



## Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education

---

Volume 9 | Issue 2

Article 6

---


2020

### Connecting Our Pedagogical Questions and Goals: An Exercise for Writing Teacher Development

Jessica Rivera-Mueller

Utah State University, [jessica.riveramueller@usu.edu](mailto:jessica.riveramueller@usu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte>

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Rivera-Mueller, Jessica (2020) "Connecting Our Pedagogical Questions and Goals: An Exercise for Writing Teacher Development," *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 2 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol9/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education* by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



---

## Connecting Our Pedagogical Questions and Goals: An Exercise for Writing Teacher Development

### Cover Page Footnote

I would like to thank the educators who so kindly shared their stories with me in this project. I also appreciate the reviewer feedback that strengthened this piece. Finally, I would also like to thank Lesley Erin Bartlett, Shari J. Stenberg, and Sandra L. Tarabochia for responding to early drafts of this article.



## **Connecting Our Pedagogical Questions and Goals: An Exercise for Writing Teacher Development**

Jessica Rivera-Mueller  
*Utah State University*

In *Professing and Pedagogy*, Stenberg (2005) argues teacher development involves unraveling our pedagogical beliefs. She writes, “And that, to me, is what teacher development is about—breaks, ruptures, unraveling, and renewal” (98). This definition has been true in my experience. I have learned the most in the moments when I have been challenged to consider the beliefs, values, and assumptions that undergird my questions about teaching writing. As a writing teacher educator, I want teachers to experience the development that emerges from a deep investigation into the ways our pedagogical beliefs shape our questions and how we attend to those questions.

Drawing from Dewey (1949), I understand this process of learning from our questions as one that involves two related activities: clarifying a problem and proposing possible solutions (112). The movement between problem-posing and problem-solving allows us to better understand and revise our pedagogical beliefs. There are some challenges, however, in supporting this process. One challenge is time. It can be difficult for teachers to unravel their beliefs when they already feel pressed for time. Another challenge is that it can be difficult to view our teaching contexts from multiple or new perspectives. Even as writing teachers may possess a strong commitment to pedagogical inquiry, the activity of pedagogical inquiry requires time and critical perception. Crafting questions about teaching writing is imperative for teacher development, but teachers also need ways to attend to these questions.

For this reason, I conducted a narrative inquiry project to study how writing teachers, who are committed to their ongoing development, learn and develop their engagement in pedagogical inquiry. I was especially interested in how writing teachers sustain their pedagogical inquiry over the course of their careers, amidst changing conceptions of teaching and learning. Through interviews with and observations of four writing teachers at both the secondary and post-secondary level, I have begun to understand how teachers' overarching goals for teacher development can shape their engagement with pedagogical inquiry. In particular, the teachers' stories illustrate the importance of growing our goals for teacher development and how this process involves negotiation among self-defined views of teaching and views defined by other educational stakeholders, including the field, institutions, and the general public. Studying the teachers' articulations of developing their pedagogical inquires, I learned that the teachers' questions have been aimed at particular and multiple goals for teacher development. This multiplicity highlights how the process of developing goals for teacher development is ongoing work; unlearning and relearning of goals for teacher development helps teachers engage and navigate tensions within themselves, as well as tensions among cultural and institutional visions for teaching.

In this article, I share findings from this study and argue that paying attention to our broader goals for teacher development can help us more purposefully develop different aspects of pedagogical inquiry. As teachers of writing, this exercise can help us reflect upon our own pedagogical inquiry, stretch ourselves to practice other aspects of pedagogical inquiry, and re-see the professional development structures or activities that may be required by our institutions. Our pedagogical practices may not be fundamentally overhauled by this exercise, but that is not the point. Lee (2000) tells us that “[r]evisioning is defined not necessarily as *changing* one’s mind, but recognizing that one’s mind is made up along an array of choices and *why* it is made up this way” (180-181, emphasis original). Noticing the connections between our pedagogical questions and goals for teacher development is one way to consider the choices we’ve (un)purposefully made and further our pedagogical inquiry.

### **Theoretical Background**

Scholarship that is relevant to writing teachers in secondary and post-secondary contexts recognizes the need for ongoing pedagogical inquiry. In both composition and English education scholarship, we find that writing teachers develop by continually inquiring into their teaching and learning, as well as investigating the teaching and learning of others (Bamberg, 2002, Buehler, 2005, Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 2009, Fecho, 2004, Hillocks, 1995, Kameen, 2000, Meyer and Sawyer, 2006, Palmisano, 2013, Qualley, 1997, Ritchie and Wilson, 2000, Simon, 2015, Staunton, 2008, Stenberg, 2005, Waite, 2017, Weinbaum,

2004). While compositionists and English educators work in different contexts with differing demands, they share principles for enacting pedagogical inquiry, and my study was shaped with these principles in mind.

First, pedagogical inquiry is an active process, and teachers are important contributors to disciplinary knowledge. While some writing teachers may seek to improve their teaching (Kay Miller et al., 2005), others may choose to problematize their teaching (Kinzy and Minter, 2008). Yet, other teachers may seek to negotiate the contexts in which they work (Siebert et al., 1997). All these examples, though, similarly position teachers as active inquirers who are important contributors to disciplinary knowledge. Classroom teachers' observations are important to notice and study for improved educational theory and practice. Accordingly, this study sought to listen to teachers as experts of their own learning-to-teach processes.

