www.xchanges.org
Volume 21.1
Fall, 2026

From Coach to Classroom: Adapting Peer Writing Frameworks for Student-Centered FYC Instruction

Braydon Dungan

"[A] peer writing coach model…can have a tremendous impact on the student and facilitate writing progress that might otherwise drag out for years."
Jennifer Wilhite, "Examining the Effectiveness of a Peer Writing Coaching Model" (12)

Introduction

Fall 2023. I'm starting the second year of my MA program at the University of Louisville. As part of my Graduate Teaching Assistantship, I was scheduled to teach two Introductory Composition courses despite having no former pedagogical training. Yes, I worked in my university's Academic Writing Center during my first year of the program, but one-on-one conversations as mutual scholarly collaborators hold completely different circumstances than standing in front of a classroom full of open-eyed, ready-to-learn students. In the writing center, sessions were flexible, conversational, and often guided by the writer's immediate needs; yet, in the classroom, I was expected to lead, instruct, and evaluate. The shift from collaborator to instructor was not as seamless as I had initially imagined. In the spirit of *Xchanges'* 25th anniversary—particularly its invitation to "look back" while "writing forward"—this article revisits the collaborative pedagogical commitments of writing center scholarship to consider how such perspectives might inform emerging approaches to First Year Composition (FYC) instruction. My own transition from writing center consultant to classroom instructor provides one site for exploring what those commitments might make possible beyond the writing center.

I remember walking into my classroom during those first few weeks of my second year, feeling the weight of such a stark transition. At just 23 years old—barely older than the age of many of my students—I wasn't just a student anymore, yet I wasn't fully an instructor either. I was navigating the liminal space that many Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) occupy, having to simultaneously learn how to teach while actively teaching. Each class session required me to make decisions about how to structure activities, respond to student writing, and position myself in relation to my students. In the writing center, I had the director and assistant director I could consult for advice or assistance; in the classroom though, I felt stranded without a practical framework to guide my pedagogical choices.

It quickly became apparent that while I had been given a generalized theoretical grounding in writing studies, I was still searching for a way to translate that knowledge into something that felt tangible and effective in the classroom. Throughout my years of graduate school thus far—and across two different institutions—I've found that this sentiment is commonly shared by many graduate students enrolled in rigorous

coursework while also being in charge of their own undergraduate courses. To battle such discord, this article proposes the Teacher Modeling Model (TMM), a pedagogical framework that adapts core principles of peer writing coaching to FYC classrooms. In doing so, it extends writing center scholarship beyond one-on-one tutoring and offers composition instructors—particularly GTAs—a practical framework for making writing processes visible through collective participation.

Composition scholars have long valued the theoretical aspects of pedagogical scholarship while, at times, underemphasizing the practical applications emerging educational professionals often desire. This tension is especially evident for GTAs who are often tasked with leading their own sections of FYC with limited pedagogical training beyond the content knowledge they have developed as students. It's imperative for our field to maintain an increased focus on GTAs and the work they do educating new and established undergraduate students in writing and reading. While foundational texts such as Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein's *They Say, I Say*, Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs' *Writing about Writing*, and Peter Elbow's *Writing Without Teachers* offer important theoretical grounding, they do not always provide the kinds of immediately-transferable frameworks that GTAs can implement into their classrooms. Consequently, many new instructors are forced to navigate the complexities of teaching while also learning how to teach at all.

At the same time, scholarship in writing center studies has long emphasized peer-based models of support. In "Examining the Effectiveness of a Peer Writing Coaching Model," Jennifer Wilhite demonstrates that peer coaching—where "more advanced peers work with… less experienced writers"— fosters self-advocacy, writerly confidence, and persistence among graduate writers, particularly those navigating complex personal and academic circumstances (4). Rather than positioning the writing coach as an external evaluator, Wilhite's model emphasizes mutual trust and respect, individualized support, and the collaborative construction of knowledge.

