

A Usable Past: Functions of Stories Among New TAs

Kathleen A. Boardman

Teaching assistants spend a good deal of time telling “teaching stories.” Told unofficially, behind office doors or over several beers, these stories allow participants to complain, let off steam, subvert authority, judge others, enforce group standards, reinforce mutual connections, and transmit practical know-how. In short, they fulfill many of the functions of gossip (Jones 242); and like gossip, they are generally marginal, devalued as accretions of lore rather than bodies of disciplined knowledge.

What happens, then, when lore goes official? What are some consequences of moving teaching stories out of the margins and into the center of a teacher preparation program? What happens when writing program faculty urge TAs to take stories seriously, not only as a way to store and transmit knowledge but also as a way to generate knowledge, reflect on experience, and transform teaching practice? Once stories are authorized in this way, they should certainly gain credibility, and TAs should therefore be eager to bring them from the private realm into the public sphere. Actually, my research among new TAs suggests something different: authorizing stories in a teacher preparation program introduces difficult new issues of authority and credibility. TAs don’t automatically embrace the story as a means to knowledge as soon as they receive permission to do so; they don’t always connect with “a usable past” that enlightens their teaching. Those TAs who resist have decided that stories don’t count enough as knowledge—and that they count too much. It depends on who’s telling and who’s knowing.

Ruth Ray has described her initial surprise at the “high anxiety” among students in her graduate seminar when they were asked to observe, describe, and analyze their teaching. Ray says, “I did not fully realize the emotional impact of what I was asking them to do: to analyze their teaching when they already felt inadequate in the classroom and to do so in the context of a graduate seminar, where they often felt intimidated and insecure” (107). Like Ray, I was surprised by TAs’ anxiety and ambivalence about simply describing their classroom experiences to fellow teachers in an open-ended, ungraded, and apparently non-threatening practicum format. Many TAs’ resistance to this process, it seemed, went far beyond their worries about inadequacies in their performance.

During a four-month participant-observation study of new TAs, I saw narratives used extensively in a university writing program that endorsed story as part of teacher preparation. New TAs participated in a week-long presemester orientation, took a one-semester Composition Theory and Practice seminar, and

enrolled in a one-credit practicum. During the orientation, experienced teachers modeled and told stories about their own classroom practice. As part of their work for the seminar, TAs kept weekly journals of their own teaching experiences. In the practicum, they met as a group twice a week with a faculty member to tell stories about what was happening in their classrooms—to discuss practices they had found successful and describe events that had raised questions for them. Story enabled many TAs to share, critique, validate, and transform their experience as practitioners.

Yet many TAs also struggled with at least three problems. 1) Some were skeptical about the validity and reliability of the local knowledge represented by stories; they also had difficulty seeing experience and practical know-how as “true” knowledge. 2) Others became cynical because they perceived that certain kinds of stories were being endorsed over others. 3) Some worried that they lacked control of the meanings and uses of their stories—in particular, they were concerned that storytelling in an institutional setting might become a tool of surveillance. This was in sharp contrast to storytelling as gossip, which could serve as a tool of resistance.

I began to pay attention to these problems because I was seeing what I considered contradictory behavior. For example, TAs eagerly told and discussed stories, then immediately trivialized that activity with the labels “group therapy” or “gossip.” They spoke with wonder about insights they had gained from reflecting on the stories they had told, and then dismissed other such “testimonies” as propaganda techniques. But before deciding too quickly that storytelling caused the trouble or that TAs’ insecurities were to blame for the problem, we should re-examine our attitudes as academics. We might ask ourselves if we are conveying mixed messages about what counts as knowledge. We should trace the ways we indicate our ambivalence about the value of story and the worth of beginners’ experience. We must also recognize the risks and costs of storytelling in an academic setting.

To begin this re-examination, I’d like to look in more detail at the difficulties I mentioned above. First, TAs expressed skepticism about the usefulness of the particular, the doubts that the local knowledge created and passed on through anecdote should count as knowledge at all. Having entered graduate school with some hope of mastering an orderly system of general knowledge, some TAs now struggled with a different conception—knowledge that appeared limited, unsystematic, incoherent. No one was providing a quick overview of the teaching field. It looked as if an unruly mass of stories had replaced a clear list of do’s and don’t’s.

