teaching what they valued, as Graham and David (1996) suggested. GTAs' superficial implementation of the curriculum was affected by their lore-informed pedagogical practices, limited theoretical knowledge, and trusting acceptance of pedagogical affordances.

To help cultivate GTAs' academic discourse, theoretical knowledge, and pedagogical practices, WPE should provide multiple opportunities for directive reflection. With the labor demands of needing quickly trained first-year PhD GTAs to teach FYC, some WPE programs do not provide opportunities for reflection, particularly on how the new teaching context is un/familiar in comparison to prior experiences. While this study demonstrated that GTAs were constantly theorizing by comparing their prior experiences to the new teaching context (Rankin, 1994), they encountered dissonance due to the pressure of converting to a new curriculum's practices and values (Bishop, 1990, 1997; Welch, 1993; Neeley, 2000; Reid, 2004; Stenberg, 2005) or adapting prior experiences to survive teaching (Restaino, 2012). For GTAs to develop their pedagogical practices and theoretical knowledge, they need to detect, elect, and connect their prior experiences to the current teaching context (Parker, 1982; Perkins & Salomon, 2012; Chi & VanLehn, 2012). As Farris (2002) noted, "From an administrative perspective, we want confident, reflective teachers whom we know will grow and change in interesting ways" (p. 102). For these GTAs to grow and change, they need to explore and examine their prior experiences, particularly how the theoretical structure of the curriculum and WPE informed their prior pedagogical practices. Then, they need to detect how those experiences are conceptually similar or dissimilar to the new teaching context. For their learning to transfer to the new teaching context, GTAs need opportunities to reflect about these connections. Reflection will not only help GTAs make sense of dissonance (Rankin, 1994; Neeley, 2000; Wisniewski, 2014), but it also will open a critical dialogue with writing pedagogy educators about their theories-in-use (Schön, 1983; Farris, 2002).

WPE scholarship has encouraged incorporating refection via writing prompts (Tremmel, 1994), teaching journals (Comely, 1986; McBroom, 1992; McKinney & Chiseri-Strater, 2003; Stenberg, 2005; Reid, 2009), or writing assignments (Winslow, 2005; Reid, 2009; Dryer, 2012). Based on my findings, I, too, support these methods of reflection in WPE, with a caveat. Scholars have encouraged reflection to develop empathy and connection between GTAs and their students, not between GTAs and their WPE. For example, Tremmel (1994) suggested incorporating writing prompts in WPE that asked GTAs to reflect about themselves and their students. I suggest that writing prompts ask GTAs to reflect on their prior experiences and theoretical knowledge. After thinking about these experiences, they then should be asked how these experiences and pedagogies align with the current teaching context. For example, here is a possible writing prompt:

> Describe how the genres at your previous institution are dis/similar to the genres you're required to teach at this institution. What pedagogical practices and/or knowledge could you reuse or adapt from your previous teaching, and what knowledge and practices do you need to develop to teach the required genres in this curriculum?

By asking these questions, writing pedagogy educators can assess GTAs' genre knowledge and practices, and they can open a dialogue about how and why GTAs perceive similarities as well as explicitly explain the dissimilarities. Educators can also guide GTAs through questioning their assumptions and beliefs (Reid, 2004; Rivera-Mueller, 2014) as well as help them to detect how the underlying curriculum structure informs the teaching of genres. This opportunity will allow writing pedagogy educators and GTAs to collaborate on how to connect and adaptively transfer their prior knowledge to make sense of the new teaching context (Parker, 1982; Stenberg, 2005).

Teaching journals can also provide the discursive space for GTAs to explore their pedagogical ideologies, identities, and practices, which remain in flux as they continue learning how to be educators (McKinney & Chiseri-Strater, 2003). Writing assignments that are required by the writing program will also help GTAs become more familiar with the rhetorical situation, genre conventions, and writing processes of the new assignment (Winslow, 2005). This experience will not only show GTAs how "messy" (Winslow, 2005, p. 328) writing can be, but it will also serve as an impetus for discussing the larger picture of the assignments in fulfilling the curriculum objectives. These conversations, though, need to be guided and made explicit by writing pedagogy educators. By implementing these reflective practices into WPE, GTAs will develop the academic discourse needed to describe their dissonance as well as learn the how's and why's of needing to adapt their pedagogical practices for the new teaching context.

In addition to reflective opportunities, my last recommendation is to continue framing GTAs' dissonance and resistance "as a normal stage of TAs' learning processes" (Estrem & Reid, 2012, p. 462). They are teachers-in-training throughout their higher education, and arguably even after they graduate. Writing programs should not expect GTAs, whether they are novices or experienced, to have theorized practices and pedagogical expertise. These GTAs are students who need ongoing supervision and WPE to help them learn about their pedagogical identities and values. Because GTAs do not possess sufficient theoretically-grounded language and knowledge, they struggle to identify the underlying structures that inform their pedagogical practices, the program's values, and the curriculum's objectives. These recommendations aim to provide a path

for helping GTAs become cognizant of their prior experiences and reliance on lore and WPAs in developing reflective practitioners who can detect, elect, and connect (Perkins & Salomon, 2012) prior experiences with new teaching contexts. WPAs and GTAs need to collaborate for pedagogical development to occur and for writing education to be successful.

I recognize that such recommendations are idealistic for writing programs due to several labor constraints. WPAs are tasked with managing administrative duties in conjunction with research, writing, and teaching demands (Belanger & Gruber, 2005). WPAs must also fill numerous FYC course sections quickly with limited financial and faculty resources (Weiser, 2002; Hardin, 2005). In addition to instructor assignments, WPAs need to prepare quickly and efficiently new contingent instructors and GTAs with "foundational knowledge of disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical practices" (Fedukovich & Hall, 2016, para. 1). With such demands, extended WPE may not be feasible, as there may not be enough faculty members, financial support, or available time to provide ongoing supervision and WPE. Therefore, I proffer an alternative, feasible solution for implementing the previously suggested recommendations.

For programs that can offer pre-service orientation for new GTAs and contingent faculty, I suggest beginning with considering who the new and returning attendees are. With such information, pre-service orientation can be designed "bottom up" (Neely, 2000). For example, at UTK, the Composition Office considered attendees' experiences, which ranged from no teaching experiences (new MA/MFA GTAs) to experienced teachers (first-year and returning PhD GTAs and lecturers). With this knowledge, the

Composition Office created multiple tracks for specific attendees over the course of the three-day pre-service orientation. For example, the first day consisted of concurrent sessions for two specific populations (new PhD GTAs and lecturers and new MA/MFA GTAs). The Director and Assistant Director of Composition led sessions for the former audience whereas the Associate Director led sessions for the latter. Workshops were tailored to these particular audiences' needs. New PhD GTAs and lecturers attended workshops that focused on providing foundational knowledge for teaching the required assignments for the first FYC course. These sessions also included lectures, modeling, and microteaching to connect theory with practice. New MA/MFA GTAs, on the other hand, attended workshops that provided briefer overviews of those concepts because they attend a required pedagogy course in the spring term. Their sessions were addressed their year-long responsibilities as mentees and Writing Center tutors. Returning MA/MFA and PhD GTAs and lecturers were not required to attend this first day. Instead, they attended sessions that occurred on second and third day. Their schedule consisted of workshops about non-FYC pedagogies, such as how to teach creative writing or literature, and visual rhetoric or multimodality in FYC courses. The separation of these audiences and the redesign of pre-service orientation to meet each audience's needs were a means of providing more a meaningful WPE opportunity. The Composition Office hoped that this redesign would provide audiences with a perceived need to learn, retain, and adaptively transfer the theoretical and practical information into their pedagogical practices. Other writing programs can create similar tracks and sessions based on attendees' experiences.