While Wilhite situates her article within graduate writing support, her findings raise important questions about how these peer-oriented frameworks might be adapted beyond the walls of the writing center and into the FYC classroom itself. In line with this special issue's desire to "look back" while "writing forward", this article interrogates how Wilhite's findings and observations can be extended to the context of a FYC classroom. Graduate writing and FYC function within very different composing realities; understanding how the instructor—and, more specifically, the GTA—can best support student writing processes may help deconstruct normative power dynamics in the classroom. When students are treated by their instructor as collaborators rather than traditional "students," they may feel more comfortable taking risks in their writing.

As I revisited Wilhite's article, I found myself less interested in reproducing the specific context of peer coaching than in the pedagogical values that made the coaching relationship successful. While graduate writing support and first-year composition differ in important ways, Wilhite's emphasis on mutual trust, collaborative engagement, and shared writing labor prompted me to ask whether these same principles might reshape

classroom instruction if instructors themselves became active participants in the writing process. Building from Wilhite's peer coaching framework, I introduce the TMM, a pedagogical framework that translates collaborative writing center practices into FYC instruction.

The TMM adopts multiple facets of Wilhite's peer coaching—including mutuality, flexibility, and collaborative meaning-making—by positioning the instructor as an active participant in the same writing processes students undertake. In turn, the instructor writes alongside students, completes the same scaffolded assignments, and shares their own drafts as a method of modeling and engagement. In doing so, the classroom becomes a site where traditional top-down hierarchies are dismantled and repositioned to maximize student benefit. The TMM does not attempt to recreate Wilhite's peer coaching model within FYC; rather, it adapts several of its underlying pedagogical commitments to a different instructional environment. Whereas Wilhite examined reciprocal relationships between peer coaches and graduate writers, the TMM explores how similar commitments to collective participation, visible writing processes, and collaborative learning might be extended to instructor-student relationships.

Scholarship on graduate teacher preparation has consistently shown that new instructors often enter the classroom while simultaneously developing their pedagogical identities and instructional practices (Cicchino; Reid et al.; Shepherd et al.). Although these studies have documented the complexities of GTA preparation, they have devoted less attention to practical classroom frameworks that instructors can immediately adapt within their own teaching. The Teacher Modeling Model responds to this need by translating collaborative writing center pedagogies into a flexible instructional framework for first-year composition.

Identity, Power, and the GTA Classroom

In detailing such a strategy, it's important to foreground my own identity within this discussion since the TMM encourages the exploration of one's identity. Its focus on identity also mirrors the TMM's goal of facilitating authentic connections while deconstructing the top-down power dynamics many university classrooms possess. Oftentimes in college classrooms, the lecturer utilizes their dominant role to establish unequal power structures and social relationships (Fajar and Nadhillah 64-65). Because the TMM asks instructors to become visible participants in the writing process, questions of identity and authority become central to the framework.

This attention to GTA positionality builds upon previous conversations regarding graduate student identity. Al Harahap and Brian Hendrickson challenge current disciplinary narratives that position graduate students solely as teachers-in-training; rather, they argue for greater attention to the distinct identities and institutional conditions graduate students navigate. Similarly, Amanda Presswood and Virginia Schwarz extend this notion by emphasizing the idea that graduate students develop their own professional identities while simultaneously negotiating the labor and material demands of graduate education. These conversations are especially relevant to the

TMM because the framework asks instructors to consider how their own identities and positionalities shape their participation in the classroom. For GTAs in particular, engaging in this type of reflection acknowledges the complex position of occupying coexisting roles of a student, instructor, and developing scholar.

I approach this discussion as a GTA myself. I'm a 26-year-old white male who identifies as part of the LGBTQ+ community. I come from a long line of public educators, and I've been exposed to teaching and pedagogy for as long as I can remember. I foreground my positionality not as a brief moment in my article but as a central tenet to the pedagogical commitments of the TMM. Identity, in this model, is not separate from instruction; rather, it shapes how authority is enacted and negotiated within the classroom. Traditional classroom structures often position the instructor as the primary wielder of knowledge, thus reinforcing systemic hierarchical relationships that can inhibit authentic engagement (Fajar and Nadhillah). To work against traditional notions of power in the classroom, the TMM seeks to redistribute authority by inviting instructors to work alongside students and making visible both the processes and anxieties inherent in writing.

