

7-2017

Prospective English Teachers Learn to Respond to Student Writing through the Student Writing Archive Project (SWAP)

Michael Sherry

University of South Florida, mbsherry@usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/tal_facpub



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Sherry, Michael, "Prospective English Teachers Learn to Respond to Student Writing through the Student Writing Archive Project (SWAP)" (2017). *Teaching and Learning Faculty Publications*. 81.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/tal_facpub/81

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Teaching and Learning at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching and Learning Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Prospective English Teachers Learn to Respond to Diversity in Students' Writing through the Student Writing Archive Project (SWAP)

Michael B. Sherry

Responding to students' writing is integral to English teaching. However, preservice secondary English teachers (PSETs) often have few opportunities to practice this skill or to see how experienced teachers respond to diverse writers. I built an online database of students' writing, teacher feedback, and teacher interviews; 32 PSETs in my English methods courses explored this database in conjunction with fieldwork in local classrooms. In this article, I analyze PSETs' database discussion-forum posts, comments on field-placement students' writing, and reflections about learning to provide feedback. Reading teachers' feedback positioned PSETs as students, evoking recollections about receiving teacher feedback, while writing their own feedback positioned them as teachers, evoking visions of what a writing teacher must do/be to claim authority in the classroom. All but two PSETs provided feedback of the kind they had claimed to hate. Those two adapted approaches they encountered in the database, learning to draw on their own writing histories as resources for responding with authority.

Responding to student writing is an integral part of the work of a high school English teacher. Indeed, a recent national study by Applebee et al. (2013) found that 80 percent of all secondary teachers, across disciplines, not only graded student writing but also responded to compositions with instructional feedback (p. 17). While responding to student writing is a crucial pedagogical practice, it is also challenging. Students come with various cultural/linguistic¹ backgrounds, yet they must meet state and national standards while writing in English. However, in my experience as an English teacher educator, I have noticed that mentor teachers tend to reserve this work for themselves rather than share it with their preservice mentees. As a result, during their student-teaching internships, preservice secondary English teachers (PSETs) often have few opportunities to practice strategies for responding to students' writing.

At my institution, as at others, it is not until the end of their undergraduate programs, after taking courses on literature and on education theory, that PSETs typically encounter pedagogical strategies particular to English language arts in their methods courses. While such English-focused courses usually include accompanying field experiences, during which PSETs visit local classrooms and interact with actual teachers and students, whether and how these field experiences are integrated with course assignments remains unclear (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995; Caughlan et al., 2017).² While most programs (like mine) have a writing pedagogies course, this class, too, may be separated from fieldwork; accordingly, discussion of teacher-response strategies often remains necessarily abstract (e.g., Tulley, 2013). Moreover, fieldwork during secondary teacher preparation may be limited: PSETs may visit only one or two classrooms near the university. Thus, they may have little exposure to students with various cultural/linguistic backgrounds, and even fewer opportunities to see more than one teacher's approaches to responding to writing.

Given these constraints, how might English teacher education programs support PSETs as they learn to respond to students' writing? To aid my research into this question, I created an online database (<http://23.21.225.52/>) called "The Student Writing Archive Project" (SWAP) for use in English methods courses.³ SWAP includes samples of students' writing provided, with permission, by English teachers working at various grade levels in different geographic/linguistic regions of the United States. Moreover, SWAP allows PSETs to view these samples both with and without English teachers' actual feedback on those compositions. PSETs can also peruse instructional materials related to students' work and read the English teachers' commentaries on how they approached responding to students' writing. Like an online library, SWAP thus allows PSETs to learn about responding to students' writing, without leaving their computers, by encountering multiple examples of teacher-response practices to actual students with various backgrounds and ability levels. In using SWAP with PSETs as a teacher educator, I have also designed several possible "paths" through the archive. Each begins with a common question about teacher response and leads users through a set of related links to examples of students' writing, teachers' feedback, and teachers' interview commentaries. For example, one such path asks, "How can a teacher respond sensitively to students with various cultural/linguistic backgrounds?"

In this article, I analyze the data generated in response to this question/path by two cohorts of PSETs as they used SWAP in a teacher-preparation

course that included a field experience. These data include posts made by the PSETs to the online discussion forums attached to each webpage in the SWAP archive; responses by the PSETs to students' writing that they collected, with permission, as student-teachers in local classrooms; and reflective essays that they then wrote about what they learned from using SWAP. Below, I contextualize this project in prior research, describe my methodology, and address findings/implications related to preparing PSETs to respond to compositions written by students with various cultural/linguistic backgrounds.

Background

Students' success in higher education and professional life depends greatly on secondary writing instruction, according to a Carnegie report and meta-analysis (Graham & Perin, 2007). In this report, writing instruction includes not only the design and presentation of instructional materials and assessments but also how teachers respond to students' writing. In fact, Applebee (1981) has suggested that teacher feedback on students' compositions is the primary means by which students learn and develop writing strategies. Much previous scholarship has addressed how college composition teachers provide feedback on undergraduate writing (e.g., Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Elbow & Belanoff, 1999; Horvath, 1994; Sommers, 1982; Straub & Lunsford, 1995). Ferris (2003) has synthesized a similarly impressive body of research on how teachers can respond effectively to the writing of postsecondary English language learners. However, research remains to be done on secondary teachers' responses to students' writing.

In the 1980s, two large-scale studies of secondary teachers' feedback on students' writing described effective approaches, suggesting that concise responses that did not "take over" students' work were both more appreciated by students and more successful at promoting substantive revision (Freedman, 1987; Hillocks, 1982). Yet some teachers experienced a conflict between their efforts to avoid appropriating students' texts and their perceived charge to provide language-level feedback, particularly to students for whom such responses might seem more necessary, such as English language learners (e.g., Reid, 1994). Since then, American classrooms have become more culturally/linguistically diverse and teachers more aware of the necessity of differentiating instruction (Saravia-Shore, 2008). More research is needed on secondary teacher-feedback practices that are sensitive to writers' cultural/linguistic backgrounds.

A recent position statement issued by the National Council of Teachers of English (e.g., 2016) on the preparation of writing teachers indicates

that knowing how to deliver “useful feedback, appropriate to the writer and the situation” is essential professional knowledge for teachers of writing. However, teacher response to students’ writing remains largely absent from syntheses of research on secondary methods courses, in general (e.g., Clift & Brady, 2005), and on secondary English methods, in particular (e.g., Brass & Webb, 2015). Further research is necessary on how PSETs can learn, during teacher preparation, to respond sensitively to writers with various cultural/linguistic backgrounds.

For example, many studies and teacher-education efforts have focused on how to prepare prospective teachers to capitalize on students’ home cultural/linguistic practices as they design literacy instruction (e.g., Delpit, 1995; González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995). As an extension of this work, more research is needed that focuses specifically on how to prepare teachers to *provide feedback on students’ writing* that is culturally relevant and treats students’ home cultural/linguistic practices as a resource (rather than a deficit). In the absence of such preparation, studies have found that preservice English teachers may revert both during and after their teacher-preparation programs to more traditional practices of writing instruction, even pedagogical approaches about which they had previously expressed negative feelings (Grossman et al., 2000). For example, Sherry and Roggenbuck (2014) found that, despite having decried their former teachers’ focus on language conventions rather than on idea development or purpose, PSETs in a writing-pedagogies course initially exercised that same pedagogical approach when given the opportunity to respond to actual students’ writing. The present study offers one explanation for why this default approach happens and what teacher educators might do to counteract it.