Another key principle is that pedagogical inquiry requires others. Pedagogical inquiry, in other words, best occurs in communities of practice. Working with others in educational or professional communities of practice provides a context for teacher-learning. Working with others enables "a continual process of making current arrangements problematic [and] questioning the ways knowledge and practice are constructed, evaluated, and used" (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 121). Collaboration helps us conceptualize our beliefs about teaching and learning as constructed, consequently opening them up for revision and development (Ritchie and Wilson). It is through hearing and responding to multiple points of view that teachers can create new ways to perceive and address teaching situations (Palmisano). While interaction with colleagues does not necessarily lead a teacher to engage in reflexive thinking, the context provides the possibility. One important condition for pedagogical inquiry in communities of practice is that all members are positioned as learners (Gallagher, 2002, Lee, 2000, Stenberg, 2005). Lee argues, for example, that quantity of experience (i.e. number of years teaching) is less relevant than quality of engagement (136). Consistent, then, is the idea that writing teachers at any level have the ability to critically examine and revise their teaching beliefs and practices, an activity that can facilitate their own development and the development of others. Therefore, I engaged in this study as an active participant, collecting and sharing my own stories to create a context for teacher-learning.

## **Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to examine how writing teachers, who are committed to their ongoing development, learn and develop their engagement in pedagogical inquiry. Because I was interested in how inquiry abilities, expectations, and processes are learned and developed through relationships, contexts, and time, I used a narrative inquiry method. In this study, I met one-on-one with the participating writing teachers to collect stories and experiences related

to the development of their pedagogical inquiry. Four teachers of writing agreed to participate in the study: Ceic, a high school English teacher in her eighth year of teaching; Daniel, a high school English teacher in his eighteenth year of teaching; Maggie, a university composition instructor who had been teaching at the college level for nearly twenty years; and Phip, a community college teacher of writing who had taught in both secondary and post-secondary contexts.<sup>1</sup>

I accessed my broad questions about the development of pedagogical inquiry by studying and tracing stories of and experiences with the pedagogical questions that have most shaped the teachers' pedagogical inquiry. Collaboratively, we identified these questions in our first meeting with open-ended interview questions (see Appendix A). These interview questions helped us identify the pedagogical questions that have been important for the teachers' development as writing teachers. They are underlying philosophical questions that speak to the "problems" we pose and aim to understand and solve.

While the first meeting, a one-hour interview, helped us determine the pedagogical question we would trace, the final meeting, a thirty-minute interview, helped us reflect upon our experiences in the study. The two middle meetings were collaboratively designed based upon the themes that emerged from my analysis of field texts, field artifacts (i.e. instructional materials, observational notes, etc.), and transcripts from our audio-recorded meetings.<sup>2</sup> Drawing from D. Jean Clandinin and F. Michael Connelly's (2000) description of narrative inquiry, my analysis focused on coding for interaction (personal influences/conditions and social

---

<sup>1</sup> Using snowball sampling as a method for recruitment, I contacted potential participants from a pool of recommendations provided to me by faculty members from my prior institution. For the purposes of studying inquiry development, the participating teachers needed to meet the following criteria: experience teaching writing for at least five years at either the secondary or post-secondary level and peer recognition for their commitment to ongoing professional development. All the participating teachers had also earned graduate degrees—either at the master's or doctoral level. I recruited exemplary teachers to purposefully look for the teachers' "learning curriculum" or the specific activity that has fostered the development of pedagogical inquiry (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the study, I composed field texts, notes describing the setting, content, and context of each experience. These notes helped me document my position as a researcher and place a "time stamp" on the experience, recording my perspectives and observations at the time of the experience. Accounting for my perspectives and interpretations was important for me as a researcher because I approached each meeting or experience as a narrative text. While the stories or narratives we told each other were important, the "actions, doings, and happenings" that occurred in the study were also "narrative expressions" (Clandinin and Connelly 79). As a feminist researcher, it was important for me to engage the participating teachers as a co-learner. My study's design enabled the participating teachers to study pedagogical inquiry development together, and it could be described as "praxis-oriented inquiry" (Lather, 1991, 72).

environment), continuity (past, present, and future selves), and place (the context the story is located within) (see Appendix B). Through the process of composing analytic notes—texts that helped me trace my growing understandings of the themes present in the field texts, artifacts, and transcripts—I crafted an email for the teachers that named the emerging themes. In these emails, I also suggested possibilities for the following experience, always leaving room open for the teachers to suggest an alternative possibility that would be meaningful. The findings from this study emerged from meeting four times with each participating teacher (16 total experiences). Table 1 shows the pedagogical questions we studied and the experiences we collaboratively designed.

**Table 1: Meeting with the Writing Teachers**

<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Pedagogical Questions</b>	<b>Types of Experiences</b>
Ceic	How can reading support writing instruction and how can writing support reading instruction?	Interview and Observation of Teaching and Department Meeting
Daniel	How can the writing classroom be humane for teachers and students?	Interview and Observation of Teaching
Maggie	How can I stay relevant as a teacher of writing? What is writing?	Interview
Phip	How do students perceive and make meaning from curriculum?	Interview

## **Findings**

In this section, I describe the four shared goals for teacher development articulated by all the teachers in my study—Mastering Teaching, Making an Impact, Refining Pedagogy, and Sustaining an Engaged Teaching Life—and illustrate how noticing goals such as these provides opportunity to practice and strengthen both problem-posing and problem-solving—the two intellectual moves driving my conception of pedagogical inquiry.

