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This chapter sits at the intersection between three established bodies of work: teachers’ identities as writers, the ‘emotional labour’ of teaching (Hochschild, 1983) and teaching writing. There is a broad body of literature that attends to these three areas, yet the emotional experiences of teaching and learning to write is an underexplored dimension within these fields of interest. The chapter seeks to contribute a multi-agent account of the emotional experiences of participating in a UK primary writing classroom, exploring the experiences of the teacher, the teaching/support staff sitting amongst the pupils, and the pupils themselves. These multi-agent accounts are reflected through the shared experience of a particular instance of teaching-writing/writing-teaching, and the interactions within this pedagogical moment, and reflections offered are analysed through the conceptual and sensory lens of emotion. The intention to explore the perspectives of these three groups of stakeholders is a novel approach, and as such adds a fresh perspective to understandings of the role of emotions in the teaching and learning of writing.

In this chapter, we expand upon our previous work on teachers’ writing identities (Cremin and Baker, 2010; Cremin and Baker, 2014). We have chosen to focus the lens on emotion specifically because this emerged as a salient intrapersonal force on how teachers position themselves, and are positioned, in their roles as teacher-writers/writer-teachers in the primary classroom. In Cremin and Baker (2010), a continuum of teachers’ writing identities was offered (See Fig. 1), which offered a conceptualisation of the available positions and positionings that a teacher can (attempt to) inhabit as they teach writing, influenced by various institutional, intrapersonal and interpersonal factors.

The continuum was intended to demonstrate the struggle that is experienced for some writing teachers as ‘an ongoing oscillation between more conforming identities: teacher-writers writing for the system and more liberating identities: writer-teachers writing more for themselves’ (2010, p. 32). We added a further layer of detail to this work when through multimodal analysis, we unpacked the teachers’ embodied discursive practices that opened and closed particular subject positions for others in the classroom (Cremin and Baker, 2014).

FIGURE 7.1 A DIAGRAM TO REPRESENT A TEACHER-WRITER, WRITER-TEACHER CONTINUUM (CREMIN AND BAKER, 2010, P. 20)

Emotions in the teaching context

There is a body of work that explores the role of emotions in education; indeed, as Hargreaves succinctly observed, ‘emotions are at the heart of teaching’ (1988, p. 835). Widening recognition of this is reflected in a recent literature review of emotions in the teaching context in which Uitto, Jokikokko and Estola (2015) highlight an increase in related publications in Teaching and Teacher Education, from three articles in 1991-1996, to 38 in the five years between 2009-2014. In this literature, emotions and ‘the affective dimension’ of teaching have been explored
through many lenses such as care (O’Connor, 2008); passion (Hargreaves, 1998; Grainger, Barnes and Scoffham, 2004); investment (Nias, 1996); subjectivity (Zembylas, 2003); teacher training (Timoštšik and Ugaste, 2012); change (Saunders, 2012); and emotional identity (Shapiro, 2010). Indeed it is argued ‘emotional identity is fundamental to our understanding of professional identity and the interactions it may generate or preclude’ (Shapiro, 2010, p. 616).

This body of literature differs according to the ontological perspective of emotion adopted, and these distinctions align closely with how identity is viewed: from a broad psychological perspective, emotions/identity originate and are located within the individual as an internal entity/set of entities. An alternative and oppositional perspective takes the view that emotions and identities are sociocultural constructions: situated in the sociocultural world and both produce and are the products of interactions. In his extensive writings on emotions in teaching, Zembylas (e.g. 2003, 2007, 2011) makes the case for a poststructuralist position, arguing that this view operates out of a liminal space between psychological and social constructivist worldviews. From this space the gaze can encompass attention to the roles of language, culture, ideology and power in shaping emotional discourses and discursive positions. From a post-structural perspective, emotions are not understood as private or experienced passively, instead they are constituted in and by language that blurs the edges between the reductive dichotomy of private and public feelings. Moreover, Zembylas (2007, 2011) makes the argument for viewing emotions as embodiments of our selves; of ‘experiences that the body expresses’ (2011, p. 34) which are an integral part of the performative and interactional experience of teaching.