Michael was a new TA who enjoyed telling stories of his adventures in and out of the classroom, but he never came to see story as a respectable source of knowledge about teaching. Michael regarded stories as gossip and entertainment, and he valued storytelling as a way to get attention. But when he wished to understand what was required to be a successful teacher, he wanted to abandon the stories and get down to business. So he hated the practicum. He

told me, “We’ve got a class—it’s TA group therapy . . . you know . . . everybody’s saying, ‘Oh, I’ve got little Jimmy, and he’s so funny’ . . . I don’t *care* about everybody’s cute little story! . . . We’re getting all the exceptions, and not the rules down. Everybody does something different. I want to see the forest, not just the trees.” To Michael, each story seemed useful only for the few TAs who were concerned with a specific issue. He wanted explanations by authorities, not the explorations of his peers. He could not locate any basic principles—or, as he put it, any “core of knowledge.” At first, he also wished for a “map.” Implicitly, he accused the academy of expecting mastery while failing to provide instructions for its achievement. Later, after reading theoretical articles, he decided there wasn’t supposed to be a map or set of instructions. Still he insisted that “telling stories” was an ephemeral, egotistical activity, inferior to what he called “talking about ideas.”

Like Michael, Jane perceived that storytelling lacked academic status, in spite of its official place in the writing program. It bothered her when faculty and graduate students from outside the program suggested that the practicum was “not rigorous enough” to deserve academic credit. It bothered her when they argued that storytelling was only a confidence-builder, not a source of knowledge that counted academically. Teaching stories dealt with practice rather than propositions; such stories had more to do with knowing-how than with knowing-that; they featured the subjective, not the objective. Influenced by these dichotomies that degraded lore, Jane began to call herself a “theory person,” meaning that she relied on abstract principles. Yet when she tried to understand and improve her teaching, she found the exchange of stories more useful than general principles. So she also referred to herself as a practitioner (and “not a theory person,” as if she had to make this choice, and make it clear). At the end of the term, Jane was confused. She said about the practicum, “It was only a social hour. It was helpful. Well—I’m fuzzy about it.” For her and for others, two views of knowledge had clashed without leading to any synthesis.

The second major difficulty arose from TAs’ perception that only certain kinds of stories were implicitly authorized. Some TAs tried to reproduce these story forms; some were pleased that new forms helped them view their teaching in new ways; others resisted what they saw as a subtle indoctrination technique. Jane was in this last group. Although she was confused about the status of stories told by her peers, she resisted stories told by experts—especially those who appeared to be endorsed by the writing program. These included the experienced teachers who spoke at orientation and the writing workshop proponents whose books appeared on the seminar reading list. Jane labeled their stories “testimonies,” and she believed they were meant to seduce her to buy into a practice without first analyzing it. Jane was not moved by stories as teaching devices, particularly since they often took the form of the conversion narrative: “I used to think . . . but now I know. . . .” Because of her fundamentalist religious background, Jane already knew about testimony as a persuasive device; she considered it anti-intellectual. The presence of this form in an academic setting made her think of orthodoxy and party lines. She and her circle joked about

having to come up with a conversion story before the end of the semester. This cynicism came as a surprise to the program faculty, who had not intended to coerce cloned stories out of anyone but who did believe that learning followed a pattern of dissonance and transformation—something like a conversion narrative.

Jane and other TAs became cynical because they had assumed that storytelling meant complete autonomy—and then felt themselves in a double-bind when they encountered the limitations of story form and practitioner community. Stephen North has said about practitioner lore, “whereas in other communities the greatest authority over what constitutes knowledge resides with the community—lies, in effect, with *public* knowledge—here it lies with the individual Practitioner, and *private* knowledge . . . ; the individual, finally, decides . . . what counts as knowledge” (28). To the extent that TAs and faculty believed in a completely open field for knowledge-making, they were in for some problems. TAs who expected their mentors to be without agendas were soon disillusioned. Faculty who tried to stay out of the way, so that TAs could tell their own stories and make their own discoveries, were startled to hear comments about “party lines” and “in-groups.” The community was indeed exerting authority over what constituted knowledge—although each TA retained the power to critique it.

The third problem had to do with new teachers’ worries over the ramifications of stories they told about themselves in an institutional setting. TAs were accustomed to thinking of stories as private and personal. When they told stories in class, they felt exposed and vulnerable—like objects of surveillance. Certainly, they expected to be monitored in their first semester of teaching. But now some of them felt like collaborators in an observation process they did not quite understand. Stories introduced a new kind of accountability without providing dependable techniques for distance and control. This anxiety was greatest for TAs who had done academic writing but little or no fiction writing.

Bruce, for example, worried that he lacked control of the stories he was *telling*. As a new teacher, he tried constantly to monitor his public persona; in the presence of those who might evaluate him, he preferred to critique ideas rather than relate his own experiences. Whether his stories were positive or negative, their implicitness bothered him: he knew he could not control their interpretation. Particularly when he wrote teaching stories in his journal, he said, “It feels like there’s constantly that evaluation.” A story about his classroom practice might inadvertently reveal something he had been unaware of. Of course this would be useful for self-critique, but why should he make himself vulnerable to authorities who had the power to renew his teaching assistantship?