Power, then, becomes a central concern of this model. In FYC classrooms, the negotiation of authority between students and instructors significantly impacts student engagement, retention, and their willingness to take risks in their writing. By analyzing power structures, themes of authority and resistance come to the forefront of examination which helps ascertain how students may be negatively impacted if the power of the instructor greatly outweighs the power of the student (Syahriani et al. 66). Since writing asks students to publicly share unfinished ideas, receive critique, and continually revise their thinking, classroom authority becomes especially consequential. Laura Micciche in *Doing Emotion*, highlights how "writing involves sticky attachments… that find their way onto the page sometimes against our will" (106). Students' willingness to experiment, revise, and take rhetorical risks is shaped not only by assignment design but by how instructors enact their authority throughout the writing process to engage with such "sticky attachments". The TMM responds to these concerns by encouraging a circulation of power within the classroom, one which encourages instructors to model vulnerability and active participation as co-writers. In doing so, the model not only provides GTAs with a practical, transferable pedagogical framework, but it also reimagines the FYC classroom as a space where learning is co-constructed rather than hierarchical. For new and emerging composition instructors, this power circulation between students and instructor will better illustrate the instructor's commitment to mutual learning and success.

Furthermore, the TMM does not simply redistribute classroom power by asking instructors to complete the same writing tasks as their students. It also reimagines how pedagogical authority is produced; rather than treating course design as a fixed structure determined solely by the instructor, the framework recognizes that effective pedagogy emerges through continual interaction with students. Like Wilhite's peer coaching model, which was co-developed through the peer coach's expertise and their participants' evolving needs, the TMM similarly evolves through instructors' experiences

writing alongside their students and responding to the insights those shared experiences produce. Classroom authority, then, is not relinquished but made more collaborative, reflexive, and responsive to the realities of student writing.

Ultimately, the TMM recognizes that effective writing pedagogy is not simply delivered by instructors but continually shaped through regular interactions with students. Like Wilhite's peer coaching model, the TMM also develops through the shared experiences of instructors and students writing alongside one another. Rather than positioning students solely as recipients of top-down instruction, this framework acknowledges their experiences, questions, and responses as valuable contributors to pedagogical development. Hence, authority is not diminished but rather reimagined as a collaborative act, allowing both teaching and learning to become co-constructed within the FYC classroom.

From Peer Coaching to Classroom Practice

Scholarship in writing center studies has long emphasized the importance of peer-based support as a means of facilitating writerly development through collaboration instead of top-down evaluation (Harris; Lunsford; North; Wisniewski). Writing is not simply a product to be assessed but a process shaped by social interaction, feedback, and reflection (Baker; Elbow; Warnock). Krista Ratcliffe, in *Rhetorical Listening*, argues for "a need for listening within rhetoric and composition studies" (23-25), emphasizing that understanding another's perspective is itself a rhetorical practice. Within writing support, this means tutors and coaches do not simply deliver expertise; rather, they first attend to writers' goals, concerns, and experiences before collaboratively negotiating meaning. By repositioning coaches as collaborators who write and listen alongside writers as they navigate rhetorical challenges, authority becomes more decentralized, allowing knowledge and meaning to emerge through dialogue rather than instructor-centered evaluation. This article builds on the rich tradition of writing process scholarship that encourages teachers to write with students, illustrating how these similar pedagogical principles can be extended to FYC classrooms led by GTAs and novel instructors.

I often experienced these principles firsthand while working in the Writing Center at the University of Louisville. Writers almost always came prepared with specific tasks to accomplish and physical deliverables to revise, expand, and develop. Rather than arriving to receive instruction, they determined the direction of each session based on their own writerly concerns and goals. In this way, the writer led the session while the tutor took a backseat. Rather than serving as the sole facilitator of instruction, the writing coach responded to the writer's immediate needs by asking questions, offering feedback, and collaboratively working through writing challenges. What struck me most about these interactions was not simply the effectiveness of the feedback itself but the relationship that emerged through collective engagement with the writing process. Those experiences ultimately prompted me to consider whether similar pedagogical commitments could exist beyond the writing center and within FYC classrooms.