To lead such sections, I recommend asking Rhetoric and Composition faculty, experienced lecturers, or advanced doctoral GTAs.

In addition to redesigning pre-service orientation based on attendees' experiences and needs, I also recommend including directive reflection opportunities either within the sessions or as a separate session. At UTK, the Composition Office created a separate session that encouraged reflection for new MA/MFA GTAs, PhD GTAs, and lecturers. The following is a description of the session for new PhD GTAs and lecturers:

> English 101 at UTK likely features some concepts, theories, and assignments that differ from other writing courses you have taken or taught in the past. This reflective session will provide participants an opportunity to put their prior teaching and writing experiences in conversation with the new curriculum. (Department of English, 2017a).

The purpose of this workshop was to provide a generative, reflective space for attendees to articulate their comprehension of the new curriculum's objectives, values, and expectations as well as identify any dissonances that the new learning poses. Through guided reflection, the WPA encouraged attendees to consider how they could connect their prior experiences with the current learning from the pre-service orientation. Such guided reflection not only models being a reflective practitioner but also provides an opportunity before the quick turnaround to teaching (i.e., three days in-between conclusion of pre-service orientation and start of fall term) for new teachers to process learning and experiences. Moreover, this reflective opportunity provides a generative space for WPAs, too, because they can address misconceptions about the curriculum as well as guide high road, adaptive transfer of new teachers' prior experiences. While UTK provided a one-time reflective session, writing programs can integrate short writing opportunities at the beginning and end of each session to help attendees identify prior

experiences and knowledge, note how the workshop connected or deviated from those prior experiences, and then reflect on how they could adaptively transfer prior knowledge to fit the new teaching context appropriately. As previously discussed, such reflective opportunities are important for the development of new teachers.

What I have provided here are some small steps toward implementing the recommendations I have laid out at the beginning of this section. I hope that such examples demonstrate the feasibility of applying transfer to WPE opportunities for experienced and new teachers. While a more extensive approach to WPE would be ideal, such steps are imperative for GTAs' pedagogical development. As evidenced throughout this dissertation, GTAs need guided supervision in their pedagogical development, particularly when they transition into a new teaching context. If WPAs consider who GTAs are, such as their prior experiences and learning needs, as well as their attitude towards accepting or reusing pedagogical affordances, then WPE can become a powerful experience for GTAs' pedagogical development. Instead of perceiving WPE as "boring" or "repetitive," GTAs may perceive a need for learning, retaining, and applying WPE to their pedagogies. As WPAs, we want GTAs to have flexible, richer pedagogies that fit not only their values but also the writing program's expectations, objectives, and values. Through such redesign, WPAs and GTAs can learn and grow together.

REFERENCES

Allen, R. R. (1991). Encouraging reflection in teaching assistants. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach: Selected readings in TA training* (pp. 312-317). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Bamberg, B. (2002). Creating a culture of reflective practice: A program for continuing TA preparation after the practicum. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 147-158). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bartholomae, D. (1985/2011). Inventing the university. In V. Villanueva & K. L. Arola (Eds.), *Cross-talk in comp theory* (pp. 523-553). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Beach, K. D. (2003). Consequential transitions: A developmental view of knowledge propagation through social organizations. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn & Y. Engeström (Eds*.), Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary crossing* (pp. 39–61). Boston: Pergamon.

Beaufort, A. (1999). *Writing in the real world: Making the transition from school to work*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Belanger, K., & Gruber, S. (2005). Unraveling generative tensions in the composition practicum. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don't call it that: The composition practicum* (pp. 113-140). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bishop, W. (1990). *Something old, something new: College writing teachers and classroom change*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bishop, W. (1997). *Teaching lives: Essays and stories*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bizzell, P. Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *PRE/TEXT, 3(3),* 213-243.

Blakeslee, A. M., Cole, C. M., & Conefrey, T. (1996). Constructing voices in writing research: Developing participatory approaches to situated inquiry. In P. Mortensen & G. E. Kirsch (Eds.), *Ethics & representation in qualitative studies of literacy* (pp. 134-154). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bly, B. K. (2000). Uneasy transitions: The graduate teaching assistant in the composition program. In T. L. Good & L. B. Warshauer (Eds.), *In our own voice: Graduate students teach writing* (pp. 2-9). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bomotti, S. S. (1994). Teaching assistant attitudes toward college teaching. *The Review of Higher Education, 17(4),* 371-93. doi:10.1353/rhe.1994.0009

Bransford, J. D., & Schwartz, D. L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with multiple implications. *Review of Research in Education, 2,* 61-100. doi:10.2307/1167267

CCCC position statement on the preparation and professional development of teachers of writing. (1982). *Conference on College Composition and Communication*. Retrieved from http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/statementonprep

Chi, M. T. H., & VanLehn, K. A. (2012). Seeing deep structure from the interactions of surface features. *Educational Psychologist, 47(13),* 177-188. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.695709

Comley, N. R. (1986). The teaching seminar: Writing isn't just rhetoric. In C. W. Bridges (Ed.), *Training the new teacher of college composition* (pp. 47-57). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cooper, A., & Kehl, D. G. (1991). Development of composition instruction through peer coaching. *WPA, 14(3)*, 27-39. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/14n3/14n3cooper.pdf

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *The basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

D'Angelo, F. J. (1977). Strategies for involving graduate students in the teaching of composition. *ADE Bulletin, 54,* 34-36. doi:10.1632/ade.54.34

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

DePalma, M. J., & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding

disciplinary discussions of ‘transfer’ in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20(2)*, 134–47. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2011.02.003

DePalma, M. J., & Ringer, J. M. (2013). Adaptive transfer, genre knowledge, and implications for research and pedagogy: A response. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(4)*, 465–470. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2013.09.002

Department of English. (2017a). Fall 2018 August workshops. *Department of English*. Retrieved from https://english.utk.edu/fall-2018-august-workshops/

Department of English. (2017b). Graduate handbook. *Department of English*. Retrieved from http://english.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Graduate-Handbook-2017-2018.pdf

Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. New York, NY: Heath.