### **Mastering Teaching, An End-in-View Goal**

Using Dewey’s (1938) notion of an end-in-view, this goal pushes writing teachers to strive for successful teaching results. The goal prompts teachers to take their understandings of what students need to accomplish and discover the classroom approaches that will most successfully initiate and support student learning. A mastery-in-view goal does not mean that teachers believe their learning-to-teach process can be completed. Instead, the teachers in this study helped me

understand this goal as one that continually challenges teachers to address the problematic situations they encounter as teachers.

Ceic illustrated the development of this goal when she described her first teaching observation in her second teaching position. Unlike prior observations when Ceic received “flying reports,” this occasion included moments when her department chair provided constructive criticism. Ceic described this pivotal moment in the following way:

She came in; there was a list of things to work on. I remember going home and crying. I'd already taught two prior years before coming here, and I thought, “I must be just terrible.” ...I talked to her maybe a couple weeks later, and I said, “I didn't realize I was that terrible.” She said, “You weren't terrible. You were really good.” I said, “It didn't seem like it.” She said, “There were so many good things.” She had written those in the thing, but all I focused on was [the critique] ...I brought it over [to her], and there was just as much good as there was things to work on. She said, “I never would've hired you if I didn't think that you were going to be someone who worked really hard to master your craft” ... She said, “I'm always going to give you things to improve on.” She said, “I'm working on things to improve on.” I guess that's always been my mindset from here forward is, even if I've been teaching 40 years, I'm still going to have things to improve on.

As Ceic illustrates in this story, the idea that we can somehow complete our learning as writing teachers is a view that is usually dispelled by the actual work of teaching. Her goal, though, transitioned into a mastery-in-view goal.

Phip similarly moved through this transition. Initially, Phip underestimated the ongoing need for teacher-learning. This view is most visible in his description of his decision to become a teacher. He explained that his plan was to “go do something in the world and come back.” He shared, “I thought it would be neat to come back to a classroom...and teach...Bring another kind of a life, with me, as a teacher.” His initial view of mastery shaped his decision to engage in a six-year career as a journalist prior to teaching. As the goal grew, though, to a mastery-in-view goal, Phip created teacher development goals that were directly connected to student success. For example, Phip aimed as a high school teacher to “develop a national reputation in competitions, [to develop] a top-flight journalism program.” As these examples illustrate, the development of this fuller goal helps teachers prioritize student learning.

Noticing the presence of this goal supports the development of pedagogical inquiry because it is a results-oriented goal. With this goal in mind, teachers aim to ensure that their problem-solving serves the goal of student results. Striving for



successful student learning is an important goal, which is why the mastery-in-view goal is rooted in good intentions. When we seek to master a certain area of our teaching, looking for specific kinds of results, we have ample opportunity to practice problem-solving.

But a focus on success can also limit pedagogical inquiry. A quest for observable results can flatten the complexity of teaching and learning. Whether a teacher perceives success or not, success as a measurement can foreclose inquiry. Phip shared, for example, how a “success/failure binary” can deceive. He shared, “When I feel good about a class that can also be just glossing over some smaller, subtler things that could have gone much better, and instead I just feel satisfied about it and I could let it boost me up for the day... [The success] doesn't invite reflexivity.” A focus on success, then, can contribute to dull perception, thereby stunting possibilities for inquiry. Experiencing success is important, but unexamined success can limit inquiry. Noticing the presence of a mastery-in-view goal in our teaching lives can help us pay attention to how success has or has not been examined.

Stories from Maggie and Daniel further illustrate how the privileging of success in institutions can limit teachers’ pedagogical inquiry. In one conversation, Maggie shared that the “promotional train” makes “it just easier to move forward [without questioning].” When success is achieved within a mastery vision for teacher development, the exigence for inquiry fades. We have less reason to inquire because our pedagogical questions can appear to have been resolved. This tension emerged in my conversations with Daniel, too. In our first meeting, Daniel shared a story about the absence of inquiry early in his career:

I can’t remember thinking about teaching then. I mean, I’m sure I had questions, like, “Okay, how do you conduct a parent-teacher conference?” in my first year, for example. I don’t remember asking anybody the question. I could have. I don’t remember being told how to think about it. I don’t remember anybody ever saying, “Hey, why don’t you read this article about—if nothing else, here’s an article from *Educational Leadership Magazine*,” or something... I can’t remember asking questions about teaching until 2006.

The year Daniel noted is the year he participated in a National Writing Project summer institute. In this environment, Daniel transitioned from thinking of himself as “a good teacher” to thinking of himself as a “teacher leader.” Prior to his participation in the writing project, Daniel had accomplished success as a teacher. He “liked [teaching] and even won a couple of teaching awards...[He] was liked by students and got good evaluations... [But there] was no one ever pushing [him].” Daniel’s work was considered successful—evidence for mastery—but he was not

engaging in rich inquiry at this point. He was not examining the consequences for his choices. Aiming for mastery, then, can allow a teacher to become content with perceived success.

### **Making an Impact, A Situated Goal**

A second shared goal that emerged in this study was teacher development aimed at making an impact in students' lives. Envisioning teacher development as a way to impact students' lives also values student success, but it does so in a more complex way. This goal, as articulated by the teachers, primarily seeks tailored pedagogical choices that enable nuanced educational gains. While a teacher aiming for mastery might locate success in an overall improvement in measurements of student learning, say from year-to-year, this goal of impact more closely tracks individual students and student populations. The goal aims for particular successes that are determined by the teacher. This goal accounts for the immediate learning and the impact of that learning in students' lives. Ceic articulated this goal when she said that the best teachers "are those who along the way fall, get back up, and figure out who they are and what's going to be the best way for knowledge to be had for their kids and themselves." Teachers seeking impact persistently seek the "best" way to reach particular learners and groups of learners. This search, however, is not a simple one. The teachers in this study were not looking for quick or easy answers—what we might loosely call "best practices." Best practices, as typically conceived, are supposed to work or are theoretically preferable despite the teaching context. The teachers in this study, though, search for an engaged and thorough understanding of the conditions shaping teaching and learning.