Theoretical Framework

When teachers respond to students’ writing, they engage with those compositions in a particular time and place, with certain tools available for responding, including pedagogical knowledge, methods, and values, as well as communications technologies. The details of this social situation enable and constrain what kinds of teacher responses are possible and appropriate. However, teachers may also draw on their own prior experiences with reading, writing, writers, and writing teachers as they compose feedback; for example, they may repurpose advice that they, themselves, received as students. Further, teachers may imagine the students to whom their feedback is directed and explicitly craft their responses to appeal to those audiences. Thus, teachers’ responses to students’ writing can be “dialogic”: “filled with

others' words . . . which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 89), and also "directed to someone . . . in anticipation of encountering [a] response" (pp. 94–95). Much prior research has applied Bakhtinian dialogism to studies of oral classroom discourse in secondary schools (Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, & Gamoran, 2003; Juzwik, Sherry, Caughlan, Heintz, & Borsheim-Black, 2012; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997; Sherry, 2014, 2016). These studies have examined how teachers can promote participation in dialogic, whole-class discussions by responding in ways that invite students to draw on what others have already written or said as they refine their own arguments. This goal is equally important for teacher responses to students' writing.

However, not all feedback is dialogic in these ways. For example, Sommers (1982) found that "there seems to be among teachers an accepted, albeit unwritten canon for commenting on student texts" (p. 153), noting that teachers often responded in the same ways to the same aspects of student texts (e.g., with language-level corrections), regardless of the writer, the stage of the writing process, or the rhetorical situation. Teacher feedback that is disconnected from the cultural/linguistic particularities of present audiences and purposes is, in Bakhtin's terms, "externally authoritative," rather than "internally persuasive" or "open [to] new contexts that dialogize it [and] reveal ever new ways to mean" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 346)—put differently, such feedback is imitated rather than reinvented for particular interpretive/communicative situations. PSETs, with little previous practice at responding to students' writing (much less in ways sensitive to cultural/linguistic differences), may be prone to such reflexive application of an authoritative discourse of teacher response that they first encountered as students.

Drawing on Bakhtin, researchers Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain (1998) suggest that "people are exposed to competing and differentially powerful and authoritative discourses and practices of the self" and that these "specific cultural discourses and practices . . . [then become] . . . media around which socially and historically positioned persons construct their subjectivities in practice" (pp. 29–32). As PSETs negotiate authoritative and internally persuasive discourses of writing-teaching practices, those discourses shape not only how they can respond to students' writing but also who they may *become* in giving pedagogical feedback.

In responding to students' writing, teachers may imagine an authorial teaching persona that their feedback will present to readers, in addition to the (particular) character of the student on whose composition they are commenting. Holland et al. (1998) call these figures of the writing teacher and student writer "figurative identities" insofar as they are generic char-

acters derived from available cultural resources (e.g., novels, movies, TV shows). However, in composing their feedback, teachers may also invoke their status as classroom authorities, and may even try to consolidate or distribute the power and control conferred to their instructional role, an example of what Holland et al. (1998) refer to as “positional identities.” In thus interpreting and possibly relating salient figurative and positional identities, teachers may also draw heavily on personal experiences, which Holland et al. (1998) label “history-in-person.” Together, these three kinds of identity are contextualized and made meaningful and actionable by the “figured world” of writing teaching in U.S. public secondary schools, which is also the product of social and cultural activities over time. In short, this figured world organizes and construes not only PSETs’ words and actions but also their identities—identities whose meanings depend on cultural roles, social positions, and personal-historical experiences that may intersect or even conflict as they respond to students’ writing.

In what follows, I examine how PSETs learned to respond to writers with diverse cultural/linguistic backgrounds by analyzing whether and how PSETs transformed authoritative discourses organized by the figured world of traditional writing teaching in U.S. public secondary schools into discourses that were also internally persuasive. These were discourses of *writing-teaching activities*: for example, I note what kinds of teacher responses—and pedagogical approaches—they found to be possible and appropriate (and why) through analyses of their online posts about the SWAP materials, their reflections on teacher feedback observed at their local school field placements, and their own written comments on field-placement students’ writing. These discourses also evoked *writing-teacher identities*: for example, I attend to the cultural figures (e.g., teacher, student), social positions (e.g., reader, writer), and personal-historical models (e.g., their former student selves, their field-placement teachers, and the students/teachers they encountered in the SWAP database), with whom the participants (dis)identified in their reflections.

Methodology

In this section, I describe my study design and how I used SWAP within the context of my English methods course (a comprehensive course separate from the writing pedagogies class) at Hillside University (HU).⁴

Site Selection

During my study, HU shared many characteristics with other institutions and their teacher-preparation programs across the country. HU is a former

normal school located in a Northeastern U.S. county that, in 2013–14, was 88 percent European American and relied largely on manufacturing, construction, and agrarian industries. PSETs at HU visited local classrooms as a required part of their teacher-preparation program, typically for junior- and senior-year coursework. Though this coursework included instruction in linguistics and writing pedagogies, these classes also enrolled students of other majors (e.g., creative writing) and did not require field placements in local schools. Moreover, the schools PSETs visited were often ones they had attended as secondary students. Additionally, local school partners tended to provide limited exposure to students of diverse cultural/linguistic backgrounds. For example, in 2013–14, PSETs from my senior English methods courses visited (usually in pairs) eight local secondary school field placements, typically attending the same middle school or high school class once a week during the 15-week semester of our course. Of these eight field placements, five were located within a 10-mile radius of HU; all but one enrolled primarily European American students from the surrounding rural areas. The one exception was an urban high school located an hour away where two (commuter) students had arranged a field placement closer to their homes. This school served a largely African American and Latino/Latina student population. Despite the relative lack of diversity at local school field placements, a recent five-year departmental review has indicated that HU graduates often found teaching jobs in various geographic/linguistic regions across the United States, including not only Coastal Southern and Upper Midwestern regions but also in-state Midland cities with much greater cultural/linguistic diversity.⁵ Thus, like many other institutions/programs, HU's English teacher-preparation program offered PSETs the chance to interact with actual students at local field sites. However, HU graduates who go on to teach in other counties, states, and regions may face the challenge of responding to more culturally/linguistically diverse students' writing than they have previously encountered during English teacher preparation.

In contrast, the SWAP database materials (students' writing, teachers' written feedback, and teacher-interview transcripts) from the "path" of related links on which I focus here were generated at an urban middle school in a large, upper-Midwestern city. In 2014, the city was approximately 60 percent European American, 25 percent African American, and 13 percent Latino/Latina. However, middle school teacher Sami Ghanem's combined seventh/eighth-grade ELL class included all nonnative students (including one who had never attended school before the previous year) with seven different cultural/linguistic backgrounds. The materials from Ghanem's class, which the PSETs at HU encountered in the SWAP database, thus provided

more opportunities to engage with writing, writers, and writing teaching associated with cultural/linguistic diversity than what was available at their local field placements.