Dobrin, S. I. (2005) Finding space for the composition practicum. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don’ call it that: The composition practicum* (pp. 1-34). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Donahue, C. (2012). Transfer, portability, generalization: (How) does composition expertise ‘carry’? In K. Ritter & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *Exploring composition studies: Sites, issues, perspectives* (pp. 145-166). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Driscoll, D. L. (2011). Connected, disconnected, or uncertain: Student attitudes about future writing contexts and perceptions of transfer from first year writing to the

disciplines. *Across the Discipline, 8(2)*. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/

Driscoll, D. L. (2013). Connected pedagogy and transfer of learning: An examination of graduate instructor beliefs vs. practices in first-year writing. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 28(1)*, 50-81. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/teachingwriting/article/view/20718

Driscoll, D. L., & Wells, J. (2012). Beyond knowledge and skills: Writing Transfer and the role of student dispositions. *Composition Forum, 26*. Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php

Dryer, D. B. (2012). At a mirror, darkly: The imagined undergraduate writers of ten novice composition instructors. *College Composition and Communication, 63 (3),*420-452. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/23131596

Ebest, S. B. (2005). *Changing the way we teach: Writing and resistance in the training of teaching assistants*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication, 28 (2),* 122-128. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/356095

Estrem, H., & Reid, E. S. (2012). What new writing teachers talk about when they talk about teaching. *Pedagogy*, *12(3),* 449-480. Retrieved from muse.jhu.edu/article/489611

Farris, C. (2002). Too cool for school? Composition as cultural studies and reflective

practice. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach: Selected readings in TA training* (pp. 97-107). Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Fedukovich, C., & Hall, M. (2016). GTA preparation as a model for cross-tier collaboration at North Carolina State University: A program profile. *Composition Forum, 33*. Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com/issue/33/ncsu.php

Fischer, R. O. (2005). Theory in a TA composition pedagogy course: Not if, but how. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don' call it that: The composition practicum* (pp. 200-213). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fishman, J., & Reiff, M. J. (2008). Taking the high road: Teaching for transfer in an FYC program. *Composition Forum, 18.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081005.pdf

Fleming, D. (2014). Rhetoric and argumentation. In G. Tate, A. R. Taggart, K. Schick, & H. B. Hessler (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (2nd ed.) (pp. 248-265). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32(4)*, 365-387. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/356600

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Company. (Original work published 1921)

Garmston, R. J. (1983). How administrators support peer coaching. *Educational*

Leadership, 18-26. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.com/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198702_garmston.pdf

Gebhardt, R. C. (1977). Balancing theory with practice in the training of writing teachers. *College Composition and Communication, 28(2)* 134-140. doi:10.2307/356098

Good, T. L., & Warshauer, L. B. (2000). *In our own voice: Graduate students teach writing*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Graham, M. B., & David, C. (1996). What's up on Monday morning? TA training and freshman English. *Writing on the edge*, 7(2), 59-72. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/43158779

Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P. L., Smagorinsky, P, & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education, 108(1),* 1-29. doi:10.1086/444230.

Hardin, J. M. (2005). Writing theory and writing the classroom. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don' call it that: The composition practicum* (pp. 35-42). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hesse, D. (1993). Teachers as students, reflecting resistance. *College Composition and Communication, 44(2),* 224-231. doi:10.2307/358840.

Hillocks, G. (2009). A response to Peter Smagorinsky: Some practices and approaches are clearly better than others and we had better not ignore the differences. *English*

Journal, 98(6), 23-29. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/40503453

Hunting, R. S. (1951). A training course for teachers of freshman composition. *College Composition and Communication, 2(3),* 3-6. doi:10.2307/355322.

James, M. A. (2010). Transfer climate and EAP education: Students' perceptions of challenges to learning transfer. *English for Specific Purposes, 29,* 133-147. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.09.002

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of training: The contribution of 'coaching.' *Journal of Education, 163(2),* 163–172. doi:10.1177/002205748116300208

Kitzhaber, A. R. (1955). The university of Kansas course in the college teaching of English. *College Composition and Communication, 6(4),* 194-200. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/355533

Krupa, G. H. (1982). Helping new teachers of writing: Book, model, and mirror. *College Composition and Communication, 33(4),* 442-445. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/357959

Lamos, S. (2012). Institutional critique in composition studies: Methodological and ethical considerations for researchers. In L. Nickoson & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies* (pp. 158-170). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Latterell, C. G. (1996). Training the workforce: An overview of GTA education curricula. *WPA, 19(3),* 7-23. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/19n3/19n3latterell.pdf

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

MacNealy, M. S. (1998). *Strategies for empirical research in writing*. London, UK: Longman.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interpretative approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

McBroom, G. L. (1992). A new crop of teaching assistants and how they grew. *WPA, 15(3)*, 62-68. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/15n3/15n3mcbroom.pdf

McCarthy, L. P. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21(3),* 233-65. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/40171114

McKinney, J. G., & Chiseri-Strater, E. (2003). Inventing a teacherly self: Positioning journals in the TA seminar. *WPA, 27(1/2),* 59-74. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/27n1-2/27n1-2mckinney.pdf

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J., (2016). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70(2),* 151-167. doi:10.1080/00335638409383686

Mutnick, D., & Lamos, S. (2014). Basic writing pedagogy: Shifting academic margins in hard times. In G. Tate, A. R. Taggart, K. Schick, & H. B. Hessler (Eds.), *A guide*

to composition pedagogies (2nd ed.) (pp. 20-36). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Neeley, S. D. (2000). "*Only connect*…": Graduate instructors choosing the margin. In T. L. Good & L. B. Warshauer (Eds.), *In our own voice: Graduate students teach writing* (pp. 19-27). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Nelms, G., & Dively, R. L. (2007). Perceived roadblocks to transferring knowledge from first-year composition to writing-intensive major courses: A pilot study. *WPA, 31 (1/2),* 214-240. Retrieved from http://www.wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2dively-nelms.pdf

Newkirk, T. (1992). The narrative roots of the case study. In G. Kirsch & P. A. Sullivan (Eds.), *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research* (pp. 130-152). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Newkirk, T. (1993). *Nuts and bolts: A practical guide to teaching college composition.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Newkirk, T. (1996). Seduction and betrayal in qualitative research. In P. Mortensen & G. E. Kirsch (Eds.), *Ethics & representation in qualitative studies of literacy* (pp. 3-16). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

North, S. M. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton.

Nowacek, R. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nyquist, J. D., & Wulff, D. H. (1996). *Working effectively with graduate assistants*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Retrieved from https://oira.utk.edu/

Parker, R. P. (1982). Writing courses for teachers: From practice to theory. *College Composition and Communication, 33(4),* 411-19. doi:10.2307/357955

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Perkins, D.N., & Salomon, G. (1988). Teaching for transfer. *Educational Leadership, 46(1),* 22-32. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d1fe/324a117c069b09cbc4ae8a82c5ac18ba3ac9.pdf

Perkins, D.N., & Salomon, G. (2012). Knowledge to go: A motivational and dispositional view of transfer. *Educational Psychologist, 47(3)*, 248-258. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2012.693354

Petraglia, J. (Ed.) (1995). *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Powell, K. M., O'Neill, P., Phillips, C. M., & Huot, B. (2002). Negotiating resistance and change: One composition program's struggle not to convert. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 121-132). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pytlik, B. P. (2002). How graduate students were prepared to teaching writing—1850-1970. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing:*

Histories, theories, programs, practices (pp. 3-16). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Qualley, D. (2017). Building a conceptual topography of the transfer terrain. In C. M. Anson &J. L. Moore (Eds.), *Critical transitions: Writing and the question of transfer* (pp. 69-106). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Rankin, E. (1994). *Seeing yourself as a teacher: Conversations with five new teachers in a university writing program*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Reid, E. S. (2004). Uncoverage in composition pedagogy. *Composition Studies, 32(1),* 15-34. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/stable/43501567

Reid, E. S. (2009). Teaching writing teachers writing: Difficulty, exploration, and critical reflection. *College Composition and Communication, 61(2),*W197-W221. Retrieved from http://cccc.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CCC/0612-dec09/CCC0612Teaching.pdf

Reid, E. S., Estrem, H., & Belcheir, M. (2012). The effects of writing pedagogy education on graduate teaching assistants' approaches to teaching composition. *WPA, 36(1),* 32-73. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=tel_a_utl&id=GALE|A347405599&v=2.1&it=r&sid=AONE&asid=792df6dc

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition.