Noticing the presence of this goal can help teachers purposefully attend to their problem-posing. Daniel illustrated this engagement in a conversation we had after I observed his teaching. In this conversation, he shared that he is "always trying to figure out some way to give [students] feedback that doesn't take a week." To address this challenge, he considers the problem of students not completing assigned reading. He shared, "At this school and I think a lot of schools now, to get students to do homework is incredibly difficult." He then reflected upon his work with a specific student: "[S]he doesn't have any support at home. To say, okay take this and go home and begin answering a philosophical question about what friendship means in this novel, even if she has been reading, which I doubt she has. What do you do?" As Daniel's story shows, this goal for teacher development prompts teachers to account for and engage with a range of factors that influence students' learning. In this moment, Daniel does not aim to generate a generic solution; he tries to facilitate meaningful learning for students.

In a similar way, teaching for impact presses Maggie to dig deeper into her question about the relevance of writing. She illustrated this idea when she described how she first came to question the nature and relevance of writing

instruction. At her institution, Maggie was a member of a technology committee that first began to integrate computers into the composition program. Initially, Maggie did not anticipate that her work in this role would shift her thinking. Her commitment to teaching as impactful work, though, helped her understand the connections that prompted her current pedagogical inquiry. She described this transition in this way:

I didn't have a strong belief that [designing computer classrooms] was going to affect my pedagogy at the time... We looked at models across the country and then at that point we really started to think about the pedagogical implications of teaching writing with a computer classroom. The model was really to decentralize the teacher. The best thing about those labs was it... completely changed the teacher position. They were no longer up front in a lecture with desks facing them... because the computers were in a circle on the outside, on the perimeter of a room and they were looking away. Then we'd turn them around if you had to give some instruction... That immediately allowed... me to wander around and intervene a little bit earlier. We did a lot more writing on the spot. I mean I used to always give in class writings anyway, but it'd be pen and paper. Then they'd turn it in, and I'd read it later. I'd probably return it maybe with a comment or two. This allowed us to maybe put two people together and write collaboratively immediately changing the whole silo kind of writing... I don't think I started with [a] question at all because it was more like hey look at this cool tool. Now it's become so "Is this writing? Am I still teaching writing or am I doing something else?"

Maggie is committed to making her curriculum relevant to students' lives, so this change in classroom structure opened new questions about the purpose of writing instruction. As her description demonstrates, Maggie's goal for making an impact accounts for the on-the-ground situations. This thinking enabled her to reconsider the subject she is teaching. As these teaching experiences illustrate, this goal helps teachers understand and account for the ways that the conditions of teaching and learning shape the impact we aim to achieve.

Additionally, the teachers' stories show that making an impact is more than just accounting for challenging or changing teaching contexts. In the descriptions from the teachers, aiming to make an impact means confronting the tensions within these conditions. Phip illustrated attention to these complexities when he shared his concern "that a lot of African American males are not successful in [his] classes. As a white man, Phip has made it a goal to pay close attention to how he is engaging relationships with his African American male students. He commits himself to this noticing because he is committed to helping all students succeed, and he recognizes

the ways the personal experiences of students and teachers, as well as privilege, interact in complex ways within classrooms. These complexities matter to Phip because they influence the level of impact. Phip's working theory is that getting to know students' stories through engaged and sustained student-teacher relationships can help him understand more of these complexities. He shared in one conversation that if he can "know one story," he can "get glimpses into the complexity of [the] story [and] be less likely to make assumptions about students." He enacted this professional goal through his dissertation project, which was a narrative research project designed to study his advisor relationship with Greg, an African American student at his college. He knows, of course, that Greg's story is just one story, but he values the ways personal relationships can enable teachers' abilities to understand teaching and learning situations in more complex ways. The goal of impact, for Phip, involves seeking these deeper understandings.

This vision of teaching as impactful work is rich with opportunities for strengthening pedagogical inquiry. One of the greatest strengths of this goal is the way that it broadens the context for teaching and learning. Striving for teacher-led success in the mastery goal can lead to a narrow focus. Teachers might measure success from the results they observe from students in their classes or department, but it is difficult to connect their professional performance with student results beyond that scope. Striving for impact, though, extends well beyond the classroom. Phip explained this broadening in his own process of developing professional goals. He shared that one of the things that should concern teachers is "the persistence of...the achievement gap." There is, in other words, an ongoing lack of impact. As he explained, the problem is structural:

[Education is] built upon lots of historical, social, economic stuff that is just not quickly fixable. That, and also that good teachers don't necessarily teach good to all students. That's why, even if I think of myself as a good teacher with some students, I'm reminded that I can be a bad teacher to some students...I'm in a field where students are supposedly needing remedial work, and I think that's probably as a result of teachers not doing the remediation of themselves, the way they see students.