Participant Selection

The demographics of PSETs at HU reflected those of the university and of the teaching profession. In 2013, HU served approximately 10,000 students, of whom 88 percent came from within the state; only 11 percent were students of color, according to institutional research. Moreover, like many practicing teachers (Zumwalt & Craig, 2008), most PSETs at HU were white women, including 28 of 32 in the two cohorts who participated in my study. Based on the demographics of their cohorts, the PSETs thus had relatively little experience with cultural/linguistic diversity, a fact their posts and reflections often echoed explicitly.

During my analyses, two exceptional PSETs emerged as focal cases. Callie Lombardi was born in South Korea and later adopted by European American parents from an affluent suburban town in a Northeastern state that neighbors HU. Adam Llewellyn was home-schooled until high school by local parents with European American and Puerto Rican backgrounds. Lombardi's and Llewellyn's cultural/linguistic backgrounds, as well as their experiences as students, distinguished them from the majority of their classmates, as did their response practices.

Middle school ELL teacher Sami Ghanem (whose materials are central to the SWAP database path on which I focus here) is also exceptional. Ghanem grew up in Lebanon, attending school in that country's French educational system⁶ before completing her undergraduate studies in the United States. Ghanem's cultural/linguistic background—as an ELL teacher who is herself a nonnative speaker of English and a former ELL student—figured not only in her interview commentary about her feedback practices but also in her responses to those students whose writing appears among the links in the SWAP path. Indeed, many of the PSETs who followed this SWAP path remarked in their online posts and reflections on the connections that Ghanem made between her identities as former K–12 student and current writing teacher.

Data Collection

I generated data in fall 2013 and fall 2014 with two HU cohorts—32 PSETs, of whom 14 chose to follow the cultural/linguistic diversity path through SWAP. The PSETs made use of SWAP during my senior English-teaching methods course as part of an assignment that also involved work at local field

placements. As part of the assignment, each of the PSETs initially collected a class set of students' writing from their field-placement classrooms. Then, they used the SWAP database. If they elected to follow the cultural/linguistic diversity path, they first read Ghanem's seventh/eighth-grade ELL students' writing (without teacher feedback), posted on SWAP. Second, they read Ghanem's interview transcript about the written responses that she had provided on those compositions, together with the same students' writing samples, this time with Ghanem's feedback made visible. PSETs could move freely back and forth among the artifacts on this path. In addition, on each page they visited in the SWAP database, PSETs could post reactions to the online discussion forum embedded in that page. After completing the SWAP path, PSETs returned to their field-placement students' writing, choosing three samples on which to write teacher feedback. Finally, they wrote reflective essays that synthesized their experiences across the steps of this process. The 14 PSETs' posts, reflections, and responses to their field-placement students' compositions thus formed the datasets on which I based my analyses.

Data Analysis

My analyses of these three data sources involved comparisons within each dataset (e.g., SWAP discussion-forum posts) and across datasets (e.g., SWAP discussion-forum posts compared with the PSETs' actual responses to their field-placement students' writing), as well as my subsequent analyses of the cases of Callie Lombardi and Adam Llewellyn. For all 14 PSETs who pursued the cultural/linguistic diversity path, I noted trends in content and form within their 31 online discussion-forum posts about Ghanem's SWAP materials; within their 14 reflective essays (each 3–7 pages long); and within their 137 responses to field-placement students' writing. Across datasets, I also compared the PSETs' SWAP posts/reflections with their actual feedback to writers from local classrooms.

During my analyses, I first noticed that PSETs often seemed to identify with students in their SWAP posts about Ghanem's feedback (e.g., "I liked that she chose to do it this way because I am a visual learner and this method would prevent me from feeling overwhelmed"), as well as in their reflections about feedback practices at their field placements (e.g., "I know that personally, I respond better to substantial feedback rather than the kinds of comments I saw on the students' work"). These identifications with the *positional identity* of "student" were often accompanied by stories of their *history-in-person* as student of writing (e.g., "in high school—or in mine at least—there wasn't a lot of variety at all when we as students got

feedback”). I also noted moments when the PSETs (dis)identified with the teacher providing the feedback, such as Ghanem or their field placement teachers (e.g., “Teachers often make the mistake of just writing generic phrases throughout their students’ writing” or “if a teacher shares with his/her students, the students may share with the teacher”). Although such posts usually appeared in response to specific people and practices documented on SWAP or recalled from PSETs field placements, their generalized quality marked these as (dis)identifications with the *figurative identity* of “teacher.”

PSETs’ evocation of these identities (positional, history-in-person, figurative) sometimes seemed to conflict—even within the same post/reflection:

I remember as a High school student, I never really received feedback that was useful. If anything, it was usually just a bunch of words or phrases crossed out, or generic statements like “good” or “need more detail” that often failed to address, 1.) What specific aspects of my writing I needed to improve on or 2.) A method that I might take in order to actually go about improving my writing. As a future English Teacher, I really want to be able to help my students grow as writers, and I know that one of the best ways to do this is to provide students with feedback that not only tells my students what aspects of their writing need work, but also shows my students *how* they can go about improving these weaker aspects in order to strengthen their own writing.

For example, in this quote, a PSET makes assertions about her values and “best” practices as a teacher while also identifying with students/writers. I read these conflicts as dialogic struggles among figurative identities (what a teacher should do/be), histories-in-person (prior experiences as a student of writing), and positional identities (attempts to claim/reject authority), as the participants grappled with externally authoritative discourses of teacher response (e.g., a focus on mechanics without regard for purpose, audience, genre, authorial voice) and attempted to transform them into internally persuasive discourses of practice and identity (e.g., responsive to the specifics of the writing, the writer, and their notion of themselves as writing teachers).

Researcher Positionality

I am a European American man from a suburban town in a Northeastern state that neighbors HU. A former secondary English teacher, I also taught for four years at an international school in France. Most of the students there had grown up overseas; some came from families that spoke little English; all had studied at least three other languages beyond English—French and two foreign languages—as part of the school’s required curriculum. As a

teacher—and before that, a study-abroad student—in a foreign country, I also grappled with the challenges of writing in a language that was not my own. Thus, I have firsthand experience with the necessity of responding sensitively to writing by students who are multilingual/multicultural.

As designer of the SWAP database and instructor of the English methods course, I naturally had a vested interest in the positive outcomes of the assignment that is central to this article. To mitigate this bias, I waited until after the course had ended, and indeed, until after the participants had all graduated, to request their permission to begin my analyses of how the PSETs learned to respond to cultural/linguistic diversity in student writing.

Findings

In their SWAP discussion-forum posts and their final reflections, most of the PSETs (i.e., 10/14) seemed to react from a student perspective, identifying with students as they read other teachers' feedback. For example, some reacted as students to the kinds of comments provided in the SWAP materials by ELL teacher Sami Ghanem, noting, "I loved the specificity of Ghanem's feedback. . . . I remember as a high school student, I never really received feedback that was useful." Others reacted as students to the feedback practices of their collaborating teachers at local field placements with observations such as the following:

I collected a set of student writing with feedback from Mr. B and was a little disappointed. . . . I know that personally, I respond better to substantial feedback rather than the kinds of comments I saw on the students' work, such as, "Good job!" "Good parallelism!" "Great quote!"

Indeed, the process of reading other teachers' responses to students' writing seemed to position the PSETs as students, rather than as teachers, regarding the figured world of traditional U.S. public secondary school writing teaching.