Written Communication, 28(3), 312-337. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0741088311410183

Restaino, J. (2012). *First semester: Graduate students, teaching writing, and the challenge of middle ground*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rivera-Mueller, J. (2014). Asking and understanding questions: An inquiry-based framework for writing teacher development. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Educati*on, *3(2),* 35-48. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol3/iss2/4

Rose, S. K., & Finders, M. J. (1998). Learning from experience: Using situated performances in writing teacher development. *WPA, 22(1/2),* 33-52. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/22n1-2/22n1-2rose.pdf

Rounsaville, A., Goldberg, R., Bawarshi, A. (2008). From incomes to outcomes: FYW students' prior genre knowledge, meta-cognition, and the question of transfer. *WPA, 32(1/2)*, 97-112. Retrieved from http://www.wpacouncil.org/archives/32n1/32n1rounsaville-goldberg-bawarshi.pdf

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication, 14(4),* 504-554. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0741088397014004004

Ruszkiewicz, J. J. (1987). Training teachers is a process too. *College Composition and Communication, 38(4),* 461-464. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/357641

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shannon, D. M., Twale, D. J., & Moore, M. S. (1998). TA teaching effectiveness: The impact of training and teaching experience. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *69(4),* 440-66. doi:10.2307/2649274

Shaughnessy, M. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Smit, D. (2004). *The end of composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson.

Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J. D. (1991). A developmental perspective on the TA role. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach: Selected readings in TA training* (pp. 295-312). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Stancliff, M., & Goggin, M. D. (2007). What's theorizing got to do with it? Teaching theory as resourceful conflict and reflection in TA preparation. *WPA, 30(3),* 11-28. Retrieved from http://www.wpacouncil.org/archives/30n3/30n3stancliff-goggin.pdf

Stenberg, S. J. (2005). *Professing and pedagogy: Learning the teaching of English*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Tate, G., Taggart, A. R., Schick, K., & Hessler, H. B. (Eds.). (2014). *A guide to composition pedagogies* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Teich, N. (1987). Transfer of writing skills: Implications of the theory of lateral and vertical transfer. *Written Communication, 4(2),* 193-208. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/doi/abs/10.1177/0741088387004002005

Thaiss, C., & McLeod, S. (2014). The Pedagogy of Writing in the disciplines and across the curriculum. In G. Tate, A. R. Taggart, K. Schick, & H. B. Hessler (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (2nd ed.) (pp. 283-300). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tremmel, R. (1994). Beyond self-criticism: Reflecting on teacher research and TA education. *Composition Studies, 22(1)*, 44-64. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/43501279

Tuomi-Gröhn, Terttu, & Engeström, Y. (Eds.). (2003). *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing*. New York, NY: Pergamom.

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding 'transfer' from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *WPA, 31(1/2),* 65-85. Retrieved from http://writingaboutwriting.umassd.wikispaces.net/file/view/Wardle-+Transfer.pdf/278764734/Wardle-+Transfer.pdf

Wardle, E. (2012). Creative repurposing for expansive learning: Considering "problem-exploring" and "answer-getting" dispositions in individuals and fields. *Composition Forum, 26.* Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/creative-repurposing.php

Wardle, E. (2013). What is transfer? In R. Malenczyk (Ed.), *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators* (pp. 143-155). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Weiser, I. (1990). Surveying new teaching assistants: Who they are, what they know, and what they want to know. *WPA, 14(1/2),* 63-71. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/14n1-2/14n1-2weiser.pdf

Weiser, I. (2002). When teaching assistants teach teaching assistants to teach: A historical view of a teacher preparation program. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 40-49). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Welch, N. (1993). Resisting the faith: Conversion, resistance, and the training of teachers. *College English, 55(4),* 387-401. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/378649

Wilhoit, S. (2002). Recent trends in TA instruction: A bibliographic essay. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 17-27). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Williams, C. L. (1996). Dealing with the data: Ethical issues in case study research. In P. Mortensen & G. E. Kirsch (Eds.), *Ethics & representation in qualitative studies of literacy* (pp. 40-57). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Winslow, R. (2005). The GTA writing portfolio: An impact study of learning by writing. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don't call it that: The composition practicum* (pp. 315-336). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Wisniewski, C. A. (2014). *Graduate teaching assistants' development of expertise in teaching first-year composition* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved *Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange*.

Yancey, K. B. (2002). The professionalization of TA development programs: A heuristic for curriculum design. In B. P. Pytlik & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 63-74). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., &Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Invitation to Participate

Hi [First Name],

Welcome to UTK's English Department. My name is Kali Mobley, and I'm a PhD candidate in rhetoric and composition as well as the Assistant Director of Composition. I'm contacting you because I'm working on a research project for my dissertation, and I'm wondering if you'd be willing to help me out.

I'm interested in how first-year Ph.D. Graduate Teaching Associates experience professional workshops and mentorships as well as if that meets the needs of graduate students like yourselves. I want to hear directly from you because I believe it's crucial that the graduate student perspective is understood.

Would you be willing to participate in my study? Participating would involve three interviews (each lasting about an hour); these interviews will occur at the beginning, middle, and end of the Fall 2016 semester. I would also observe two classroom sessions and ask you to submit your ENGL 101 documents, such as syllabi, assignment sheets, handouts, and lesson plans (only for the observation dates). If you choose to not participate, it will not adversely affect you in the program.

By way of compensation, I can offer you prorated gift cards to either Amazon or Starbucks; the final sum of the gift cards will be $50. You'd also have a chance to inform the teacher preparation curriculum at UTK as well as reflect on your own experiences as a first-year Ph.D. Graduate Teaching Associate. As important, you'd be adding to a growing discussion about GTA preparation in composition studies.

Anyway, thanks for considering this, [First Name]. I hope you choose to participate!

Best,
Kali Mobley
Assistant Director of Composition
Department of English
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
419.429.9862

Appendix B
Informed Consent Statement

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Do Graduate Teaching Associates (GTAs) Transfer "Transfer"?:
A Qualitative Study about Ph.D. GTAs and the Transferability of Writing Program Education

INTRODUCTION

This qualitative study aims to describe first-year Ph.D. GTAs' 1) previous teaching and writing experiences, 2) knowledge acquisition, and 3) application of writing program education to pedagogical practices. This study will compare its findings to previous scholarship about transfer theory and writing program education at UTK as well as with national studies. The data will also be used as part of PI Kali Mobley's dissertation project.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

During fall semester of 2016, the PI Kali Mobley will collect course documents such as syllabi, unit assignments, handouts, lesson plans and worksheets. Participants will be interviewed three times. All interviews will last about an hour and will be audio-recorded and then transcribed. The first interview will occur within 2 weeks after Fall 2016 start date; the second interview will occur in early November, and the third interview will occur after Fall 2016 semester concludes. PI Kali Mobley will conduct two ENGL 101 classroom observations; these observations will occur between late October and early December. The PI Kali Mobley will document field notes from the classroom observations.

RISKS

This study presents minimal risks, if any, to participants. The identity of all participants will be kept confidential in any published or presented accounts of the research findings. Information you offer or that is observed in your teaching will not affect your employment in the English Department. Specific procedures to ensure that you are not adversely affected by this study are described as follows.