Wilhite's study of her peer coaching model offers an especially pertinent articulation of such dynamics reflected in my writing center experiences. In her work with women graduate writers, Wilhite demonstrates how individualized support can foster not only improvements in writing but also increased confidence, persistence, and self-advocacy. Rather than positioning the coach as an evaluator, she describes coaching as a flexible and responsive relationship in which support is continually adapted to writers' immediate goals, concerns, and evolving needs. Importantly, Wilhite explains that the coaching model itself was “co-developed” through the coach's expertise alongside participants' needs and suggestions (11). As the coaching relationships developed, they created opportunities for encouragement, celebration, emotional support, and frank conversations about fear, anxiety, and feelings of impostor syndrome. In this way, writing support emerged from participants' authentic lived experiences rather than from predetermined instructional practices.

Despite the longstanding efficacy of peer coaching within writing center contexts, these pedagogical approaches have remained largely institutionally separated from FYC classrooms. Writing centers typically function as sites of supplementary support, while classroom instruction continues to operate within different structures of authority, assessment, and scale. This distinction raises an important question: what might happen if the collaborative pedagogical commitments of peer coaching were adapted for everyday classroom instruction? The Teacher Modeling Model responds to this question by translating Wilhite's emphasis on flexibility, collective participation, and shared vulnerability into a framework designed specifically for FYC. Rather than reproducing peer coaching within the classroom, the TMM demonstrates one way that writing center pedagogies can extend beyond the writing center and into everyday teaching practices while acknowledging the unique responsibilities, constraints, and challenges of classroom instruction.

The Teacher Modeling Model (TMM): A Pedagogical Framework

Building on these collaborative pedagogical commitments, the Teacher Modeling Model (TMM) offers one way to translate such approaches into the composition classroom. The TMM is a model where the instructor of the classroom positions themselves as a mutual learner alongside students. Throughout this article, I refer to the TMM as a pedagogical framework rather than simply a teaching strategy or classroom activity. In using the term “framework”, I mean an overall set of principles which guides instructional decision-making across multiple classroom contexts rather than prescribing a single instructional technique.

Whereas pedagogical theories often explain why learning occurs and individual classroom activities illustrate how particular objectives are accomplished, the TMM provides instructors with a flexible structure for making decisions about participation, modeling, authority, and collaboration throughout the writing process. Since writing often develops through recursive drafting, revision, reflection, and social interaction, instructors frequently make ongoing decisions about how visible their own writing practices should become within the classroom. Consequently, the TMM is designed to

guide those decisions by organizing them around collective participation and collaborative learning rather than around instructor-centered evaluation.

Within the TMM, this collaborative philosophy is operationalized by asking instructors to participate in the same composing processes they ask of students. The work that the TMM asks students to complete—drafting, reflecting, researching, revising—becomes work that the instructor also completes. To do this, the instructor may periodically complete the same activities students engage with and the same readings students are assigned, thus working toward the same final deliverable as their students. In doing so, instructors make their own composing practices visible while simultaneously experiencing the same challenges that students encounter throughout the writing process. This approach extends Wilhite's (2022) framing of peer support as a space of mutual "encouragement, celebration, and motivation" into the FYC classroom.

For example, if an Introductory Composition class is assigned a literacy narrative, the instructor would also write their own literacy narrative alongside their students. Not only would this serve as a running model students could use for inspiration, but it would also allow the instructor—especially a novel instructor or GTA—to understand firsthand what is working in the assignments they assign and what could be improved. As Peter Elbow argues in *Writing Without Teachers*, writing is "a transaction with other people" (76). By participating in that transaction alongside students, instructors experience their own assignments, prompts, and scaffolding from the perspective of a writer rather than solely as the designer of instruction. Doing so can reveal unclear expectations, ineffective scaffolding, or rhetorical challenges that might otherwise remain unnoticed. Consequently, instructors are better positioned to refine course materials in ways that are more accessible and responsive to students' composing experiences. With the TMM, I am proposing an approach in which the composition instructor positions themselves as an active contributor to course scaffolding. If students are asked to post to a discussion board, the instructor also contributes as a participant. If students submit a working draft to demonstrate their progress, the instructor likewise shares a draft that remains visibly in progress.