Teachers as writers and the role of emotion in teaching writing

Early cognitive models of the composing process tended not to recognise or foreground emotions or other contextual factors, although as Brand (1985/6) acknowledges, in the work of Britton et al. (1975) and Emig (1971), feeling is implied. A sense of the personal is also evident in Graves’ (1983) pedagogical approach which foregrounds writing workshops, although his work has been critiqued for being overly anecdotal and individualistic, ‘abstracting writers and their texts from social context’ (Lensmire, 2000, p. 17). Since Graves’ (1983) assertion that ‘teachers of writing must write’ remains the focus of considerable professional and academic attention, it is surprising there is not more literature which addresses the affective dimension of their involvement as writers, within or beyond the classroom. In a recent systematic review on teachers as writers in which attention was paid to teachers’ attitudes to writing, it is clear that whilst the picture is complex, there is a tendency towards negativity, evidenced in a discourse of self-doubt and self-criticism (Cremin and Oliver, forthcoming). Additionally this review found that teachers’ past experiences of school/university writing, (both positive and negative), were recalled with considerable emotional intensity, and that such experiences had long-term consequences for their personal and professional identities and potentially for their pedagogic practice (e.g. Cremin, 2006; Gardener, 2014; Gannon and Davies, 2007; Norman and Spencer, 2005). Drawing on 21 studies from five countries, the review underscores the potency of affect and observes that ‘there are more unresolved tensions than positive connections between teachers’ personal attitudes and writing practices and their teaching of writing’ (Cremin and Oliver, forthcoming).

Psychological studies of emotions during the act of writing suggest that feelings often come to the fore and that whilst positive affect such as relief and satisfaction increase
during writing, negative emotions such as fear and anxiety are more resistant to change. This has been shown with both novice (Brand and Leckie, 1988) and professional writers (Brand and Powell, 1986). In another study with undergraduates and members of the public, D’Mello and Mills (2014) undertook two experiments to track the affective states that arose during writing. Connecting to the ‘motivating cues’ in the task environment of Flower and Hayes’ (1981) cognitive model of the writing process, these researchers found that boredom, confusion, frustration, anxiety, engagement/flow were the major self-reported affective states. Happiness was also commonly reported, although its occurrence was tied to the topic of the writing. On the basis of this work, they claim that there is a distinction between ‘topic affective states’ and those more closely related to the cognitive processes involved (‘process affective states’), although they acknowledge these states are not mutually exclusive. The sense of emotional angst during composing that is evident in these psychological studies, has also been documented in studies of a more broadly sociocultural nature which focus on teachers who are invited to write and to share their writing as part of pre-service or professional development programmes (Cremin, 2006; Gardner, 2014; Morgan, 2006; Whitney, 2008). (See also this volume, Chapters 3 and 4). These collectively reveal considerable insecurity, anxiety and discomfort on the part of teachers; predominantly this appears to relate to a lack of self-confidence, disquiet about having nothing significant to say and the possible value judgements of others.

Notwithstanding these concerns, in two studies that examined teachers’ participation in writing groups from an emic perspective, creative risks were taken and ‘bravery’ was shown (Cremin, 2006; Woodard, 2015). In Cremin’s (2006) case study of three teachers, she notes that, in common with their colleagues in the writing group (n: 16), the teachers experienced the compositional process as uncertain and unsettling, which may have been compounded by their role-shift from apparently expert teachers to relatively novice, artistically engaged writers. Nonetheless, the tension and emotional uneasiness generated when composing short stories for publication appeared to mobilize a kind of creative energy that involved the teachers in taking risks as writers. This allowed the unconscious and the intuitive to come into play and unexpected routes were travelled. In Woodard’s (2015) study, in which she also case studied three teachers from a cohort of 16 who participated in writing groups, the concept of being a ‘brave writer’ is explored. The three case studied teachers experienced this differently: for one it meant acknowledging that sharing personal writing was difficult but worthwhile; for another it involved ‘intentionally becoming vulnerable’ (p.307) with peers and students; for the last, bravery encompassed taking the risk to make substantial revisions to a composition she had already worked hard to polish. In both studies, themes of vulnerability and risk-taking came to the fore as the teachers talked about and documented their composing processes and the experience of sharing their writing with others.

In another study in which teachers’ emotions were explored through their participation in workshops, data sources included ongoing surveys (n: 50) and interviews (n: 16) (Scott and Sutton, 2009). The data told different stories; the quantitative data suggest that the teachers’ emotions towards writing became more positive over time, but returned to pre-training levels when the workshops ended. The qualitative data suggest that the teachers had mixed emotions about engaging in the writing process, and developed increased empathy for their students as writers as a consequence. An enhanced awareness of students’ affective engagement in writing is also noted by Cremin (2006) who found that teachers reported working towards the creation of more secure writing environments in which students could share their
apprehensions and were supported to take authorial risks. Woodard (2015) too emphasises the potential pedagogical value of teachers developing as ‘brave writers’; and includes the comments of one pedagogue who planned to design writing experiences over time to support students’ comfort, confidence and risk taking.