- The purpose of the study is descriptive rather than evaluative.
- Participation in the study will not adversely affect participants' relationships with either PI Kali Mobley or Dr. Jeff Ringer, Director of Composition.
- During the time of when the study is conducted, the PI Kali Mobley, is the Assistant Director of Composition; in this role, she directly supervises and reviews the performance of all Graduate Teaching Assistants and Graduate Teaching Associates. Since this study is descriptive of teaching procedures and course design, the collected data will not be used to evaluate the degree of teaching effectiveness; therefore, no risks are foreseen due to her involvement in the study.
- At this time, the faculty sponsor, Dr. Jeff Ringer, is the Director of Composition; in this role, he directly supervises and reviews the performance of all Graduate Teaching Assistants and Graduate Teaching Associates. Since this study is descriptive of teaching procedures and course design, the collected data will not be used to evaluate the degree of teaching effectiveness; therefore, no risks are foreseen due to his involvement in the study. In addition, several procedures are in place to ensure that participating in the study leads to no adverse effects:
    - With similar spirit of the composition program's evaluation procedures, classroom observations and information offered in interview discussions will be responded to constructively, just as they are in the usual teaching evaluation

process. Should any concerns arise, those will be discussed, and you will have the program's usual opportunity to address them, again in keeping with the ordinary evaluative process.

- Each participant will be allowed to review and discuss the findings, thus ensuring that the information is an accurate depiction of what is being done in the classroom.

  If at any point in the study you have any concerns about how your participation in this study is affecting your evaluation as a teacher, please contact Dr. Allen Dunn, Head of the English Department, ardunn@utk.edu

BENEFITS

Professional benefits of the study include contribution to scholarship, including increased evidence-based knowledge about how writing program education informs experienced GTAs pedagogical practices. This knowledge will be used to inform the teacher preparation curriculum at UTK and may also influence how programs nationally construct their teacher preparation courses. Benefits for the student participants will be the opportunity to talk about teaching plans and experiences, which is presumed to be of value to first-year teachers.

COMPENSATION

Student participants will receive $50 in gift cards to either Starbucks or Amazon. These gift cards will be prorated based on completion of scheduled interviews. The first gift card will be $15 and will be given after the completion of interview 1, which will be within two weeks of the start date of Fall 2016 semester. After completing the second interview in early November, participants will respectively receive a $15 gift card, and for the final prorated payment, participants will respectively receive a $20 gift card at the conclusion of the third interview, which will occur after Fall 2016 semester concludes.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The identity of the participants in this study will be kept confidential. Participants will receive pseudonyms, and anyone mentioned during the interviews will also receive a pseudonym. No references will be made in oral or written reports which could link participants to the study. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless participants specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have questions at any time about the study, you may contact the PI Kali Mobley, at 301 McClung Tower, kamobley@vols.utk.edu, or the faculty sponsor Dr. Jeff Ringer, at 301 McClung Tower, jeff.ringer@utk.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of Tennessee IRB Compliance Officer at utkirb@utk.edu or (865)974-7697.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study prior to compensation, all data collected will be returned to you or destroyed. If you withdraw from the study and have received partial compensation, PI Kali Mobley will retain and use all data collected from the compensated period of participation.

CONSENT

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's Name (print): _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix C
Demographic Information Sheet

Directions: Please fill out this sheet and bring to the first interview on [enter date].

Pseudonym:

Age:

Race:

Current Program Information:

A. Degree:
B. Emphasis:
C. Year:
D. Expected Date of Graduation:

Academic History:

A. Undergraduate Institution:
    a. Major:
    b. Minor:
    c. GPA:
    d. Degree Awarded Date:
B. Graduate Institution:
    a. Degree:
    b. Emphasis:
    c. GPA:
    d. Degree Awarded Date:

Teaching History:

Please list the courses you have taught as well as the institution.

Writing Program Education History:

Please list any courses or workshops about pedagogy that you have attended as well as the institution.

Appendix D
Interview Protocols

Interview #1 Protocol

Introduction: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. The interview today should last about 60 minutes, and its main purpose is to get a sense of previous experiences with writing and teaching as well as to learn about the design of the EN 101 course syllabus, assignment sheet(s), and handouts.

Part I: Previous Writing Experiences

1. So how are things going for you?
    a. Probe: How are classes?
    b. Probe: How's teaching?
2. Did you take a first-year composition (FYC) course? Tell me about that class.
3. Have you taken other writing courses? Tell me briefly about the other writing you did in undergraduate classes.
    a. Probe: What types of writing did you do?
    b. Probe: What types of writing were you most comfortable with?
    c. Probe: What types of writing did you find difficult?
4. Tell me briefly about the writing you have done in graduate classes.
    a. Probe: How did your writing change or not change from undergraduate writing to graduate writing?
    b. Probe: How did you learn to write for graduate school?
    c. Probe: What types of writing are you most comfortable with?
    d. Probe: What types of writing do you find difficult?

During your MA or undergraduate education, can you recall a very difficult writing experience?

a. Probe: What was difficult about it?
b. Probe: Why was it difficult?
c. Probe: How did you respond to that difficult experience?
d. Probe: What did you learn from that difficult experience?

During your MA or undergraduate education, can you recall a positive writing experience?

a. Probe: How was it positive?

b. Probe: Why was it positive?

I'd also like to know a little bit more about how you were taught to write.

e. Probe: Would you tell me about a writing teacher who influenced you?

f. Probe: Did that teacher give you any advice about the writing process? If so, what do you recall?

g. Probe: What did you like/dislike about that writing guidance?

Can you think of a particular interaction with a teacher that changed your writing/changed you as a writer?

Part II: Previous Teaching Experiences

1. I'm interested in your previous teaching experiences. Tell me briefly about the kinds of courses you have taught.
    a. Probe: How long have you been teaching?
    b. Probe: How did you teach those classes?
    c. Probe: What was the curriculum emphasis for those respective classes?
    d. Probe: How much freedom did you have in designing and teaching those classes?
2. Tell me about a lesson or a class session that worked well.
    a. Probe: What do you think contributed to that success?
3. Tell me about a lesson or a class session that did <u>not</u> work well.
    a. Probe: What do you think contributed to that not working well?
    b. Probe: Have taught that concept again, and if so, did you try another strategy?
4. I'd also like to know how you were taught to teach writing. Tell me briefly about any pedagogy courses, training, and/or mentoring prior to UTK that you have attended.
    a. Probe: What was the objective for the pedagogy class and/or workshop(s)?
    b. Probe: What do you remember from the pedagogy class and/or workshop(s)?
    c. Probe: Do you use any materials or strategies from the pedagogy class and/or workshop(s) in your teaching?
5. Can you think of a writing experience that informed your teaching practice?
    a. Probe: How has your writing experiences guided your teaching?
6. Can you think of a particular interaction with a teacher that informed your teaching practice?

    a. Probe: How has that interaction guided your teaching?

7. What do you want your students to learn about writing?
    a. Probe: How do you incorporate those goals in your teaching?