This identification with students in reading teacher feedback may seem unsurprising, given that the PSETs regularly participated in university courses as well as in the local secondary schools they visited as "student-teachers." Moreover, they had far more experience as students with reading teacher responses to their own writing. However, while most of the PSETs identified with students in their SWAP discussion-forum posts and final reflections about *reading* other teachers' feedback, they took a different perspective when *writing* responses to actual field-placement students' writing. For example, in reading Ghanem's feedback, 10 out of 14 PSETs made admiring comments, noting for example that she "not only gave caring support, but

reached into the student's personal culture and wrote something relatable to that specific student," thereby "showing her students that she also struggled with these English rules, [which] allows her students to feel comfortable, rather than embarrassed over their mistakes." However, only 25 of the 137 written responses the PSETs provided on students' writing collected at

their field placements similarly identified with students. Much more common was feedback such as, "You need a little more support/details. You are getting your point across, just a little more development ☺," in which the PSET gave minimal comments and nonspecific praise/corrections to the writer. This lack of specificity in their feedback was notable given that most of the PSETs attended their field placements for more than the required one hour per week, and that a parallel assignment asked them to collect specific

While most of the PSETs identified with students in their SWAP discussion-forum posts and final reflections about reading other teachers' feedback, they took a different perspective when writing responses to actual field-placement students' writing.

data about the community, school, curriculum, class, teacher, and students leading up to a lead-teaching experience. But this trend was especially striking given that these were often the same kinds of teacher feedback the PSETs had described as "never . . . useful" and "disappoint[ing]" in their own experiences as students. In short, while most of the PSETs identified with students in their posts/reflections, and appreciated the way Ghanem did the same in her written feedback to students, few of the PSETs responded to students' writing in ways that were tailored to individual writers, much less sensitive to their cultural/linguistic backgrounds. The similarity and prevalence of the kinds of responses they did make suggested that this feedback was associated with a consistent and powerful discourse—perhaps one they had repeatedly encountered as students—that they reflexively applied to their own responses to students' writing. Put differently, in the process of responding to students' writing, most of the participants resorted to a limited set of externally authoritative practices associated with teacher response, despite the fact that these traditional feedback practices contradicted their own history-in-person feedback preferences as writers.

However, not all of the PSETs responded to students' writing in this way. In the subsections that follow, I address data from two particular cases: Callie Lombardi and Adam Llewellyn. These PSETs' SWAP discussion-forum posts and final reflections resembled those of their classmates and also revealed some of the same tensions between preferences from a student perspective and practices associated with traditional discourses of teacher response. However, their comments did not exhibit the same trend toward

vague, language-level feedback. I analyze data from these two PSETs to better understand why their responses differed and how they learned to respond more sensitively to cultural/linguistic diversity in students' writing.

Callie Lombardi

Below, I analyze the posts, reflections, and comments of one PSET, Callie Lombardi, as evidence of how she learned to respond more sensitively to cultural/linguistic diversity in students' writing. I address Lombardi's SWAP discussion-forum posts and reflections about her negative reactions to the feedback practices she observed at a local field placement, her positive reactions to Ghanem's response practices detailed on the SWAP website, and her ambivalent recollections of an intensive six-week student-teaching practicum with ELL students, which Lombardi had completed as part of another university program. Interwoven with these recollections and reactions were memories of her own experiences as a student. In her written responses to field-placement students' writing, she attempted to show genuine interest in students' activities while still providing language-level feedback with explicit explanations.

Of the response practices she observed at her field placement, Lombardi wrote: "My collaborating teacher's feedback was minimal. She circled and crossed out words without explanation. Looking at the feedback from a students' perspective, I would be confused as to why a word was circled or a sentence was crossed out. . . . [So] I decided to include my own comments." Like many of her peers, Lombardi aligned herself with the positional identity of student in reading her host teacher's feedback practices, expressing her distaste for nonspecific, language-level feedback that did little more than correct a student's diction. Her reaction suggested that vague, language-level feedback, from a student's perspective, was a problematic (though not surprising) practice. Indeed, 10 out of 14 PSETs observed the same practice—circling or marking words and phrases with little accompanying explanation—at their field placements, and many (including Lombardi) remarked on how this resembled their own student experiences with receiving feedback: "usually it was just a 'good job' or 'good work'—nothing too specific to the student." Thus, like her peers, Lombardi seemed to associate this practice with an externally authoritative discourse of teacher response in the figured world of traditional U.S. public secondary school writing teaching.

Lombardi reacted differently to Ghanem's responses. In Lombardi's SWAP posts, she admired the way Ghanem sensitively responded by identifying with the student:

Another time Ghanem wrote feedback that was relevant to the student is when she reminded a student to use capital letters. She wrote, “Remember to start all sentences with capital letters. I know this can be hard because there are no capital letters in your language . . . just like mine! We get better at this with practice.” I thought this feedback was personal and encouraging.

Lombardi appreciated the way Ghanem responded sensitively to a student whose home language (Nepali) has no capital letters, and did so by drawing on her own experience as a speaker of a language without capital letters (Lebanese Arabic). In this way, Ghanem used her own history-in-person as an ELL student to offer critical language-level feedback, thereby claiming positional authority as a teacher in a way that was nevertheless “encouraging.”

Lombardi also noted that Ghanem’s comment used “we” and “did not tell the student s/he was wrong” but rather pointed out “a difference between languages that she also experiences.” That is, Ghanem’s response did not claim positional authority by invoking an externally authoritative discourse—one that ignored the student’s personal history. Ghanem’s feedback thus offered Lombardi an admirable example of how a teacher might provide language-level feedback in a way that was nevertheless sensitive to the writer’s cultural/linguistic background. Put differently, Lombardi appreciated how Ghanem claimed positional authority as a writing teacher by drawing on her history-in-person as a student of writing. Lombardi’s reactions to Ghanem’s materials suggested that she saw these practices as positive alternatives to the traditional approach to teacher feedback evidenced at her field placement. Ghanem’s example thus allowed Lombardi to refigure the practices of teacher response.

Like Ghanem, Lombardi attempted to identify with students in her teacher feedback on their narratives about their activities outside of school. For example, she “wrote little side comments responding to the events the students were describing.” In response to one student’s description of his outdoor activities, she wrote “Wow! Sounds like fun!” noting that, “Writing little side comments shows students that I am engaged in their writing and that I am actually reading it for the content and not just the conventions.” Although she noted that “students often spell words incorrectly, confuse grammatical elements, and have trouble with sentence structure,” rather than just circling or crossing out words, she made sure—as Ghanem had—to “explain why I am circling a sentence or a word. . . . For instance, if a student used ‘its’ in possessive form instead of ‘it’s.’” In reflecting on her feedback, Lombardi wrote:

I think it is important to be just as sensitive attending to these students' work because although I made the assumption that my students are homogenous, [they] culturally all come from different backgrounds. One thing I noticed in my placement is that the students' families enjoy a more rural way of life. They enjoy hunting and outdoors activities. . . . As a teacher, I need to be sensitive to their cultural differences.

Unlike Ghanem's students, the field-placement students to whom Lombardi responded were not English language learners. Nevertheless, in her responses to field-placement students' writing, Lombardi attempted to identify with students, as Ghanem had, by recognizing and appreciating the cultural content of their writing while still providing language-level feedback that included explicit explanations. However, Lombardi did not achieve Ghanem's smooth blend of encouraging and critical feedback, nor did she employ the technique she had admired in Ghanem's comments of drawing directly on her own experiences as an ELL student. Put differently, Lombardi's feedback attempted to engage students' personal histories while she offered critical feedback, but did not claim positional authority as a writing teacher by invoking her history-in-person as a student of writing.