While these various teacher-focused studies shine a much-needed light on the emotional work of writing and draw on data from writing workshops, in relation to pedagogic practice they rely entirely on self-report; no observation of teaching writing in classrooms is included. As such they cannot capture the lived and situated experience of what it is to teach writing to young people, nor examine the interplay between teachers’ identity positioning and their emotions in this context. It is in this niche that this chapter sits. Our earlier work, which we revisit here for this purpose, revealed that whilst institutional and interpersonal factors influenced the writer-teacher, teacher-writer identity positions adopted in the classroom, intrapersonal factors were also significant (Cremin and Baker, 2010). The teachers’ relationships with their unfolding compositions and their emotional engagement/disengagement with their writing appeared highly salient in influencing their situated sense of self as writers in this context. It contributed to the emotional struggle experienced by the teachers as they sought to adopt the dual identity positions of teacher and writer. In our work we conceive of identity as relational, positional and enacted in interaction (Holland and Lave, 2001). This notion of relational identity positioning is important when considering the ways in which teachers engage emotionally as writers in the public forum of the classroom. As we document later, Jeff, our case study teacher was composing in front of 33 pupils, a teaching assistant and the class teacher. He was neither a lone writer, nor a lone teacher and this had consequences for his identity positioning and emotional involvement.

Methodology

As noted, this chapter draws from a broader ethnographic study which explored the concept of teachers-as-writers. Two teachers were recruited to take part from two primary schools in the south of England. They were purposefully selected (Patton, 2014) on the basis of their previous participation in a professional development (PD) programme where practitioners were encouraged to adopt the position of ‘writer’ in their teaching, and which involved authentic composition and engaging with the processes, practices and products of being a ‘writer’ (Ing, 2009). One teacher, Elaine, worked at a Catholic primary school in a fairly affluent area; the other, Jeff, worked in a secular primary school in an area characterised as being of low socioeconomic status. A researcher was assigned to each teacher and three sessions were observed on consecutive weeks and extensive field notes written; classroom interactions were also videoed for follow-up viewing, with consent given by all participants (from the parents in the case of the children). The subject of each observed session was the ‘literacy hour’ of the day, and both teachers modelled spontaneously-produced compositions (hereafter referred to as 'demonstration writing') in front of the class before continuing their writing while sitting alongside pupils. Copies of the participants’ written texts from both demonstration and writing alongside contexts were collected after each session. In addition to the classroom observations, both participants participated in weekly post-session reflective interviews. In addition to interviewing the teachers, the other staff (teaching assistants and a class teacher in Jeff’s case), and an opportunistically selected sample of pupils, also took part in a one-to-one interview (staff) and a focus group (pupils). Furthermore, the two
participants kept reflective journals of the period of data collection and beyond and participated in individual pre-observation extended ‘literacy history’ interviews and a collective post-observation plenary interview. In the latter they responded to the video footage and reflected on their actions and feelings at key points variously selected by the teachers and by the researchers.

From this engagement, albeit relatively brief, a large body of data were collected. In what follows, we create a case study from one set of data pertaining to Jeff – including interview data with Jeff, two other members of staff and a group of children, textual data, field notes and Jeff’s reflective diary – to craft a story about the emotional labour involved in the teaching and learning experiences of writing in this primary classroom. We acknowledge that the case of Jeff – as a literacy teacher without whole class responsibility – is unique and we recognise this case is not generalisable; rather we intend to offer a rich picture based on the ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973) that such ethnographic inquiries offer. We hope that other teachers and researchers reading this chapter will find resonance with the description offered of Jeff’s teaching, and the emotional toil involved.

Findings

Jeff who was aged in his mid-thirties at the time of the data collection, had been working as a teacher for over 12 years and was working in a large school in a socioeconomically deprived area. Jeff was the Deputy Head and Literacy Coordinator; he did not have a class responsibility, but taught Literacy to four classes (9-11 year olds), with class teachers working alongside him.