Part III: UTK FYC Curriculum and ENGL 101 Course Design

1. Would you tell me a little bit about your understanding of UTK's FYC program?
    a. Probe: What are the curriculum values?
    b. Probe: What are the goals of the curriculum?
2. I'm interested in your overall impressions of UTK's August workshops. Tell me about your overall experience.
    a. Probe: What sessions did you attend?
    b. Probe: Why did you attend those sessions?
3. Did you find anything useful from the August workshops?
    a. Probe: How was it useful?
    b. Probe: Why do you find that useful?
    c. Probe: Do you plan on incorporating that into your teaching this fall semester?
    d. Probe: How will you incorporate it?
4. Did you find anything <u>not</u> useful from the August workshops?
    a. Probe: How was it not useful?
    b. Probe: What questions do you have about that concept/material/task?
    c. Probe: How do you plan on teaching that concept/material/task?
5. Would you tell me a little bit about your understanding of rhetoric?
6. (Looking at the syllabus) I'm interested in your ENGL 101 course syllabus. Tell me how you feel about it.
    a. Probe: Did you make any changes to the standardized syllabus? If so, what and why?
7. (Looking at the assignment sheets) I'm interested in your writing assignments. Tell me how you feel about these assignments.
    a. Probe: Did you, or do you plan to, make any changes to these standard assignment sheets? If so, what and why?
8. I'm interested in how your first week of teaching is going. Tell me briefly about your class.
    a. Probe: How are your students?

b. Probe: What have you been teaching?
c. Probe: What has gone well?
d. Probe: What has been challenging?

9. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share?

Interview #2 Protocol

Introduction: Thank you for meeting with me again. The interview today should last about an hour, and its main purpose is to get a sense of your experiences with teaching EN 101 as well as with developing professional relationships or participating in professional development workshops.

Part I: Current Teaching Experiences at UTK

1. So, how are things going for you?
    a. Probe: How's teaching?

2. Curriculum Knowledge: Please describe your understanding of UTK's first-year composition values.
    a. Probe: What are you doing in your teaching to promote those values?
    b. Probe: What do you find challenging about promoting those values?
    c. Probe: What resources (e.g., workshops, handouts, mentors, etc.) are you drawing on to help you promote meet those values?

3. Teaching Rhetorical Knowledge: How is teaching rhetorical knowledge (e.g., Aristotelian appeals, appropriateness, rhetorical situations) going for your class?
    a. Probe: What rhetorical knowledge do you feel comfortable teaching?
    b. Probe: What rhetorical knowledge do you feel uncomfortable teaching?
    c. Probe: How does rhetoric inform your teaching practice?
    d. Probe: Do you use rhetorical theory to design assignment sheets or class tasks?
    e. Probe: What do you find most useful in teaching rhetorical theory?
    f. Probe: What do you find most challenging in teaching rhetorical theory?

4. Genre Knowledge: How is teaching genres to your class going?
    a. Probe: What are the genres that you assign your students?
    b. Probe: Why do you assign those genres?
    c. Probe: What about genres do you feel comfortable teaching?
    d. Probe: What about genres do you feel uncomfortable teaching?

5. Pedagogical Practice Knowledge: How is teaching writing as a process going for your class?
    a. Probe: How do you encourage the writing process? Revision?
    b. Probe: What about the writing process do you feel comfortable teaching?
    c. Probe: What about the writing process do you feel uncomfortable teaching?
    d. Probe: (Looking at the class schedule) I'm interested in how you teach the writing process. Tell me how you went about scaffolding the units and daily assignments.

6. Discourse Community Knowledge: You've probably learned that transfer is a key value of our program. What do you think about our program's emphasis on teaching for transfer?
    a. Probe: How do you define transfer?
    b. Probe: What do you like/dislike about teaching for transfer?
    c. Probe: Do you find value in teaching for transfer? Why or why not?
    d. Probe: What do you like/dislike about reflection or metacognitive practices?
    e. Probe: How do you incorporate reflection in your classroom?
    f. Probe: What is your primary objective for teaching UTK's EN 101?

Part II: Mentoring and Peer Relationships

1. Has there been anyone in particular who has been helping you in either teaching or understanding UTK's FYC curriculum?
    a. Probe: How has that person helped you?
    b. Probe: How did you take the proffered advice and apply it to your classroom?

2. Have there been any teaching difficulties thus far this semester? Tell me briefly about those difficulties.
    a. Probe: Have you talked with any fellow peers about those difficulties?
    b. Probe: Were there any proposed solutions?
    c. Probe: Have you talked with any faculty members about those difficulties?
    d. Probe: Were there any proposed solutions?
    e. Probe: Did you find any of this advice helpful? Successful?
    f. Probe: Did you find any of this advice difficult? Unsuccessful?

3. Has any of your peers asked you for teaching advice? What did they ask?
    a. Probe: Did you provide any teaching solutions for your peer?

4. Have you asked your peers for teaching advice? What did you ask?
    a. Probe: Did they provide any teaching solutions?

Part III: Professionalization Workshops

1. Have you attended any professionalization workshops? Tell me briefly about the workshop(s). When? Where? Objective?
    a. Probe: What did you find most useful from that workshop?
    b. Probe: What did you find most challenging from that workshop?

2. Have you incorporated any of the workshop material/ideas into your classroom? Tell me briefly about how you incorporated it into the classroom.

a. Probe: Was it successful or unsuccessful? Why?

Interview #3 Protocol

Introduction: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. The interview today should last about an hour, and its main purpose is to reflect about your experiences with teaching EN 101 as well as with developing professional relationships or participating in professional development workshops.

Part I: Reflection on ENGL 101

1. How is everything going for you since we last met?
    a. How does it feel to have completed your first semester of coursework? Of teaching ENGL 101?

2. Curriculum Knowledge: Last time you said x. Has your view of UTK's FYC values changed since then?
    a. Probe: Why or why not?
    b. Probe: What did you find challenging about designing the units to meet those values?
    c. Probe: Did you find anything useful that helped you design or rethink the units to meet those values?
    d. Probe: Is there anything that you learned about curriculum through teaching it?
    e. Probe: What contributed to your understanding of the FYC curriculum?
    f. Probe: What do you feel like you still want to know or understand about the FYC curriculum?
    g. Probe: Is there anything else you'd like to discuss about UTK's FYC values?

3. Teaching Rhetorical Knowledge: Looking back over the semester, how was teaching rhetorical knowledge (e.g., Aristotelian appeals, appropriateness, rhetorical situations)?
    a. Probe: Overall, how did rhetoric inform your teaching practice?
    b. Probe: Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still you feel comfortable teaching it? Why/why not?
    c. Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still feel uncomfortable teaching it? Why/why not?
    d. Probe: Last time you said x. Is that still the most useful component in teaching rhetorical theory? Why/why not?
    e. Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still find that the most challenging part in teaching rhetorical theory? Why/why not?
    f. Probe: Is there anything else you'd like to discuss about teaching rhetorical knowledge?

4. Genre Knowledge: Looking back over the semester, how was teaching genres?

a. Probe: Last time you said x. Is that still why you assigned those genres?
b. Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still feel comfortable teaching that part? Why/why not?
c. Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still feel uncomfortable teaching that part? Why/why not?
d. Probe: Is there anything else you'd like to discuss about teaching genres?

5. Pedagogical Practice Knowledge: Looking back over the semester, how was teaching writing as a process?
    a. Probe: Last time you said x. Did you find that x encouraged the writing process? Revision?
    b. Probe: Last time you said x. Do you still feel comfortable teaching that part? Why/why not?
    c. Probe: Last time you said x. Do do you still feel uncomfortable teaching that part? Why/why not?
    d. Probe: (Looking at the class schedule) Last time we talked about how you scaffolded the units and daily assignments. How do you think the scaffolding of the units and daily assignments went?
    e. Probe: Is there anything else you'd like to discuss about teaching writing as a process?