Born in South Korea and adopted at age seven by European American parents, Lombardi grew up in an affluent, suburban, primarily white neighborhood:

All of my friends were Caucasian and at times, I forgot I was physically any different. . . . I never had anyone pull their eyes back mimicking my eye shape or call me slurs or make fun of Asian culture to me. . . . In the back of my mind, I did wonder, "Who am I? Am I Asian-American? Am I just Asian? Or am I just Callie?"

Although (or perhaps because) she grew up surrounded by European American, native speakers, Lombardi had firsthand experience as a student whose cultural/linguistic identities differed from those of her peers. Despite this, she had struggled before the SWAP assignment with the question of how to respond sensitively to writers of various backgrounds, as she explained in her reflective essay:

After I completed my practicum at Eastern Middle School, I was exposed to the diversity I did not experience growing up. I worked with many diverse students—but what specifically stuck out to me were the English Language Learners. They struggled in their academics because of the language differences between English and their own language. Reflecting on these differences, I often wondered how would I give feedback to these students that is encouraging, accepting, but at the same time critical?

As a student, Lombardi had learned a new language; despite the positives of these experiences, they caused her to “forget” aspects of herself and to question her cultural identity/ies. Yet these experiences had also shaped her sense that a teacher should be “critical” of students’ “language differences” to help them succeed academically. Lombardi’s recollections of her childhood experiences and of her student-teaching practicum revealed a tension between her perspective as a student and her sense of what a teacher should do/be in responding to students’ writing. That is, Lombardi’s history-in-person feedback preferences as a student of writing conflicted with the figurative identity of writing teacher she had held until she encountered Ghanem’s example.

Ghanem’s strategic use of her own complex cultural/linguistic experience (as a Lebanese, nonnative English speaker who went on to become an ELL teacher) was especially important for Lombardi, whose relationship to her cultural/linguistic identity was less clear. Toward the end of her reflective essay, Lombardi wrote, “I also loved how Ghanem sometimes referred

Lombardi saw that a teacher could invoke her cultural/linguistic experiences as an ELL student to respond both encouragingly and critically to writers—that her history-in-person as a student of writing could be a resource for claiming positional authority as a writing teacher.

to herself and her experiences in learning English as a second language. . . . If teachers have a clear sense of their own cultural identity, they will be better prepared to provide feedback that is in return sensitive to their students’ cultural differences.” In Ghanem’s example, Lombardi saw that a teacher could invoke her cultural/linguistic experiences as an ELL student to respond both encouragingly and critically to writers—that her history-in-person as a student of writing could be a resource for claiming posi-

tional authority as a writing teacher. To become a writing teacher, Lombardi need not adopt externally authoritative response practices she had hated as a student. Lombardi’s engagement with Ghanem’s example thus refigured not only Lombardi’s teacher-response practices but also her notion of writing-teacher identity in a way that was internally persuasive.

Above, I have addressed Callie Lombardi’s SWAP discussion-forum posts, final reflection, and responses to field-placement students’ writing to describe how she learned to respond more sensitively to cultural/linguistic diversity in students’ writing. Like her classmates, Lombardi noted in her posts/reflection the teacher-response practices she found objectionable and admirable. However, unlike most of her peers, Lombardi’s responses to students’ writing avoided the authoritative discourse of the practices she had despised and exhibited some of the techniques she had admired.

Like Ghanem, she attempted to identify with students in giving feedback, responding to their descriptions of their cultural activities outside of school with encouraging comments that focused on content, not just conventions; she also included language-level criticisms accompanied by explicit explanations. Unlike Ghanem, Lombardi did not directly invoke her own experiences as ELL writer in her responses to field-placement students; however, these students were not ELLs, and this technique may not have been contextually appropriate. Nevertheless, Lombardi's reflection suggested that she had found in Ghanem's example a new figurative identity of writing teacher—one for whom history-in-person as a student could be a resource for claiming positional authority as a teacher. Instead of a prescriptive, externally authoritative approach to teacher feedback, which encouraged students to assimilate to another language and identity, Lombardi found in Ghanem's example a more internally persuasive means of responding to students' writing, which recognized the complexity of linguistic identities/performances. Perhaps, like Ghanem, one did not have to choose between being an American and a hyphenated American, between empathizing with students and responding with authority as a teacher.

Adam Llewellyn

In what follows, I analyze the SWAP discussion-forum posts, final reflection, and responses to field-placement students' writing of another PSET, Adam Llewellyn, as evidence of how he learned to provide feedback more sensitive to students' cultural/linguistic diversity. In particular, Llewellyn expressed his distaste in his SWAP discussion-forum posts and final reflection for a focus on mechanics at the expense of writers' voices, a bias he observed at his field placement. However, he admired Ghanem's explicit explanations concerning diction. His SWAP discussion-forum posts/reflection included recollections of his experiences as a student of writing. In his written responses to field-placement students' writing, he attempted to indicate explicitly to writers why certain rhetorical choices seemed appropriate for their audiences and purposes.

Like many of his peers, Llewellyn was disappointed by the emphasis on mechanics over voice at his field placement. In an early SWAP discussion-forum post, he wrote:

I do believe that grammar and mechanics are important, but . . . perhaps the primary focus of the grading process should not be grammatical. Students may have a really strong voice and creative use of figurative language that is noteworthy, but if all that teachers address is their mechanics, [students],

like myself, start to undervalue the strengths to which their unique cultural or linguistic background may have predisposed them.

Although Llewellyn recognized the necessity of providing language-level feedback, he imagined that students would react negatively to a “primary focus” on grammar. Like other participants (including Lombardi), he aligned himself with the positional identity of student in reading other teachers’ feedback. Llewellyn’s “like myself” further indicated that in his history-in-person as a student of writing, an over-emphasis on mechanics, at the expense of other elements of writing, was a negative practice he associated with an externally authoritative discourse of teacher response.

In contrast, Llewellyn admired the way Ghanem’s language-level feedback attended sensitively to students’ cultural/linguistic differences with explicit explanations. For example, Llewellyn noted how, in response to a Chinese student with musical aspirations, Ghanem wrote, “Wow! I wish I knew how to play guitar. I bought a guitar for [my daughter] and hope she will become a guitar player in the future.” She then drew an arrow from “bought” and explained “bought is the past tense of buy.” Here, Ghanem’s compliment also illustrated the use of past tense in English for this native speaker of Chinese, a language in which verb tenses are often not expressed grammatically. By offering language-level feedback, Ghanem claimed positional authority as a writing teacher, but she did so by commenting on her own response, without applying an externally authoritative discourse that emphasized mechanics at the expense of the student’s expression of personal interests and expertise. In his SWAP discussion-forum post, Llewellyn applauded how Ghanem’s response avoided “mere error checking” of the Chinese student’s (mis)use of verb tenses in his personal narrative, instead creating a “teachable moment” in which she could point to a pattern in her own writing as a model of how to use different verb tenses in this genre. Llewellyn’s SWAP posts about Ghanem’s feedback suggested that these techniques revealed positive alternatives for him to the traditional discourse of teacher feedback he had noted at his field placement. Llewellyn’s engagement with Ghanem’s example showed him that a teacher could honor a writer’s voice while explicitly demonstrating why mechanics mattered to expressing oneself for a particular audience and genre.