While the TMM was developed through my experiences as a Graduate Teaching Assistant and is particularly well-suited to new composition instructors, its underlying principles can be adapted across a range of pedagogical contexts. The degree to which instructors implement the TMM, however, should be informed by the material realities of their teaching environments. GTAs and instructors with relatively-low teaching demands will find the TMM to be quite transferable into their classrooms. On the other hand, for instructors with a heavy teaching schedule such as three to five sections of FYC each semester, it may not be feasible to complete every assignment alongside students. In these contexts, instructors might instead selectively implement the TMM during major assignments, newly-developed units, or scaffolded activities where visible modeling is likely to have the greatest pedagogical impact.

In other words, the TMM should be understood less as a prescriptive requirement than as a pedagogical orientation. Its central premise is not that instructors must complete

every task students complete, but that strategically participating in the writing process can make composing practices more visible, foster collaborative learning, and provide instructors with opportunities to evaluate and refine their own pedagogical materials.

Walking the Walk: Implementing the TMM

Part of the reason I wanted to share this strategy is because I've witnessed the effects of implementing the TMM myself. In my Intermediate Composition course I taught in the Fall 2025 semester, I had a course structure where students wrote an essay in each of our course's three units: the discourse analysis, the literacy narrative, and the research essay. For each unit, students were required to submit three drafts to encourage process-oriented pedagogies: the Shitty First Draft—akin to Anne Lamott's landmark work—the 2nd Draft, and the Final Draft. The final unit of the course centered on a research essay that students completed through a sequence of scaffolded assignments. Rather than asking students to immediately begin drafting the essay, the unit guided them through several low-stakes activities that gradually built toward the final product. Among these scaffolded assignments were two separate activities: the Research Rationale and the Corpus Building Exercise. Together, these assignments prepared students for drafting the larger research essay while also becoming ideal sites for implementing the TMM. By completing the same assignments alongside my students, I engaged in the same composing processes while simultaneously evaluating the effectiveness of my own scaffolding. This section illustrates how the TMM functions in practice by demonstrating how collective participation reshaped assignment design, classroom interactions, and ongoing pedagogical revision throughout a FYC course.

Near the end of teaching my Intermediate Composition course in Fall 2025, I began to notice how physically and emotionally drained my students had become. Their faces—eager, bright, and animated at the start of the term—had turned pale, unmoving, and stoic. I realized that many students were balancing demanding workloads across their other courses, and the stress of the mid-semester grind—a period GTAs know all too well—was beginning to affect their well-being. They weren't the only ones feeling this pressure; I, too, had become overwhelmed by the heightened responsibilities that accompany the end of the semester. I knew I needed to do something differently, or both my students and I would lose even more motivation to engage with such a demanding writing project. This collective sense of fatigue created a pedagogical challenge which prompted me to reconsider how students were engaging with the course.

In my experiences teaching, and through my conversations with students, one of their biggest frustrations with process-oriented writing pedagogies is that some process work can seem irrelevant or, as they term it, like "busy work." If students feel as if the assignments they're completing are not effective or pertinent to them, they're much more likely to not put adequate labor into their drafting. In line with my desire to have students write an essay which could be transferred beyond the classroom as a professional material, I wanted students to truly care about the scaffolding assignments they would complete in the composition of the research essay. I decided the best way to

illustrate the efficacy of the assignments I created would be to participate alongside my students: I wouldn't just talk the talk, but I'd now be walking the walk too.

I specifically would like to draw attention to two assignments where I found mutual learning and collective motivation to be most present during the TMM. The first I will discuss is the Research Rationale. This assignment—assigned during the first week of the unit—is a step-by-step activity encouraging students to draft a justification for writing their research essay. In this assignment, students explained their own connection to the chosen topic and why their selection would help them maintain interest across the final unit. Such an assignment encourages students to get words onto the page, as Lamott suggests, serving as a springboard for the initial drafting stages of the essay. The second assignment was a similar activity which guided students through their initial research. I call this assignment the Corpus Building Exercise. In this assignment, students were required to spend time scouring the Internet for secondary sources to help address their research topic. In building this corpus, students were also required to provide a brief annotation and MLA citation for the source. As a result, by the end of the exercise, students had a corpus of 3–5 secondary sources to ground their essay in.