6. Discourse Community Knowledge: Looking back over the semester, how was teaching for transfer?
    g. Probe: Last time you said x. Has your definition changed? Why/why not?
    h. Probe: What do you like/dislike about teaching for transfer?
    i. Probe: Do you find value in teaching for transfer? Why/why not?
    j. Probe: What do you like/dislike about reflection or metacognitive practices?
    k. Probe: Last time you said x. Did you continue to incorporate reflection in your classroom? How did that go?
    l. Probe: Last time you said x was your primary goal for teaching UTK's ENGL 101. How did that go?
    m. Probe: When you think about re-teaching ENGL 101 next fall, will x still be your primary goal?
    n. Is there anything else you'd like to discuss about teaching for transfer?

Part II: Mentoring and Peer Relationships

1. Has there been anyone in particular who helped you in either teaching or understanding UTK's FYC curriculum?
    a. Probe: How did that person help you?
    b. Probe: How did you take the proffered advice and apply it to your classroom?

2. Were there any teaching difficulties thus far this semester? Tell me briefly about those difficulties.
    a. Probe: Did you talked with any fellow peers about those difficulties?
    b. Probe: Were there any proposed solutions?
    c. Probe: Have you talked with any faculty members about those difficulties?
    d. Probe: Were there any proposed solutions?
    e. Probe: Did you find any of this advice helpful? Successful?
    f. Probe: Did you find any of this advice difficult? Unsuccessful?

3. Did any of your peers ask you for teaching advice? What did they ask?
    a. Probe: Did you provide any teaching solutions for your peer?

5. Have you asked your peers for teaching advice? What did you ask?
    a. Probe: Did they provide any teaching solutions?

Part III: Professionalization Workshops and Orientation Review

1. Did you attend any professionalization workshops? Tell me briefly about the workshop(s). When? Where? Objective?
    a. Probe: What did you find most useful from that workshop?
    b. Probe: What did you find most challenging from that workshop?

2. Did you incorporate any of the workshop material/ideas into your classroom? Tell me briefly about how you incorporated it into the classroom.
    a. Probe: Was it successful or unsuccessful? Why?

3. What do you recall from orientation training?
    a. Probe: What do you know now that you wish you had known at the beginning of the term?
4. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share?

Appendix E
Sample Field Notes

Classroom Observation I
Field Notes
Friday, October 21, 2016
Cornelius
1:25 PM – 2:20 PM
Estabrook 201

1:23 PM Prior to class, he returned graded homework.

1:25 PM Begins with a roll question: What is your favorite season? He begins with his answer: Fall because of the cool weather and childhood memories of jumping into the giant leaf piles.

1:28 PM Introduces me to the class and discusses my research. He asks them to do a good job so that it makes him look good. Students laugh.

1:29 PM Begins the class discussion talking about the Dakota Pipeline and "Divergent" Star's (Shailene Woodley) arrest. He provides background context about the pipeline and why Native Americans are protesting the pipeline.

1:30 PM He passed out another article about the reporter who was arrested in relation to the Dakota Pipeline protest. Asks students to spend 5 minutes looking over the article, and the other 5 minutes for writing how this article and Dakota Pipeline fit into the larger discussion about racism, which has been the course topic.

1:33 PM Reminds students that they don't have to read the whole article but at least the first 2 pages.

1:34 PM He tells a late student of what the rest of the class is doing.

1:35 PM He answers student questions about what they are doing for the freewrite.

1:38 PM He tells students that five minutes have passed and that they should begin to write at this time. He also catches up another late student.

1:40 PM Draws the rhetorical triangle onto the board. He draws two triangles. One is audience-purpose-voice, and the other is pathos-ethos-logos. To the right of the triangles, he writes "ethos?"; "pathos?"; and "logos?"

1:42 PM Gives a 1-minute warning. Asks students to wrap up their thoughts and to make sure their names are on their papers.

1:43 PM He asks students to keep the writing. They will do two freewrites because they are falling behind in the number of freewriting done in class.

1:44 PM Tells students that he wants students to go beyond thinking about ethos, pathos, and logos in other people's writing and shift that to their own writing.

The article handout will be used to answer the questions on the board. He asks them, "How would you use this article? For pathos? Ethos? Or Logos?"

Students provide different answers. A student responds, "What?" He tells them that it is OK because, as learned in the rhetorical analysis unit, these terms tend to blend together.

He asks the students who would want to use the article for logos, how would they use it? Students respond: that it provides facts behind protest; no coverage; facts of pipeline; use the pipeline website to compare sides;

He switches to pathos. Students respond: burial grounds!!!; video shows a bloody dog and a woman screaming; reporter's arrest; just now reporting.

He describes the video and talks about how it evokes emotion.

With "just now reporting," he comments on how that was used for logos. Here, he explains how that these can overlap; that these are facts that evoke emotions.

He asks if there were this article and a 16-year-old's blog about the pipeline, how does that affect ethos? Students respond: More reliable than social media/blogs; evidence and documentation.

1:52 PM He asks if there is anything else that they could add to the board to tie into their own papers. From this question, a student adds to ethos because the article clearly ties in to the topic.

1:54 PM He goes to the first triangle and states that he is their audience. Then, for purpose, he asks, "What have all the essays we've read sought to do?" A student says, to inform. He asks for other purposes; another student says that they try to persuade. He adds that the articles are trying to educate you about what's going on, not just informing that it is happening.

1:56 PM On Wednesday, they had ended with questions, and he self-proclaims that the lesson bombed. He asks the students what are the purposes of the third paper.

1:57 PM A student provides an anecdote about pepper spray; he allows the distraction but gets the students back on track and begins talking about Google and the many other articles about the topic.

A student says that they as writers need to add their own ethos, pathos, and logos—changing/adding new voice.

1:59 PM He says that if you're only writing for me, then it won't be effective. Students need to insert themselves/their interests into the paper.

A student provides an anecdote; he says that could be used for the introduction because it shows that the student has a vested interest in the argument.

He writes: C. T. L. on the board. He says that main purpose was to describe the Maine Lobster Festival for readers. [He sent me this article prior to class.] He asks the students to identify the question raised in the article. One student says: animal cruelty/pain. He adds how the festival brings economy to the region, which is a question raised in the article. The really big question of the article is that he had a lot of unanswered questions. He references *TSIS* to say it is OK to end with questions. He then adds that the big question is about morality.

He explains that David Foster Wallace was assigned a topic, much like the students. The piece is so much more interesting because DFW had a vested interest and raised issue questions.

2:05 PM Asks students to return to their freewriting sheets. They have to develop 3 questions from their research that they want to answer for themselves. They have 5 minutes to think of 3 questions.

2:08 PM Answers questions from students who raise their hands.

2:11 PM He gets the class to stop writing. He asks them, what kinds of questions are they wanting to ask? He tells students that he will get volunteers and hopes that this will get everyone's juices flowing. He tells them that it is OK to still be trying to figure out what they want to ask.

He writes on the board: Questions—

Underneath that he writes out shortened questions that were given by students. Here they are:

- Public education?
- Racism in justice system?
- What role is media playing?
- What is the publicity for certain races?
- Legal precedents of other countries? —a comparison
- Peer pressure?

With each question, he expands on how those questions could be researched.

2:17 PM Dismisses class. Asks students to turn in writing assignments.

Classroom Observation II
Field Notes
Monday, November 14, 2016
Cornelius
1:25 PM – 2:20 PM
Estabrook 201

Prior to class, he handed out a handout, which is an assignment sheet for Unit 4: Position Paper for a Public Audience. I received one, too. He encouraged students to read because there are a few minutes prior to class beginning.