He noted that scholarship has helped him broaden his questions over time. His questions "have become broader in terms of the context where school takes place. In the community, in the economics, in the politics that a school setting is." These questions, ones operating from a goal of seeking impact require Phip to look at the larger picture in which education occurs. This broadening also brings attention to the consequences of our work, which is crucial for the problem-posing piece of pedagogical inquiry.

Just because this goal can prompt a teacher to examine larger, societal structures, though, does not mean that it necessarily will invite that kind of examination. Phip's conception of impact operates from a social justice approach to teaching, but we can, of course, imagine other world views that could similarly seek impact. In fact, one risk of this goal is the idea that teachers might operate from a deficit-oriented approach to students. We know the notion of "fixing" students stems from a deficit-oriented view of students. The problems we pose, then, are often framed within the lens of what we need to fix within students. In instances such as these, the problems we pose also need to be problematized for the assumptions that underlie why we consider them to be problems in the first place.

The teachers in this study provide a fuller view of teacher development that aims for greater impact. While impact can be conflated with successful results from students, the teachers in this study illustrate an engaged and nuanced conception of impact. This emphasis on impact is especially important in our current educational climate. These teachers show us that teachers, as agents of their development, are driven by inquiries that wrestle with the complex tensions present in teaching and learning. Teachers can learn and practice framing inquiries when they are able to critically examine the range of factors contributing to student learning, as well as the consequences of particular learning goals.

### **Refining Pedagogy, A Praxis-Oriented Goal**

Both prior visions for teacher development assume change. In the mastery goal, change is a tool for producing successful results. Teachers change their level of knowledge and/or kinds of teaching experiences to generate results. In the impact goal, change is an avenue for engaging the ever-changing learning contexts teachers inhabit. These changes help teachers create tailored pedagogical approaches that aim for a meaningful impact—either in the short or long term of students' lives and in the local or broad scope of education. This goal—teaching as refining pedagogy—also foregrounds change. The goal, however, focuses on process, rather than product. This goal prompts teachers to experiment and learn more about their conception of writing pedagogy.

A teacher working toward this goal may produce messier results, but the messiness is understood as part of the process of learning more about the nature of teaching writing. Phip illustrated this commitment when we discussed how we evaluate our own and others' teaching. He shared, "my confidence is in my process...it's not in these absolutes." When speaking with his colleagues about pedagogical inquiry, he expresses that his peers shouldn't necessarily "do it [his] way but [they should] at least [be] thinking about how [they] did [their] thing in class." Phip helps us recognize that teachers need opportunities to continually examine how and why their beliefs about teaching are enacted. We can understand that the choice to standardize approaches to teaching and learning is a choice that

limits opportunities for pedagogical inquiry, as it excludes examinations of the theoretical underpinnings present in our pedagogical choices.

It is important to note that change in this process-oriented goal is not haphazard. For the teachers in this study, this process is a refining one, aiming to sharpen a teacher's beliefs and actions. In this goal, prior, less polished versions of our teaching selves are valued because they are indicators of growth. Teacher development, like any developmental process, does not suggest we start at our "worst" and get "better." Each moment of the process—which may include regression and the need for renewal—is integral. The central belief, though, is that engagement in this non-linear process can bring about more refined understandings of the relationship between our teaching theories and practices.

Because this goal is a process-oriented one, it anticipates that teacher-learning will challenge both the ways we frame problems and create problem-solving approaches. Daniel shared, for example, that "there's a certain type of question you ask right after the class, which is a different question than you ask at the end of the day—or the next day or at the end of the term." The goal expects teachers to conceptualize teaching in new ways, given time and new perspectives. Daniel also asserted that "it probably takes an experienced teacher to start truly contemplating while you're working with this year's class or this day's class, how is this, what's happening now, is going to affect tomorrow or next semester or next year or five years from now when you're still teaching." This goal utilizes a sowing and reaping logic: Teacher-learning sponsors future teacher-learning, which is a logic that generates a desire for teacher-learning. Ceic explained, for example, that she possesses a great desire to develop as a teacher. She explained that it is critical for her to work in an environment that expects revision:

A lot of people...fall into a category where they just read out a textbook and give worksheets and don't ask questions. If that's all that's ever expected, that's all they're ever going to be. Because I've been in that climate before. Then you have that educator who wants to be more than a worksheet queen...[W]hen I interviewed here, that's what I told them. I said, "I want to be more than a worksheet queen. I want to be more"—I want to be someone more than just reading out of an anthology. I don't want to get comfortable because I think that that makes education stagnant.

In this description of her desire for revision, Ceic illustrates an important distinction between this goal and the prior goals. Ceic anticipates that her revisions will not only create more successful results or greater impact; she expects her views to shift. Otherwise her work as an educator will become "stagnant."

Noticing the presence of this goal helps us attend to the relationship between problem-posing and problem-solving. Consequently, this goal prioritizes "why"

questions. Daniel explained that a key shift in his teaching occurred when he began asking “why” questions. Early in his career, he does not remember making “pedagogical choices for [his] classroom, beyond thinking, ‘Oh, I think this would be cool and be fun for the students.’... [He] never really thought, Why would this be better than this? or How would this be more humane? or How would this be more compassionate? or, to speak in Dewey’s term, How would this be a better experience than this?” Maggie exemplified this same concern, saying that she wants to inquire into her teaching because she does not want to “stagnate or coast back.”