Both of these assignments—the Research Rationale and the Corpus Building Exercise—provided students the time to engage in transferable labor with direct applications to drafting the essay. These low-stakes activities also became important moments for implementing the TMM because they made the composing process visible in ways that traditional instruction alone could not. Informally, several students commented that seeing my own drafts helped them better understand how my written directions translated into actual rhetorical choices. For students who struggled to interpret assignment prompts through written instructions alone, the instructor model provided a concrete example of how those expectations could take shape in practice. Rather than replacing instruction, the modeling complemented it by making the writing process more transparent and accessible.

In joining students as they completed this work, I was able to better understand what was working and what wasn't working for each assignment. For example, during the Rationale, I initially had a minimum word requirement of 300 words; as I completed my own Rationale, I noticed it was difficult to reach that 300-word mark. Consequently, I announced to the class that the word count would be flexible, and they could instead aim for 225–250 words. This moment exemplifies the TMM's emphasis on reflective pedagogical revision, showing students a central premise of the TMM: instructor participation does not simply model writing for students, but it also creates opportunities for instructors to critically evaluate and revise their own pedagogical materials as composing unfolds. Rather than waiting until the end of the semester to reflect on assignment efficacy, the TMM positions pedagogical revision as an ongoing component of collaborative participation.

It's also essential for me to describe my physical placement during these two assignments, as it is a vital component of the TMM. Even what might seem like minor classroom practices—such as physical positioning or patterns of interaction—can shape

student comfort and accessibility, especially for those navigating different cultural expectations or trauma responses (Tayles 309). By reconsidering these practices, instructors can create environments that are more responsive to a wider range of student needs.

To respond to the varying experiences of students, I physically positioned myself in a desk at the front of the room right beside another empty desk that students could sit in if they had a question. In doing this, I was pulling from my writing center training and experience at the University of Louisville. By physically sitting at a desk, I was mirroring students' own positioning in their seats. I was creating a rift in the traditional power imbalance inherent to the classroom. By leaving a desk beside me empty, I was visually inviting students to seek my guidance without forcing them to talk about their work and putting them on the spot.

Many students walked up and sat beside me, bringing their computers so we could look at their assignment together. As students showed me their own work, I mirrored this behavior by showing portions of my own writing where I either shared a commonality with the student or I differed from their approach. Rather than just talking the talk, I was also walking the walk by mutually learning with the student about each other's writing processes and approaches. Once the assignment was due, I shared a course announcement where I included a running Google Doc of all the assignments I was completing with students. That way, if students wanted to see what I was working on, how I was approaching the process-oriented assignments, if my writing could serve as a moment of brainstorming, or something else, they had complete access to my own work, just as I had complete access to theirs. I was decentralizing the power imbalance of the classroom both physically, socially, and pedagogically.

Implications for FYC Pedagogy and GTA Labor

As I reflect on the TMM, I recognize that it emerged from an attempt to reimagine composition pedagogy within the material realities of GTA labor. Graduate instructors routinely balance teaching, research, coursework, service, and professional development. These competing responsibilities can limit the time available for individualized writing support, a challenge similarly identified by Wilhite who notes that instructors often carry workloads that restrict their availability to students (3). As a GTA myself, I am aware of how teaching, research, professional development and service, and personal responsibilities often compete for time and energy.

Rather than ignoring these conditions, the TMM begins from them; it asks what might be possible if pedagogy were designed not just to support student learning, but to also create time and space for GTAs to engage in their own scholarly work. In fact, teaching and research do not need to function as separate domains, but can instead be merged in ways that support more learner-centered pedagogies (Henry and Bruland 309). By positioning instructors as active participants in the same scaffolding students do, the TMM envisions the classroom as a site of shared discovery. Rather than viewing scholarship as something postponed until after grading is completed, the TMM suggests

that classroom participation itself can generate scholarly questions, pedagogical revisions, and future research agendas. This approach redistributes the power traditionally embedded in the instructor role, a facet underlying the very nature of our field.

Beyond its implications for GTA labor, the TMM also has important implications for how students experience the writing process. Because instructors participate in the same composing activities they assign, the writing process becomes more transparent, collaborative, and responsive. Rather than encountering only finished examples or instructor feedback after the fact, students witness writing as it unfolds through drafting, uncertainty, revision, and reflection. This transparency also has implications for student engagement.