1:25 PM He gives the class 30 seconds to finish reading what they are reading. On the projection screen, he has the Unit 4 handout on it. He then tells them that Thanksgiving is coming up and that there isn't a whole lot left in class time.

He asks them a Thanksgiving based roll question: What is the one food that you're looking forward to the most when you go home for Thanksgiving dinner?

He apologizes to those who may not be able to go home, but he tells them that he hopes they will have some kind of turkey.

1:27 PM He tells the students that he won't have a traditional Thanksgiving dinner because he can't go home and spend it with the holidays. His wife is Venezuelan, and they will have a Venezuelan dinner. He describes his favorite dish.

As students respond to the question, he interacts with every student's response.

1:32 PM Class roll is concluded, and then he turns to discussing the submission of Unit 3 paper. He assures every student that they won't be graded on their politics. He had encouraged several students to incorporate current political events into their Unit 3 papers in their conclusions.

1:33 PM He moves to Unit 4 handout on the board. He tells them that there isn't a lot of time dedicated to this unit, so the class time will be very focused on it for the remainder of the course.

He defines Op-Ed via Wikipedia. It's on the handout. He follows the definition with an overgeneralization—his words—of what an Op-Ed is. This information can be found in the bulleted list on the handout. He reads each bullet. He ends with, "Fun times, right?"

1:36 PM He tells them that initially that this paper is supposed to be on a similar topic as their Unit 2 and Unit 3 papers. He opens the assignment to expand the topic. He tells them that there are restrictions to broadening the scope. First, he has them find a newspaper article, and the students should respond to the article. He provides well-recognized, more credible publications, which is why he put them on the assignment sheet. He tells them that this list is part of the 10 ten most-purchased newspapers.

1:39 PM He tells them that whichever publication they will choose will determine their audience. He provides information about financial and political leanings of some of the listed publications. He tells them that if they write a conservative piece for a liberal audience, then the message wouldn't "mesh well" and that they would need to return to stasis.

1:40 PM He moves forward to discussing the number of outside, credible sources required for the unit. After discussing the number of sources, he goes on to discuss the listed tips on the assignment sheet.

He tells them that they need to connect to their audience via ethos, pathos, and logos for a specific purpose. He provides some examples and then explains how an alternative approach wouldn't work with the common ground needed for the argument.

He tells them that they get to choose their audience, and they need to reflect about the values of their audience.

He tells them that they will need to show him what they are saying instead of just telling him their points. Students need to show sources and provide evidence. He tells them that they need to know their sources in order to be knowledgeable.

1:44 PM He then moves on to discussing the due dates. He reminds them that there isn't much time left in the semester so that rough drafts will be due on the Monday after Thanksgiving (11/28)

He tells them that their PPT slides are due on 12/05 because this will help everyone to go through their presentations without switching laptops. He will have them from his computer, which is why they are due on the day prior to their final exam.

1:47 PM He goes over the formatting of the document. He tells them that they will use 2 columns for their writing so that it would look more like a newspaper. Students have confused looks on their faces. He notices it and asks if everyone knows how to do that. There's silence. He opens Microsoft Word and shows them how to format columns.

He has them using MLA citation style guide. There needs to be a Works Cited page.

1:48 PM He tells them that they need to write a cover letter, in which students need to identify article they are responding to and a summary of it. Students will also need to provide the article with their submission. Additional questions that the students need to answer via cover letter are about intended readers and purpose.

For the presentation, it will be on exam day—2hr block. Each presentation will be 5 mins. long. He tells them that if they get to 7 mins, then they are infringing on other people's time, and he will stop them.

He tells them that they will have a class that's about all things presentational. His words.

1:51 PM He tells them that this paper is a bit small but that there are things going into it. He goes over the points for final draft, rough draft, and presentation. He tells them that he is looking at preparedness and knowledge of the topic for the presentation grade. He then shares with them an anecdote about him almost passing out when he did his first presentation in a biology class. He tells them that the more they do, the easier it gets.

1:53 PM He asks them if they have any questions. They say no. He then asks them to get out a clean piece of paper. As students get out a piece of paper, he writes on the board:

-1 article (from HW)
-4 pros or cons: what did well? What failed at?

This writing is from their reading in *Rhetorical Choices*.

He tells them that paragraph form gets them a better grade, but they could use bullet points if they won't (—there will be a grade deduction is what is implied here.)

He tells students that there doesn't need to be a balance of pros & cons; it's whatever they would like to list/discuss.

1:58 PM He tells them that it isn't closed back, and there isn't enough time to read an article.

2:00 PM Gives them 2 more minutes to finish up their thoughts.

2:02 PM He asks how many students wrote about each article. He writes the numbers on the board. He says that since more people wrote about the rape culture article, then they will focus on that one first. He asks students to share pros and cons.

Here's what he writes on the board:

<u>Pro</u>
-listing multiple problems
-not generalizing
-more objective, not pushy

<u>Con</u>
-Frats = bar = too satirical.
-recent references
-used facts more effectively
-elaborate metaphor

He starts asking students who is familiar with Cheers. I think it was just the two of us who have seen it. He then asks about Frazier, and more students were familiar with it. He uses this information to say that a con could be the references.

He tells them that the facts part affected him more because there were more paragraphs talking about bars and not enough discussing/effectively using the facts that are presented in the piece.

2:10 PM He references 7i, which is about rhetorical fallacies, in the *Harbrace*. He asks them if they are familiar with non-sequitur fallacies. He tells them that maybe the article is an example of that fallacy.

He tells them that another fallacy they run into is the ad hominem, and he says that they probably ran into that one more often with this past election.

This section on fallacies was supposed to be read for homework. He tells them that they should read it again. He tells them to not do those things when writing their Unit 4 papers.

2:13 PM He asks if there are any more pros and cons. No one has any to offer. He tells them that they will be reading an Op-Ed for Wednesday's class. Students are to turn in their writing assignments on their way out of class.

2:14 PM Class is dismissed.

Appendix F
Chapter Six Table 19

Table 19

Comparison of Participants' Definitions of Transfer

Participant	Interview One		Interview Two		Interview Three	
	Transfer Definition	**Degree of Appropriation**	**Transfer Definition**	**Degree of Appropriation**	**Transfer Definition**	**Degree of Appropriation**
Ava	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Clara	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Cornelius	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	Adaptation	Surface Features
Joseph	Adaptation	Conceptual Underpinnings	Adaptation	Conceptual Underpinnings	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Liz	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	General Writing Skills	Surface Features	General Writing Skills	Surface Features
Mandy	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Mike	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features
Spencer	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features	Forward and/or Backward Reaching Transfer	Surface Features

Note. Degrees of Appropriation were shortened to contain the key label.

VITA

Kali Alexis Mobley Finn was born on December 22, 1984, in Jacksonville, Florida. When she was eight years old, her family moved to Wetumpka, Alabama, and she graduated from Wetumpka High School in 2003. She then attended the University of North Alabama, where she received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Professional Writing in 2007.

In 2009, she enrolled into the English Department's master's program at Auburn University at Montgomery. She received the Master of Liberal Arts degree in 2011.

In 2013, she was accepted into the English Department's doctoral program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, where her major field of study was in Rhetoric, Writing and Linguistics. She received the Doctor of Philosophy degree in August 2018.