Sara, on the other hand, lacked control of the stories she was *hearing*. If her stories were officially so important, she reasoned, then her students’ stories were vital too. As a result, she was soon engulfed in particulars. In a few months she collected a mountain of stories: classroom lore from every experienced teacher willing to share it and “trauma stories” (her phrase) from her students—

stories about rape, abuse, money troubles, addiction, failure. She felt obliged to respond to everyone's stories. The result was stress. "I get so worked up I have to talk myself down from it," she told me. "All I do is talk about my students. . . . they're emotional vampires." She had no distance, and she suspected that "distancing" was probably immoral anyway. Sara faced a world of stories with no protection.

Not surprisingly, fiction writers were least threatened by the use of story in their teaching preparation. They knew how to use stories to achieve distance and control. One TA, Alan, spoke often about using fiction as a "backdoor to truth": "Whatever truth I think I have to offer, or whatever I want to explore, it's always natural for me to try to explore that through fiction," he explained. Alan used anecdotes as examples of what he wanted to avoid in teaching, as evidence of classroom success, and as analogies for certain teaching practices. "In writing a story," he said, "you have an idea of what you're going to do with it . . . where you're going to go with it. But often the process itself dictates where that's going to go, what's going to happen. I think it's the same with classes and teaching." Alan did not share any true confessions or tell about any unsolved problems: his expertise in storytelling allowed him to maintain the private/public boundary that he wanted.

If stories are a source of important knowledge, if TAs have stories to tell, and if this storytelling is authorized and encouraged within a program, why do so much stress and ambivalence remain? One reason may be that TAs are confused about whether they are subjects or objects of their own stories. That is, by telling and listening to stories, are they doing something or having something done to them? Are they constructing themselves as knowers and transforming themselves as learners? Or are they only letting themselves be molded, allowing themselves to be known? Can authorized teaching stories resist and transform cultural patterns, or only reproduce them? Story as part of teacher preparation makes a welcome connection between private and public spheres of experience but in so doing it removes the protection of privacy. These are some reasons it is necessary for a seminar or practicum to discuss not only the interpretations of teaching stories, but also the implications of telling these stories.

A second reason for TAs' stress over this matter of storytelling has to do with our own confusion, in the field of composition, over what counts as disciplinary knowledge. These questions don't have to be settled, but they should be explicitly discussed with TAs. Recent articles by Thomas Newkirk, Patricia Harkin, Linda Brodkey, and others can be helpful starting points for such discussions. Not only researchers, but also new TAs and experienced teachers must (in Newkirk's words) "face the traditional academic bias against the particular" (129). As Brodkey puts it, "the academy has traditionally demonstrated a limited tolerance for lived experience, which it easily dismisses as 'anecdotes' or 'stories'" (41).

Students need to know that, like the case study in research, the teaching narrative "gains generalizability through particularity—if it provides insight"

(Newkirk 130) and enough specific information to allow teachers to judge whether it does provide insight. It is not unreasonable or unrigorous for TAs to view their stories as research—and not *only* as gossip, group therapy, or testimonial, however valuable these other functions may be. As Newkirk says, “In telling their tale, teachers need to recognize that the source of their authority comes from their intimate knowledge of the classroom and students It does not come through deference to expert opinion or through suppressing intuitive resources in favor of more distanced and more academically respectable means of observation” (133). Vrinda Dalmiya and Linda Alcoff, who explore the epistemological status of practical and experiential knowledge, also suggest that more than a sense of well-being can emerge from storytelling sessions: “The conversation between people who have shared a type of experience has a richer quality to it that may not be observable by a simple recounting of their statements. . . . [T]here is *content* to an ‘empathic’ conversation, which is what makes it richer (informationally) than a mere objective discourse” (240).

Even though we may be convinced of the authority of practitioners and the importance of teaching stories as sources of valid knowledge, we still have to deal with the matter of expertise among *new* TAs. Ironically, the same focus on story that many see as *not* demanding academically can appear *too* demanding in terms of practical expertise. Most new TAs are used to being students, not teachers; they may find it easier to continue pursuing “knowledge-that” rather than to tell stories which reveal their lack of “knowledge-how.” New teachers do not have much lore—if we define lore as practitioner knowledge of teaching. But they have plenty of experience. Obviously, they have experience as students. *Lives on the Boundary* provides a valuable model for the use of stories of early educational experiences. Mike Rose shows how his experiences as a student and as a boy growing up continue to shape and inform his teaching. A story that turns out to be useful for teaching practice may have little connection with teaching or the classroom. Alan, for example, told me a story about his father who constantly issued orders, thus inadvertently showing his son one way not to teach. Lynn Z. Bloom’s autobiographical “Teaching College English as a Woman” shows that teaching experience cannot be separated from what we call “life experience.” An emphasis on such stories in teacher preparation validates new TAs’ experiences as sources of knowledge that will help them transform their inexperience.