The observed session

In the session from which the data presented in this chapter are drawn, Jeff was teaching a class of 10-11 year olds as part of a six-week topic ‘All About Me’. Also present were the class teacher (Clare) and a teaching assistant (Debbie). The session took place at the beginning of the school year, so Clare was not well known to the children; although they were familiar with Jeff through his Deputy Head role. Jeff started the observed interaction by sharing postmodern visuals from the book *Clarice Bean That’s Me* (by Lauren Child) with the children via the interactive whiteboard. They noted the members of her family and the often-ironic asides made about each other and then for 10 minutes drew their own families, with actions and bracketed asides. All staff joined in this activity, which was followed by sharing time when those present talked to a partner about one of their ‘special people’. Jeff chose his gran who had died. Following this he stood to demonstrate how to move from the drawing/talk to writing. Initially Jeff’s emotional engagement is considered, then the experiences of his audience/co-writers: both staff and children. All participants have been given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

Jeff’s demonstration writing

Analysis of three key separate moments during Jeff’s demonstration writing is offered. He began by talking through the session’s aims and what he was doing.
Can I ask you now to do the hardest thing that I’m going to ask you to do probably all year? This is going to be a really, really, really tough thing to do…¹ I hope you’ve had a chance to talk to someone about somebody in your family, and it really helped me when I was talking. What I’m going to try and do for you now is to show you the sorts of writing that we could be doing…

Also the other part of what we said at the start was try and engage the reader, so I’m going to try and write something on here about someone in my family. Now I’m talking a lot now because I’m trying to avoid doing it. We talked about this last week. This is going to be really hard because I don’t know what to put on first of all.

Jeff uses his hands to explain himself, walking backwards and forwards and gesturing to the whiteboard

Extract 1: The beginning of Jeff’s demonstration writing

Here Jeff pointedly refers to writing as something that is ‘really, really, really tough’, evidencing his anxiety, and arguably offering reassurance to any of the children (and teaching staff) who felt similarly. Moreover, Jeff’s acknowledgement of his procrastination adds to the evidence of his nervousness that he shares with regard to starting his writing. In this way he commenced his demonstration writing with a display of authenticity: for him, starting to write on a blank page is difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jeff’s talk</th>
<th>Contextual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had a chat with the guys here; do you know who I’m going to write about? I’m going to write about my Gran… Whilst I write, I’m going to talk about what I’m thinking, and just to see whether that helps you when you come to write as well to show that it’s not an easy thing, I’m going to struggle with this. … The hardest part what I say to you guys as well is starting. This is going to be really hard because I don’t know what to put on first of all. For some reason straightaway I’ve gone into like a story mode. What I’m trying to do is I want to see if I can imagine my Gran. The problem is that because she’s dead it’s hard to remember so much now, so I’m trying to think back and think about what she was like, so in a dream sometimes you can remember things more.</td>
<td>Picks up his drawing. Goes to whiteboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 2: Mid-way through Jeff’s demonstration writing

¹ ‘…’ is used as an ellipsis to signify when parts of Jeff’s speech have been omitted from the transcript reproduced here. We acknowledge that we have made particular choices in terms of Jeff’s talk and that this flavours the representation of him.
As Jeff begins his composition, he continues his meta-narrative of what he’s doing in order to show the children that he was genuinely engaged in his writing, and to demonstrate his moment-by-moment authorial choices, selecting words to commit to the whiteboard. While Jeff was writing, the children were sitting quietly and watching intently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jeff’s talk</th>
<th>Contextual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve got this feeling inside me at the moment which isn’t good. Because I said it about my picture. I drew this picture of my Gran and it was awful, it’s naff. My Gran I loved her so, so much and the picture’s awful. She looks like this flat, sandy sort of thing, and just there. I’ve got this same sort of feeling at the moment. Whilst I’m writing it’s not completely right.</td>
<td>Looks downcast as he looks back at the whiteboard and forward towards the children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extract 3: Nearing the end of Jeff’s demonstration writing

Here, Jeff shares his negative feelings about what his composition so far. The experience of writing about his gran – clearly a topic that is emotionally-laden – resonated with his experience of attempting to draw her. He expressed the negative feelings he had felt (frustration, guilt, inadequacy) and then went on to finish this demonstration and moved to write alongside the children, joining a table and continuing to work on his text. Jeff’s writing is reproduced as Figure 2.

FIGURE 7.2. JEFF ENGAGED IN DEMONSTRATION WRITING

Jeff’s initial evaluation of the lesson was that it “didn’t feel good” to him, which connects with his appraisal of his writing. Hesitantly he explained how difficult he had found it to write publicly about his gran:

> I found it really, really hard [pause], because I had purposefully as we’d like said - I had not planned anything, so it wasn’t [pause], in my mind I knew it’d be gran because we were talking about families and things and I thought it would be her, but when I stood there it was that whole, ‘I don’t know’; ‘I don’t know what to do’ and I went straight into story mode. I felt I was trying to [pause], I didn’t want to do my gran down [she] means a lot to me.