Noticing the presence of this goal for teacher development draws our attention to the dual outcomes of pedagogical inquiry. It can help teachers become more effective educators, but it can also help teachers contribute to disciplinary conversations about teaching and learning. Conceptualizing teacher development as an opportunity to refine pedagogical beliefs and practices is a goal that can help teachers become teacher-scholars. As teachers critically examine their beliefs about teaching and learning, as well as the teaching practices stemming from those beliefs, they are positioned to make pedagogical knowledge and share it with colleagues. This is different from models that seek to improve teachers without encouraging reflexive thinking. As Zeichner and Tabachnick (1991) have documented, the emphasis on promoting reflective teaching practices can become so commonplace that “the impression is given that as long as teachers reflect about something, in some manner, whatever they decide to do is alright since they have reflected about it” (2). This situation, as Zeichner and Tabachnick highlight, is problematic because not all questions about teaching and learning have equal relevance, significance, or consequence. Further, not all stakeholders agree on the questions that are most important for teacher reflection. Students, for example, may value different learning questions than a teacher. Therefore, envisioning teacher development as a journey that refines pedagogy is a goal that accounts for this range of perspectives and foregrounds the need for reflective and reflexive thinking.

### **Sustaining an Engaged Teaching Life, A Personal Goal**

A limitation of viewing teacher development as revisionary work is the way it assumes changes are inherently positive, moving us to clearer and better versions of our teaching beliefs and practices. While Maggie, in the quote above, shared that she does not anticipate stagnating, due to her revisionary view goal for teacher development, she also shared that it is “a concern, and life happens.” The goal of maintaining an engaged teaching life addresses this tension. In this goal, a teacher’s well-being is the aim because the goal acknowledges that teacher well-being fosters student learning. Teachers need to be able to make purposeful decisions about their personal resources, including time and quality of engagement in decision-making (Fox, 2000).

The teachers in this project help us understand that teacher well-being can be broadly defined, and part of the work of the goal is determining what well-being means for a teacher. Each of the teachers in the project illuminated different aspects of well-being. Daniel, for example, helps us consider how striking a balance between professional commitments and other aspects of life may be a part of well-being. While he acknowledged that the first year of a teacher's career will require a great deal to understand the "teaching context and the politics of being a teacher; the interpersonal stuff of being a teacher," teachers also need to "begin thinking, early, about how not to let [teaching] imbalance your life." While Daniel finds that many new teachers want to discuss "how to survive," he believes the question needs to shift to "How are you going to make it through the next five years [and beyond]?" Daniel shared a similar view when he described his views about teacher sustainability:

Why some people are good...or not good at [teaching], has nothing to do with test scores or anything like that, but about...the teacher's resilience. Now, of course, good leadership helps and healthy work environment, but a big part of it is also what a teacher is doing to come to grips with what happens each day. From everything from classroom management to interpersonal to the stuff you're bringing emotionally from your family life into your teaching days.

Maggie further illustrated this thinking by sharing that "family is very important to [her]," and she has "made a lot of decisions about work and career based on family." While this has been "tough" at times, this goal prompts Maggie to find a way to account for these commitments.

Aiming for well-being may also include discovering the professional environments that are most conducive. Ceic, for example, learned through her first teaching position that she had to be "someplace where they had the means to support [her] and make [her] better." She explained the need for new institutional structures:

They didn't have a lot of money to send you anywhere. They did what they could. I didn't have weekly meetings, and I didn't have someone at my hands to go ask questions or to give me things. Everything I created was on my own...While I knew I was a hard worker, and I was organized, and I had the drive, I still didn't have the academic base of knowledge from someone else, and so that's what worried me.

Mentorship and structured collaboration—two of the aspects Ceic listed as missing from her first position—are two central features of her current professional



environment. Phip also expressed his ongoing work to discover how to engage with his institution's environment, which values nurturing teachers. In this context, Phip has been "exploring" the boundaries of relationships with students and advisees, aiming to understand what he can do to help students "stay in school [and] continue to learn."

Noticing the aim of sustainability prompts teachers to make purposeful decisions about the kinds of challenges that are integral to the kind of work they are most committed to doing. One of the great assets of this goal is the way it helps teachers explore and define their mission for teaching. Every teaching context will provide a set of challenges and shape teachers' engagement with those challenges. This goal for teacher development, then, can help us pay better attention to our relationship to pedagogical inquiry in general. We can evaluate the kinds of questions we are positioned to address and our commitment to those questions.

### **Applications for Writing Teachers**

The teachers in this study help us understand how pedagogical inquiry that is initiated by teachers—as agents of their development—is linked to multiple goals for teacher development. These local examples are incredibly important in our current teaching conditions. Pressures for administrators to define teacher development for teachers flattens the complexity that is inherent in pedagogical inquiry. These teachers help us understand how the work of developing goals for teacher development is an avenue for learning and strengthening pedagogical inquiry. Each of these goals foregrounds different aspects of pedagogical inquiry, thereby providing a range of ways to practice pedagogical inquiry.

The four goals presented in this article can be used as a starting point for these conversations. As writing teachers identify their most important pedagogical questions, they can begin to articulate how their pursuit of these questions may shift under different goals for teacher development. Rather than simply considering how we might pursue our questions about teaching writing, we can consider how each goal will offer different kinds of practice engaging in problem-posing and problem-solving. As Table 2 illustrates, list-making may be a helpful way to make these connections explicit. For example, writing teachers can list the tasks they would assign themselves to address their own pedagogical question. Next, teachers can determine what kinds of goals for teacher development the tasks seem to serve. With this self-evaluation, then, teachers can consider how they might need or want to stretch themselves in other areas of inquiry. In my own practice, for example, this exercise helps me notice how I often emphasize the goal of refining pedagogy at the expense of other goals. It compels me, then, to consider ways I might enhance my overall pedagogical inquiry by devoting additional thought to the other kinds of goals.