Still, we should not expect that TAs, through a naturally unfolding process, will arrive at a position more or less matching a particular program’s philosophy: that is, that their own teaching stories will cause them to perceive some truths about writing and teaching that their mentors had known all along. Often these truths do not appear self-evident, and no sooner have TAs responded to an invitation to validate experience as a source of new knowledge, than they feel that knowledge being undercut. Nancy Welch has described her experiences in a writing program where TAs who expressed certain views of their teaching were “named” by instructors and peers as naive, resistant, or intolerant (392). In such a program, the pressure to convert is explicit. My

observations of new TAs in a less coercive setting indicate that implicit pressures may also be strong. Some of these pressures come from the narrative modes of the stories themselves: “conversion stories” implicitly urge conversion.

Rather than simply waiting, or pushing, for new teachers to come around to their way of thinking, mentors, too, must come to terms with a multiplicity of knowledges and stories. Carolyn Ericksen Hill provides one model as she verbalizes her own “hidden agenda” as a teacher of teachers. Hill explains that as long as she had been content to live a story of academic life without telling that story, she had remained “unaware that I was acting out two poles, my soft-stanced mindset and the harder one of the system in which it was embedded” (78). By taking story seriously as a means to knowledge, Hill found it possible to analyze the conflict between her own “soft story” of “needy writers nourished by community” and a new TA’s “hard story” of “independent writers taking authority for their own writing” (72).

Patricia Harkin suggests a postmodern way to view knowledges by superimposing them and concentrating on selected intersections. Lore needn’t be a rattletrap unattended house nor knowledge a busy one-way street; narrative need not be linear or static. Harkin proposes two analogies—the transcontinental simulcast interview and the collaboratively drawn “cognitive map” made up of superimposed transparencies. Recently published groups of teacher stories, told in multiple voices, show that stories can accrete in a different ways to generate knowledge about teaching. For example, the Feminist Sophistics Group (Eichhorn, et al.) provides several stories, each told by a different author, but all closely focused on gender issues in the classroom. In contrast, Peter Elbow records stories collected at the English Coalition Conference without insisting on any central theme or focus for them. Attention to these alternative ways of viewing and using story would challenge TAs who are concerned about starting out in teaching with a map of worthwhile knowledge and those who have difficulty trusting the map they are beginning to compose for themselves.

Yes, the problems encountered by the TAs I studied may indicate inadequacies of lore as knowledge that counts. But it is more likely that there are inadequacies in our attitudes toward lore and toward the stories that constitute much of it. We fail to authorize teaching stories or fail to treat them adequately when we do authorize them. In addition to modeling and endorsing the teaching story, TAs and their mentors must discuss explicitly how it participates in what we call knowledge. Lore might also be redefined to include not only stories of what worked and didn’t work in the classroom, but also critical discussions of why something worked, why it makes a difference, and who benefits. This is a most demanding approach to knowledge that counts: it is not only *assented to* as truth but *put to use*—as teaching that counts.

Works Cited

- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Teaching College English as a Woman." *College English* 54 (1992): 818-25.
- Brodkey, Linda. "Writing Ethnographic Narratives." *Written Communication* 4 (1987): 25-50.
- Dalmiya, Vrinda, and Linda Alcoff. "Are 'Old Wives' Tales' Justified?" *Feminist Epistemologies*. Ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter. NY: Routledge, 1993. 217-44.
- Eichhorn, Jill, et al. "A Symposium on Feminist Experiences in the Composition Classroom." *CCC* 43 (1992): 297-322.
- Elbow, Peter. *What Is English?* NY: MLA, 1990.
- Harkin, Patricia. "The Postdisciplinary Politics of Lore." *Contending with Words: Composition and Rhetoric in a Postmodern Age*. Ed. Patricia Harkin and John Schilb. NY: MLA, 1991. 124-38.
- Hill, Carolyn Ericksen. *Writing from the Margins: Power and Pedagogy for Teachers of Composition*. NY: Oxford, 1990.
- Jones, Deborah. "Gossip: Notes on Women's Oral Culture." *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. Ed. Deborah Cameron. NY: Routledge, 1990. 242-51.
- Newkirk, Thomas. "The Politics of Composition Research: The Conspiracy Against Experience." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Ed. Richard Bullock and John Trimbur. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, Heinemann, 1991. 119-36.
- North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, Heinemann, 1987.
- Ray, Ruth E. *The Practice of Theory: Teacher Research in Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1993.
- Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary*. NY: Penguin, 1989.
- Welch, Nancy. "Resisting the Faith: Conversion, Resistance, and the Training of Teachers." *College English* 55 (1993): 387-401.