In his reaction to Ghanem’s feedback for the guitar player, Llewellyn also recalled personal experiences with “my bilingual cousins [who] were adjusting to speaking more English than they were used to during a trip I had taken to Puerto Rico. Like this student, they placed English words and substitutions within the confines of . . . Spanish. . . . While they still articu-

lated their point conversationally, in an academic setting, such substitutions and inclusions could be very confusing.” Here, Llewellyn seemed to suggest the importance of instruction in language conventions appropriate to a particular academic context, especially for ELLs. He expanded this anecdote in his final reflection to include another, more personal example from his student experiences. Homeschooled until high school, Llewellyn recalled feeling frustrated that his peers “seemed to be literate in an entirely different language of academic writing” while he had “little familiarity with these ‘five-paragraph essays’ that I now saw so much of.” Over time, he was “passively communicated a list of invisible expectations that I only arrived at by trial and error.” And though he learned to write school genres such as the five-paragraph essay and earned excellent grades, he also “lost interest in putting myself into my writing.” Thus, while Llewellyn recognized, from a teacher’s perspective, the importance of explicit instruction in the conventions and types of writing appropriate to an academic context, this perspective clashed with his experience, as a student, of sacrificing his personal voice to the (largely implicit) conventions of school-writing genres. In short, Llewellyn’s history-in-person feedback preferences as a writer conflicted with the figurative identity of writing teacher he had maintained until he engaged with Ghanem’s example.

Llewellyn sought in his feedback (as Ghanem had done) to make explicit the reasons for using language differently according to audience and genre, even within the same piece of writing. For example, at the bottom of one 12th-grade student’s college application narrative, he wrote, “I think one thing that gives [this piece] a strong voice is the use of informal language in all the right places. The dialogue doesn’t sound forced and the word choice suggests familiarity. Yet, it’s formal in all the right places. This strikes a good balance between formal and creative!” Llewellyn’s responses indicated how dialogue and word choice could be used informally to create characters, but the overall tone of the narrative had to retain a sense of the formal college-admissions audience. In offering evaluative comments about diction, Llewellyn claimed positional authority as writing teacher, but he did so without resorting to an authoritative emphasis on the (implicit) conventions of a school genre. Although Llewellyn’s students were not ELLs (like Ghanem’s), and although he did not employ Ghanem’s technique of commenting on his own response to create a “teachable moment,” Llewellyn’s response did foreground—as Ghanem’s had—the importance of word choice, both for preserving voice and for giving an account of oneself for a particular audience and genre.

Of his attempts to provide this kind of guidance in his feedback, Llewellyn wrote:

I believe that a problem for students of all backgrounds is a lack of understanding *clearly defined roles* in their writing. Students will invariably bring their past experiences into the classroom with them, and they may have bias about who they are writing *as*, or who they are writing *to*. Many times, teachers have expectations about voice and audience that are either undefined or not articulated to students, and this can be problematic, especially when feedback is concerned. However, if clearly defined roles are established and maintained, instructors can have conversations with their students centering around how well the student evoked the particular voice which the assignment focused on.

In this final reflection, Llewellyn linked voice (“who they are writing *as*”) and audience (“who they are writing *to*”). By making these roles explicit, he suggested, teachers might help students see writing as an interaction that does not necessitate giving up one’s unique cultural/linguistic voice to be a good student. Rather, writing could be a chance to practice with multiple voices evoked by types of writing assignments that entail interactions with different audiences. Llewellyn’s reflection suggested that a writing teacher might claim positional authority without resorting to the traditional, externally authoritative practices that conflicted with his history-in-person feedback preferences as a student of writing. This new perspective—a new figurative identity of writing teacher, inspired by Ghanem’s example—was internally persuasive for Llewellyn.

In this section, I have analyzed Adam Llewellyn’s posts, reflection, and comments as evidence of how he learned to respond more sensitively to diversity in students’ writing. Like other PSETs, Llewellyn indicated in his posts/reflection clear preferences for certain teacher-response practices, based on his history-in-person as a student. On the other hand, unlike his classmates, Llewellyn’s teacher feedback eschewed the overemphasis on mechanics he disliked and implemented some of the moves he appreciated. Like Ghanem, he tried to identify with students when writing feedback by providing explicit explanations of when and why their language choices were appropriate to the context. Although Llewellyn’s students were not ELLs, such rhetorical choices were still relevant for writers negotiating the formality/informality of the college-admissions essay genre. Indeed, Llewellyn’s reflections suggested that his engagement with Ghanem’s materials had refigured his notion of writing-teacher identity: his history-in-person preferences as a high school student need not conflict with his idea that to claim positional

authority, a writing teacher must provide instruction in genre conventions. As an alternative to an externally authoritative discourse of teacher feedback that emphasized mechanics and left the rhetorical features of school genres mostly implicit, Ghanem's example inspired Llewellyn to articulate an internally persuasive approach to teacher response that explicitly addressed the interplay of multiple voices and their relative effectiveness for the occasion.

Llewellyn's formulation about voice and audience in his final reflection also captures the conflict faced by PSETs learning to respond to students' writing: like students, PSETs may struggle with "who they are writing *as*, and who they are writing *to*." In my study, most of the PSETs still responded as they seemed to think "teachers should," making nonspecific, language-level corrections, even as they identified in their posts/reflections with the woes of the students to whom they were responding. Their preferences as students of writing (history-in-person) conflicted with their sense of how a writing teacher should respond (figurative identity) in order to claim authority as a teacher (positional identity). For Lombardi and Llewellyn, their encounter with Ghanem's SWAP materials showed them that a teacher could respond in ways that claimed positional authority without resorting to the traditional approaches they had previously encountered, thus transforming their notions of the figurative identity of writing teacher. These refigured writing-teacher identities, which did not conflict with their history-in-person feedback preferences as former high school students, were internally persuasive for Lombardi and Llewellyn.

Discussion and Implications

My findings suggest that PSETs, in reviewing *other* teachers' feedback, may identify with students and invoke their own feedback preferences as writers, based on their long histories as former students of writing. But they may contradict those feedback preferences when writing their *own* comments on students' writing, because they are identifying instead with visions of what a high school writing teacher should do/be, based on more limited experience with that role. I do not argue that all teacher-education activities/assignments/approaches that invite PSETs to position themselves as students (e.g., Writing Workshop) will produce this disconnect between preference and practice. After all, Callie Lombardi and Adam Llewellyn, who both identified initially with students in reacting to other teachers' feedback, were able to transform their notions of writing-teacher identity by relating their own experiences to Ghanem's SWAP materials, and to re-

spond more sensitively to students' writing than the other 12 participants. Nor do I claim that teacher-education tasks that attempt to position PSETs as teachers (e.g., field experiences/internships) will automatically evoke, or enable transformation of, their visions of what an English teacher should do/be. Indeed, Lombardi still struggled with a conflict between her personal identification with ELL students and her sense of professional responsibility as a writing teacher, even after an intensive, six-week, full-time practicum in a local school.