This exercise can also help teachers re-see the professional development structures or activities that are established by their institutions. Expectations teachers resist may be reframed as contributions to overall growth in pedagogical inquiry. The opposite is also true. Teachers may discover that they wish to revise or challenge expectations that have been established by their institutions. Noticing the connection among teachers' goals, actions, and inquiry practice can help teachers explain how and why revisions would be beneficial.

**Table 2: Noticing Connections between Goals and Pedagogical Inquiry**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Questions for Categorizing Teacher-Learning Tasks</b>	<b>Inquiry Practice</b>
Mastering Teaching	Does this task help me better understand the end-in-view?  <i>Example:</i> Completing a close analysis of student work	Problem-Solving
Making an Impact	Does this task help me better understand the teaching and learning situation?  <i>Example:</i> Observing students within or beyond the classroom	Problem-Posing
Refining Pedagogy	Does this task help me better understand the nature of writing instruction?  <i>Example:</i> Preparing a professional conference presentation	Relationship between Problem-Posing and Problem-Solving
Sustaining an Engaged Teaching Life	Does this task help me better understand my relationship to my professional life?  <i>Example:</i> Meeting a colleague for a conversation	Relationship to Pedagogical Inquiry

Identifying these goals for teacher development can also be used in group settings. As groups of writing teachers reflect upon the questions they are pursuing and their methods for addressing these questions, they can look for the places that may be underdeveloped in their inquiry processes. Groups of teachers can also use this exercise to identify how the tasks they are required to complete or the tasks they assign themselves to complete relate to their collective goals for teacher development and inquiry. For example, many programs and groups of teachers are currently engaging in conversations about antiracist pedagogy. Identifying the connection among goals for teacher development, teacher-learning tasks, and inquiry practice can help teachers more critically discuss the assumptions, values,

and/or beliefs that are revealed in this process. Put another way, considering how the actions we take as teachers focus on particular aspects of pedagogical inquiry and serve particular goals for teacher development can affirm, challenge, or complicate the teacher-learning tasks and pedagogical practices that might otherwise remain unquestioned.

### **Implications for Writing Teacher Educators**

This study sought to contribute to our knowledge of how writing teachers and writing teacher educators might purposefully integrate our fields' principles for inquiry-oriented teacher development within the range of current teaching conditions. Additionally, though, the study reveals broader insights that are useful for writing teacher educators. First, the teachers' stories underscore the importance of engaging with preservice and practicing teachers as agents of their professional development. Each of the four goals outlined by the teachers in this study are grounded in the idea that teachers are engaged learners who direct their professional learning. While the teachers recognized the influence of workplaces on their professional learning, they did not expect others to direct their goals or processes for teacher development. This assumption contradicts approaches to teacher development that position teachers as technicians who need to be trained with generic or standardized professional development experiences. Prompting preservice and practicing teachers to identify and explore their pedagogical questions and goals can help them examine their expectations and assumptions about teacher-learning in teacher education and beyond. If preservice or practicing teachers expect teacher education to provide finite and/or final answers about teaching, teacher educators can coach them toward additional goals for teacher-learning. These conversations can help preservice and practicing teachers imagine more possibilities for their pedagogical questions and goals. For the teachers who already hold more complex views of teacher-learning, these conversations may prompt discussions about the multiple resources educators bring to their learning-to-teach process. As Gatti (2016) explains in *Toward a Framework of Resources for Learning to Teach*, "learning to teach might best be understood as the process of accessing sets of overlapping and distinct resources: programmatic, disciplinary, dispositional, experiential, and relational" (3). In theorizing this framework, Gatti argues that "teacher educators ought to be aware of what resources their students bring with them...and work with those as a starting point for students' learning-to-teach process" (55). We can better facilitate this process by asking learners to name their pedagogical goals and explore their pedagogical questions in the context of our assignments or professional development experiences.

Secondly, the presence of multiple (and sometimes competing) goals for teacher development highlight the complex and non-linear process of becoming a teacher. This insight is especially important when we consider the need to recruit

and support teachers from diverse backgrounds. Tarabochia (2020) has challenged writing teachers to examine “how our approaches determine access to knowledge production by facilitating the developmental trajectories of some more than others” (18). I believe this call also applies to writing teacher educators. We must remain mindful of the fact that our structures and approaches to writing teacher education will impact preservice and practicing teachers differently. Some structures or approaches, in fact, may function as a form of oppression. To support diverse pathways for becoming a writing teacher, we need to engage in the ongoing learning that is necessary to identify these differences and make revisions accordingly. We can also invite preservice and practicing teachers to engage in and share this analysis with others. Our course projects, for example, can include critical reflections that provide a space for learners to examine and critique the values that are embedded in the projects. In doing so, we can help learners articulate who they are becoming as teachers and partner with them in their journey to pursue pedagogical questions and goals within and against institutional structures.

Finally, I would argue that our field’s understanding of writing teacher development can be supported by further narrative inquiry research. Narrative inquiry allows researchers to understand how the process of learning to teach unfolds through relationships, contexts, and time. When conducted as praxis-oriented research, narrative inquiry allows researchers to study *and* sponsor teacher development. Clandinin and Connelly argue that “[t]elling stories of ourselves in the past leads to the possibility of retellings” (60). This revisionary work occurred multiple times throughout the study, thereby affirming the important activity of crafting and critically examining our narratives about teaching, writing, and learning to teach writing. Additional narrative inquiry research about writing teacher development can further illustrate how teachers navigate their learning-to-teach processes and how writing teacher educators can purposefully support their development.