When students perceive assignments as unhelpful, they are much less likely to invest meaningfully in the writing process. Rather than locating disengagement primarily within students, educational scholars have long challenged deficit-based explanations that frame students' backgrounds or abilities as the primary source of educational difficulties. For instance, Gloria Ladson-Billings argues that educational inequities are too often attributed to cultural deficit theories instead of the broader pedagogical and structural conditions that shape learning (4-5). Building on this perspective, the TMM encourages instructors to examine how their own pedagogical practices—including assignment design, scaffolding, and classroom participation—may contribute to student engagement. Rather than assuming students simply lack motivation, the instructor actively demonstrates how and why these assignments matter within the broader writing process.

In this sense, modeling becomes less about giving a “correct” response and more about making visible the thinking, vulnerability, and anxiety that often accompanies writing (Wilhite 4). This shift allows students to see process-oriented work as a meaningful facet of their writerly development. When students see their instructor simultaneously engaging in the same scaffolding work, the classroom dynamics begin to evolve. Writing becomes a collaborative activity rather than an individual performance for evaluation. As a result, writing becomes a collective process of inquiry rather than an individual performance for evaluation, encouraging students to take rhetorical risks, engage more deeply with scaffolded activities, and view composing as a socially situated practice rather than an imposed requirement.

Taken together, these implications suggest that the Teacher Modeling Model is not simply a classroom strategy but a way of rethinking the relationship between writing center and classroom pedagogies. While writing center scholarship has traditionally emphasized collaboration, dialogue, and writerly agency within one-on-one tutoring relationships, FYC classrooms have often operated through more instructor-centered models of authority and assessment. Rather than replicating Wilhite's peer coaching model, the TMM demonstrates how the pedagogical commitments that underpin writing center practice can be adapted to classroom instruction without erasing the distinct roles of tutor and instructor. In this sense, the TMM contributes to ongoing

conversations within rhetoric and composition by illustrating one way writing center pedagogies may extend beyond tutoring contexts to reshape everyday practices of FYC.

Conclusion

As my discussion comes to an end, I want to close with this: the TMM doesn't claim to dismantle inequitable labor systems, but it does offer GTAs a classroom-tested framework that could be replicated in the very next unit they teach, a frame that reimagines pedagogical labor as intellectually generative for both students and instructor. In this sense, teaching becomes a site of collaborative research where both GTAs and students can learn with and from one another in ways that resist the demanding norms of academia.

To close, the Teacher Modeling Model asks an imaginative question: what if composition pedagogy were built on teacher–student collaboration as its foundation? In honoring this question, the TMM imagines a future where GTAs are not just positioned as evaluators of student work, but also as co-writers and co-learners whose labor produces both student engagement and scholarly growth. While this future may remain aspirational on a widespread scale, the practices outlined in this discussion suggest that even within constrained realities, small-scale, localized pedagogical shifts can open space for more equitable, collaborative, and humane approaches to teaching writing. More broadly, this discussion speaks to the role that *Xchanges* has played in creating space for emerging scholars, graduate students, writing center practitioners, and instructors to rethink writing pedagogy through lived experience. Jennifer Wilhite's examination of peer writing coaching challenged me to reconsider how collaboration, vulnerability, and mutual learning might extend beyond the writing center and into FYC classrooms. In many ways, the Teacher Modeling Model represents one possible continuation of that conversation to explore how its underlying principles might be reimagined within another pedagogical context.

As *Xchanges* marks its anniversary, the journal's continued commitment to publishing reflective, practitioner-informed scholarship reminds us that meaningful pedagogical innovation often emerges from the everyday experiences of teachers and writers themselves. If Wilhite's work invited us to rethink collaboration within graduate writing support, I hope the Teacher Modeling Model extends that conversation by imagining how those same collaborative commitments might reshape FYC instruction.

Rather than viewing the TMM as a rigid, prescriptive model, I hope instructors will consider experimenting with its principles in ways that make sense within their own institutional contexts. What might change if instructors completed the same low-stakes composing activities they assigned to students? How might this reshape their understanding of assignment design, student engagement, or even their own scholarly work?