I do contend that a potential disconnect between PSETs' feedback preferences as students and their visions of what a secondary writing teacher should do/be may account for the persistence of what Sommers (1982) has called the "unwritten canon for commenting on student texts" (p. 153). Education researcher Lortie (1975) famously explained the persistence of teaching practices in terms of an "apprenticeship of observation": PSETs' long (if limited) experience with observing their K-12 teachers' traditional practices may outweigh the "weak intervention" of reform-oriented teacher education. However, Smagorinsky and Barnes (2014) found that, much like the PSETs in my study, many preservice teachers report progressive visions of English teaching, drawn from their K-12 student experiences. My inquiry enhances Smagorinsky and Barnes's research by highlighting the crucial influence of the position (student or teacher) from which PSETs evaluate observed teaching practices, whether traditional or progressive. For example, my study demonstrates that PSETs can claim to have preferred certain pedagogical approaches as K-12 students, yet enact divergent methods in their endeavors to embody authoritative secondary writing teachers.

Other studies of writing teacher education (e.g., Grossman et al., 2000; Sherry & Roggenbuck, 2014) have found, as I have here, that beginning teachers in their classrooms often reverted to traditional writing pedagogies they had observed as K-12 students, abandoning progressive methods they had learned during teacher preparation. These studies have drawn on principles of Vygotskian social psychology to suggest that this reversion may result from how different practices are valued in different contexts or "activity settings" (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991), including not just physical locations but also the interpretations participants bring to those settings as they engage in shared activity. Smagorinsky, Rhym, and Moore (2013) have suggested that competing conceptions of effective teaching practices associated with different settings—or even with the same school setting—may shape beginning teachers' writing pedagogies. This theory accounts for the "two-worlds pitfall" (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 63), in which

preservice teachers typically participate in one set of (progressive) practices valued in their university methods courses and in another set of (traditional) practices valued at their local school field placements. From this perspective, the PSETs' negative evaluations of their field-placement teachers' responses to students' writing, in my study, merely echoed the progressive values of my teaching-methods course (the immediate activity setting). However, this perspective does not explain why those same PSETs in the same activity setting (methods course) enacted their field-placement teachers' responding practices when providing feedback on students' writing. After all, I (their course instructor) was the only actual audience for their feedback, though the imagined audience was secondary students. My research resolves this conundrum by emphasizing the importance of positional/figurative identities (student or teacher), both of which may be claimed in a given activity setting. As I have demonstrated, these identities may be evoked by activities (reading or writing); however, they may also operate somewhat at odds with the values of the immediate activity setting and with other available identities. In other words, identities related to teaching and learning may be in dialogic struggle both in teacher-preparation courses and in field placements.

The fact that Lombardi's and Llewellyn's responses differed from those of their classmates, following their encounter with Ghanem's materials in the SWAP database, suggests that preservice teachers' feedback practices can be changed by engagement with examples of how and why other writing teachers respond to their students' writing. However, this change may depend on how those examples of writing-teacher practice relate to PSETs' personal feedback preferences, as well as to their visions of what a high school writing teacher should do/be. I do not argue that PSETs with firsthand experiences of the challenges of cultural/linguistic diversity, like Lombardi and Llewellyn, are predisposed to respond more sensitively. Indeed, Lombardi struggled, despite her background as a Korean child adopted by an American family, and the intensive six-week practicum she had completed as a PSET in a local district, with the question of how to provide feedback that was both "encouraging" to ELL students and also "critical" in helping them to succeed academically. I propose that even preservice teachers with firsthand experiences that make them sympathetic to the challenges ELLs face may approach teacher response as a process of helping students to assimilate because they see this approach as necessary to fulfilling the role of writing teacher. Yet, in her encounter with Ghanem's SWAP materials, Lombardi discovered that, instead of providing nonspecific language-level corrections, a teacher could draw on her experience as an ELL writer (as

Ghanem did) to provide feedback that acknowledged cultural differences and also helped students to make contextually appropriate language choices. I suggest, therefore, that PSETs like Lombardi can also learn, with help, to see

their student struggles with writing as a resource (rather than a deficit) for providing encouraging *and* critical feedback, and thereby fulfill the role of writing teacher. Previous education research (e.g., González et al., 2005) has addressed how *students'* cultural/linguistic histories might be treated as resources that enrich and enhance their classroom learning, rather than as deficits or mere stepping stones to in-school literacy practices. Fewer studies have examined how *teachers'* relationships to their cultural/linguistic

identities can be a resource and/or an obstacle for teaching students of diverse backgrounds (e.g., Saravia-Shore, 2008; Zeichner, 1992). My inquiry augments this previous research in suggesting that examples of other teachers' feedback practices may show preservice teachers how their own experiences as students of writing can help (rather than hinder) in claiming authority as writing teachers.

My analysis of Adam Llewellyn's case suggests that preservice teachers may struggle with a personal desire to foster individual students' authorial voices and a sense of professional responsibility for teaching academic genre conventions. Explicitly discussing the interaction of voice, audience, and genre with students may help not only writers but also writing teachers struggling to reconcile different ideas about what a writing teacher should do/be in providing written feedback. Llewellyn's story of his secondary school experience with losing his "voice" echoes studies of secondary and postsecondary teacher response to students' writing (e.g., Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Freedman, 1987; Hillocks, 1982; Sommers, 1982), which critiqued teacher-feedback practices that appropriated, or "took over," students' texts at the expense of writers' voices/intentions. However, Reid (1994) countered this perspective by describing how fear of the negative effects of teacher appropriation led her to write fewer comments on ELLs' writing, and thus to worry that she had become "fraudulent" (p. 277) in her inability to fulfill her charge as a teacher: to be a "surrogate audience" and "discourse community expert" (p. 279), conveying readers' expectations to ELL writers. Tardy (2006) proposed that having explicit discussions about appropriation may help students understand "the difference between giv-

I suggest, therefore, that PSETs like Lombardi can also learn, with help, to see their student struggles with writing as a resource (rather than a deficit) for providing encouraging *and* critical feedback, and thereby fulfill the role of writing teacher.

ing the teacher control over their texts and responding to teacher feedback in a way that helps readers understand the writer's intentions in a more persuasive way" (p. 74). I add that not only students but also writing teachers may also benefit from having explicit conversations with students about school-writing genres' audiences, purposes, and power (rhetorical features that are often left implicit), because such discussions might ease tensions between teachers' personal identification with writers and their sense of professional responsibility as writing teachers.

Both Lombardi and Llewellyn described negative experiences with teacher-response practices such as circling language-level errors, and eventually favored more explicit, rhetorical explanations like those they encountered in Ghanem's feedback. I do not imply that teacher response to language-level errors is inherently negative. Indeed, both Lombardi and Llewellyn, despite their negative evaluations of an exclusive focus on mechanics, also expressed the importance of making language-level comments and eventually adapted Ghanem's approaches to provide some language-level feedback to field-placement students' writing. I argue instead that their preferences were shaped by associations between certain teacher-response practices, like a focus on language mechanics, and particular writing-teacher identities, like *writing-teacher-as-arbiter-of-English-grammar*. Lawrence (2015) has suggested that "writers may 'hear' previous writing teachers' 'voices' in their minds as they compose new texts and may even comply with such promptings" (pp. 320–321). I add that writing teachers, like writers, may grapple with associations between writing practices (like the practices of writing language-level feedback) and the pedagogical identities they evoke.