Together, these implications challenge pervasive assumptions about teaching and learning. For example, the assertion that teachers are agents of their development challenges the notion that teaching is a skill that can be mastered through training. Similarly, the notion that teacher development is a complex and nonlinear process challenges the idea that professional growth can be measured in standardized ways. Writing teacher educators, however, often prepare or work with preservice and practicing teachers who confront such assumptions in their teaching contexts. For this reason, writing teacher educators have an important role in shaping how educators engage with these notions. The exercise of connecting our pedagogical questions and goals for teacher development is one concrete way to help teachers better understand and (perhaps) unravel their pedagogical beliefs, thereby providing an experience with inquiry-oriented teacher development that can shape teachers’ overall conceptions of teacher development.

## References

- Bamberg, Betty. "Creating a Culture of Reflective Practice: A Program for Continuing TA Preparation after the Practicum." *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*, edited by Betty P. Pytilik and Sarah Liggett, New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Buehler, Jennifer. "The Power of Questions and the Possibilities of Inquiry in English Education." *English Education*, vol. 71, no. 4, 2005, pp. 280-287.
- Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly. *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000.
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan L. Lytle. *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*. New York: Teachers College P, 2009.
- Dewey, John. *Experience and Education*. 1938. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
- . *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1949.
- Fecho, Bob, et al. "From Tununak to Beaufort: Taking a Critical Inquiry Stance as a First Year Teacher." *English Education*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2004, pp. 263-288.
- Fox, Roy F., editor. *Updrafts: Case Studies in Teacher Renewal*. Urbana: NCTE, 2000.
- Gallagher, Chris W. *Radical Departures: Composition and Progressive Pedagogy*. Urbana: NCTE, 2002.
- Gatti, Lauren. *Toward a Framework of Resources for Learning to Teach: Rethinking US Teacher Preparation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2016.
- Hillocks, Jr., George. *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice*. New York: Teachers College P, 1995.
- Kameen, Paul. *Writing/Teaching: Essays Toward a Rhetoric of Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2000.

- Kay Miller, Susan, et al. "The Composition Practicum as Professional Development." *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney Dorbin, Urbana: NCTE, 2005.
- Kinzy, Dana, and Deborah Minter. "The Dynamics of Teacher Development: Negotiating Where We Stand." *Pedagogy*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2008, pp. 481-494.
- Lather, Patti. *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/In the Postmodern*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Lee, Amy. *Composing Critical Pedagogies: Teaching Writing as Revision*. Urbana: NCTE, 2000.
- Meyer, Tom, and Mary Sawyer. "Cultivating an Inquiry Stance in English Education: Rethinking the Student Teaching Seminar." *English Education*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2006, pp. 46-71.
- Palmisano, Michael J. *Taking Inquiry to Scale: An Alternative to Traditional Approaches to Education Reform*. Urbana: NCTE, 2013.
- Qualley, Donna J. *Turns of Thought: Teaching Composition as Reflexive Inquiry*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1997.
- Ritchie, Joy S., and David E. Wilson. *Teacher Narrative as Critical Inquiry: Rewriting the Script*. New York: Teachers College P, 2000.
- Siebert, Shannon, et al. "Between Student and Teacher Roles." *Sharing Pedagogies: Students and Teachers Write about Dialogic Practices*, edited by Gail Tayko and John Paul Tassoni, Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1997.
- Simon, Rob. "'I'm Fighting My Fight, and I'm not Alone Anymore': The Influence of Communities of Inquiry." *English Education*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2015, pp. 41-71.
- Staunton, John A. *Deranging English/Education: Teacher Inquiry, Literary Studies, and Hybrid Visions of 'English' for 21st Century Schools*. Urbana: Urbana: NCTE, 2008.

- Stenberg, Shari J. *Professing and Pedagogy: Learning the Teaching of English*. Urbana: NCTE, 2005.
- Tarabochia, Sandra L. "Self-Authorship and Trajectories of Becoming." *Composition Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2020, pp. 16-33.
- Waite, Stacey. *Teaching Queer: Radical Possibilities for Writing and Knowing*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2017.
- Weinbaum, Alexandra, et al. *Teaching as Inquiry: Asking Hard Questions to Improve Practice and Student Achievement*. New York: Teachers College P, 2004.
- Zeichner, Kenneth M., and Robert Tabachnick. "Reflections on Reflective Teaching." *Issues and Practices in Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education*, edited by Robert Tabachnick and Kenneth Zeichner, New York: Falmer, 1991.

## Appendix A: Interview Questions for Identifying the Teachers' Pedagogical Questions

1. Can you tell me about a pedagogical question that has been important to you as a teacher of writing? This might be a question that keeps coming up over time.
2. How do you think about this question today?
3. When was the first time you can recall thinking about this question?
4. Where, how, and why did this question emerge?
5. Who were the important people in this story?  
Can you tell me stories about other times you've pondered this question? Again, where, how, and why did this question emerge? Who were the important people in this story?

## Appendix B: Questions for Narrative Analysis

1. How does this experience show us more about the inter- and intra-personal relations shaping the teacher's inquiry?
2. How does this experience show us more about the teacher's relationship to the question in the past, present, and anticipated future?
3. How does this experience show us more about the influence of place on the teacher's inquiry?