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the Teacher Modeling Model is not simply that it encourages instructors to write alongside their students, but that it invites us to make the composing process visible, transforming writing from an individual performance into a collective practice of inquiry, revision, and learning.

Works Cited

Baker, Kimberly M. “Peer Review as a Strategy for Improving Students’ Writing Process.” *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2016, pp. 179–192.

Cicchino, Amy. "A Broader View: How Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition Prepare their Graduate Students to Teach Composition." *WPA: Writing Program Administration,* vol. 44, no. 1, 2020.

Ede, Lisa. “Writing as a Social Process: A Theoretical Foundation for Writing Centers.” *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1989, pp. 3–13.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*. Oxford University Press, 1998.

Fajar, Muh, and Farah Nadhillah. “Revealing Power Relations in Online Learning: A Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis.” *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2023, pp. 63–76.

Graff, Gerald, and Cathy Birkenstein. “They say, I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.” New York: WW Norton & Company, 2014.

Harahap, Al, and Brian Hendrickson. “Editor’s Introduction: Rhetoric and Composition Graduate Students Define Their Identities Against Dominant Narratives.” *Xchanges*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2021. xchanges.org/symposium-on-graduate-study-intro-15-1

Harris, Muriel. “‘What Would You Like to Work on Today?’: The Writing Center as a Site for Teacher Training.” *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices,* edited by Betty P. Pytlik and Sarah Liggett, Oxford UP, 2002, pp. 194–207.

Henry, Jim, and Holly H. Bruland. “Educating Reflexive Practitioners: Casting Graduate Teaching Assistants as Mentors in First-Year Classrooms.” *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2010, pp. 308–319.

Ihara, Rachel. “‘It Kind of Helped Me but Also Kind of Didn’t’: Reflections on FYC Five Years Later.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2024, pp. 197–214.

Lamott, Anne. "Shitty first drafts." *Bird by bird: Some instructions on writing and life*. Penguin Random House, 1994, 21-26.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools*." Educational researcher*, vol. 35, no. 7, 2006, pp. 3-12.

Lunsford, Andrea. “Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center.” *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1991, pp. 3–10.

Micciche, Laura R. *Doing Emotion: Rhetoric, Writing, Teaching*. Boynton/Cook, 2007.

North, Stephen M. “‘Revisiting’ the Idea of a Writing Center.” *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1994, pp. 7–19.

Presswood, Amanda, and Virginia M. Schwarz. “Mentorship, Affordability, and Equity: Ways Forward in Writing Program Administration.” *Xchanges*, vol. 15, no. 1,

2021. xchanges.org/mentorship-affordability-and-equity-15-1
Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical listening: Identification, gender, whiteness*. SIU Press, 2005.
Reid, E. Shelley, Heidi Estrem, and Marcia Belcheir. “The Effects of Writing Pedagogy Education on Graduate Teaching Assistants’ Approaches to Teaching Composition.” WPA: Writing Program Administration, vol. 36, no. 1, 2012, pp. 32–73.
Shepherd, Ryan P., Rachael A. Ryerson, and Courtney A. Mauck. "Scarier Than It Seems: Multimodal Composition in GTA Training." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 47, no. 2, 2024.
Syahriani, Irma, Supriadi Supriadi, Mutakhirani Mustafa, Aceng Ruhendi Saifullah, Hasria Riski, and Yasir Mubarok. “Power Dynamics in a Classroom Interactions Context: Critical Discourse Analysis.” *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, vol.12, no. 3, 2024, pp. 65–79.
Tayles, Melissa. “Feature: Trauma-Informed Writing Pedagogy: Ways to Support Student Writers Affected by Trauma and Traumatic Stress.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 48, no. 3, 2021, pp. 295–313.
Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs, editors. “Writing About Writing: A College Reader.” 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014.
Warnock, John. “The Writing Process.” *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1983, pp. 4–27.
Wilhite, Jennifer. “Examining the Effectiveness of a Peer Writing Coaching Model.” *Xchanges*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2022.
Wisniewski, Carolyn. “Generous Audience, Activist, Evaluator: Tutor-Teachers’ Knowledge, Practices, and Values for Response to Writing.” *Journal of Response to Writing*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2024, article 1.