Some second-language acquisition researchers (e.g., Truscott, 1996) have argued that "grammar correction" has no positive effects, due to the potential for teacher inaccuracy, for student misunderstanding/inattention, and for the time it detracts from other tasks. Others (e.g., Bates, Lane, & Lange, 1993) have suggested that "indirect feedback," in which teachers indicate that a language-level error has been made (with a mark like a circle, underline, or code) without supplying an explicit ("direct") correction, may be preferable because this encourages students to self-regulate. While this debate attempts to change teaching practices by addressing their efficacy, my inquiry suggests that teachers may connect certain teacher-response practices, regardless of their contextual effectiveness, to writing-teacher identities with which they may (dis)identify.

In this article, I have addressed how two PSETs refigured notions of traditional U.S. secondary school writing-teacher identity in internally per-

suasive ways; however, it is noteworthy that these two teacher candidates were exceptional in a class (and a cohort) of primarily middle-class white women. Future studies of teacher response to diversity in students' writing might examine how teachers' cultural/linguistic backgrounds support or limit their transformation of traditional discourses of teacher feedback and notions of writing-teacher identity. I do not imply that teachers of color are more likely to (learn to) respond sensitively to student writing. Both Lombardi and Llewellyn, despite their negative experiences as students with traditional discourses of teacher response, such as an exclusive focus on language-level conventions of academic writing, also described past experiences that affirmed the importance of that focus. Prior research has called for further study of the ways in which teachers and students co-construct each other in the teacher-response interaction (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), particularly regarding how teachers' conceptions of students shape their pedagogical feedback (e.g., Ball, 2009; Haswell & Haswell, 2009). I propose that teacher-preparation experiences might help PSETs not only to invoke their experiences as students of writing with writing teachers but also to dialogize these visions of professional identity with their own values to provide culturally relevant (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1995) teacher feedback whose authority is bolstered by professional integrity.

Notes

1. In my view, students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds have an interrelated and inseparable bearing on how they write (and thus on how teachers respond). Hence my use of "cultural/linguistic" throughout this article.

2. For example, Levine's (2010) report to the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships differentiates between laboratory experiences, which often take place in the context of university coursework, and school-embedded field experiences (including those in which a methods course is held onsite at a local school). In my experience, elementary programs have been quicker than secondary English teacher preparation programs to develop such "clinically rich" integrations of coursework and fieldwork.

3. Those interested in using this password-protected database should contact mbsherry@usf.edu to acquire access information for methods course instructors and students.

4. All names of places and people have been replaced with pseudonyms, with the exception of countries.

5. For more on this linguistic geography of the mainland United States, please see Salvucci (1999).

6. French and American educational systems are both freely available in Lebanon, and French, English, and Armenian are widely spoken, though Lebanese Arabic is the national language.

References

- Applebee, A. N. (1981). *Writing in the secondary school* (No. 21). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2005). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(5), 685–730.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Wilcox, K. C., Nachowitz, M., Mastroianni, M. P., & Dawson, C. (2015). *Writing instruction that works: Proven methods for middle and high school classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press/National Writing Project.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, A. F. (2009). Expanding the dialogue on culture as a critical component when assessing writing. In B. Huot & P. O'Neill (Eds.), *Assessing writing: A sourcebook* (pp. 357–386). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Bates, L., Lane, J., & Lange, E. (1995). *Writing clearly: Responding to ESL compositions*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Brannon, L., & Knoblauch, C. H. (1982). On students' right to their own texts: A model of teacher response. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 157–166.
- Brass, J., & Webb, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Reclaiming English language arts methods courses: Critical issues and challenges for teacher educators in top-down times*. New York: Routledge.
- Caughlan, S., Pasternak, D. L., Renzi, L., Rush, L. S., & Frisby, M. (2016). How English language arts teachers are prepared for twenty-first century classrooms: Results of a national study. *English Education*, 49(3), 265–297.
- Clift, R. T., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teaching education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 309–424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2008). CCCC position statement on the preparation and professional development of teachers of writing. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/statementonprep>
- Connors, R., & Lunsford, A. (1995). Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(2), 200–225.
- Delpit, L. D. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Elbow, P., & Belanoff, P. (1999). *Sharing and responding*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record*, 87, 255–273.
- Ferris, D. (2005). *Response to student writing: Implications for second-language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Freedman, S. W. (1987). *Response to student writing* (NCTE Research Report No. 25). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Grossman, P. L., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). *Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.
- Haswell, R. H., & Haswell, J. T. (2009). Gender bias and critique of student writing. In *Assessing writing: A sourcebook* (pp. 387–434). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Hillocks, G. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16(3), 261–278.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W. J., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Horvath, B. (1994). The components of written response: A synthesis of current views. In *The writing teacher's sourcebook* (3rd ed., pp. 207–223). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Interpersonal aspects of response. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 206–224). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Juzwik, M. M., Sherry, M. B., Caughlan, S., Heintz, A., & Borsheim-Black, C. (2012). Supporting dialogically organized instruction in an English teacher preparation program: A video-based, Web 2.0-mediated response and revision pedagogy. *Teachers College Record*, 114(3), 1–42.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, A. M. (2015). Literacy narratives as sponsors of literacy: Past contributions and new directions for literacy-sponsorship research. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 45(3), 304–329.
- Levine, M. (2010). Developing principles for clinically based teacher education. Washington, DC: Report commissioned by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2016). Professional knowledge for the teaching of writing [Position statement]. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/teaching-writing>.

- Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 273–292.
- Salvucci, C. (1999). *Linguistic geography of the mainland United States*. Merchantville, NJ: Evolution Publishing.
- Saravia-Shore, M. (2008). Diverse teaching strategies for diverse learners. In R. Cole (Ed.), *Educating everybody's children: Diverse teaching strategies for diverse learners* (pp. 41–97). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Sherry, M. B. (2014). Indirect challenges and provocative paraphrases: Using cultural conflict-talk practices to promote students' dialogic participation in whole-class discussions. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(2), 141–167.
- Sherry, M. B. (2016). Bringing disciplinarity to dialogic discussions: Imaginative entry and disciplinary discourse in a ninth-grade History classroom. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 46(2), 168–195.
- Sherry, M. B., & Roggenbuck, T. (2014, Winter/Spring). Reframing responses to student writing: Promising young writers and the writing pedagogies course. *Teaching/Writing*, 3(1), 6–18.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 41(4), 29–52.
- Smagorinsky, P., Rhym, D., & Moore, C. P. (2013). Competing centers of gravity: A beginning English teacher's socialization process within conflictual settings. *English Education*, 45(2), 147–183.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods class*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(2), 148–156.
- Straub, R., & Lunsford, R. F. (1995). *Twelve readers readings: Responding to college student writing*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Tardy, C. (2006). Negotiating teacher feedback in academic settings. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 60–78). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327–369.
- Tulley, C. E. (2015). What are preservice teachers taught about the teaching of writing?: A survey of Ohio's undergraduate writing methods courses. *Teaching/Writing*, 2(1), 38–48.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1992). *Educating teachers for cultural diversity*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2008). Who is teaching? Does it matter? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. MacIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 404–424). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis; Association of Teacher Educators.



Michael B. Sherry is assistant professor of English education at the University of South Florida (mbsherry@usf.edu). An NCTE member since 2008, he studies teacher response during whole-class discussions and to students' writing, and particularly how such responses enable and constrain participation from students who may be marginalized by traditional academic discourses.

Reproduced with permission of copyright
owner. Further reproduction prohibited
without permission.