It is clear that Jeff’s choice of his gran as the topic of his writing had led to tension: he was torn, his pedagogic desire was to compose spontaneously but he also had to deal with the writerly affective consequences of his chosen topic. This tension manifested itself as a sense of guilt as well as frustration with the children in the class, whose attention started to wain once they began themselves to write. When their talking became disruptive, Jeff, who had been diligently continuing his composition sitting alongside pupils, stood up, expressed an authorial desire for space and asked for quiet, saying, ‘…then we can keep our thinking going - okay? I can’t do justice to my gran with all this noise.’ From his interjection into the chatter in the room, it is evident that he perceived the children were both an inhibitor and a ‘nuisance’ to his composition. He was left feeling “upset” by the children’s interruptions as they wrote alongside him, explaining that ‘I didn’t do justice to my gran through what I wrote and I suppose that upset me as well and in a way I thought what right have these
children got to stop me?’ As we have commented before (Cremin and Baker, 2010), Jeff’s full engagement in his writing at that point positioned him firmly at the ‘writer-teacher’ end of the continuum (Fig.1), which resulted in conflicting desires between being the ‘teacher’ and wanting to be ‘a writer’.

Jeff’s intention to produce writing without prior rehearsal also caused a layer of anxiety. While engaged in demonstration writing, he spelt the word ‘precious’ incorrectly (‘precius’) and pondered aloud if he had made a mistake. The class teacher, Clare, counselled him ‘Don’t worry about the spelling now, it’s not important, just underline it and come back to it later’, and a child shouted out the correct spelling. At this point, Jeff appeared momentarily sidetracked and looked somewhat awkward. His genuine challenge with the spelling of this word revealed a sense of unease. He later reflected that the session ‘showed the struggle of ideas, the struggle of what… how to move from what you’ve spoken about and what you shared and what you put on paper’. The pedagogy of spontaneously composing texts as a teacher in front of a class may support children to develop their nascent authorial confidence, but Jeff’s reflections suggest it also poses an open risk for teachers who are emotionally invested in their role as writer/teachers and teacher/writers.

However, there was also mention of positive elements; reflecting on the experience of physically situating himself amongst his pupils and continuing to craft his text there, Jeff observed that it, ‘really felt we all felt we were writers in that class, all experiencing something together’. Jeff is describing the development of a space for communal writing; indeed, this notion of a writing community was reinforced by his stated intention to produce a publication where ‘every child will have a piece of work in the book, teachers as well’. The idea of a community of writers is potentially transformative as it connects with a Freirean sense of the horizontal classroom, where the status of the teacher-as-expert is eroded through the sharing of knowledges and the understanding that everyone is a learner. As recent research into classroom reading communities has found, when teachers reposition themselves as adult readers alongside learners, new relationships of a less hierarchical nature may develop (Cremin et al., 2014).

**The class teacher’s experience**

Unlike Jeff, Clare had not participated in the PD programme on becoming a ‘writer’ and did not engage in authentic and spontaneous composition when she taught literacy. Like many teachers she composed her writing at home (Cremin, 2006), and during demonstration writing ‘pretended’ to compose what had already been written and rehearsed. Rather than the intense emotional labour that Jeff reflected upon from a writerly perspective, Clare’s view of the pedagogical approaches of demonstration writing and writing alongside suggested a more teacherly view of writing:

**Researcher:** Does it [these approaches] make any difference to the quality of their writing do you think?

**Clare:** It does in some respects as they like it when it’s quiet and they appreciate that we all need to focus- I can’t write when all I can hear is ‘it’s a special locket’ then you end up writing what they’ve said to you! It also helps the more independent kids who know they can rely upon self-help strategies. They need to know that you don’t need to worry about the spelling when you are getting your ideas down or you will lose the flow.
Clare’s appraisal of these approaches as facilitating ‘focus’ and ‘quiet’ suggests a set of understandings and assumptions about writing that are both personal to Clare, and commonly considered to be key tenets of teaching writing. Nonetheless research indicates that for some children the chance to talk and share ideas is an integral part of writing, especially creative writing (Vass, 2007; Davidson, 2007). However, Clare did imply divergence from traditionally taught models of writing when dismissing the need to spell correctly if that risks “losing the flow” of ideas.

Like Jeff, Clare spoke of the sense of a burgeoning community within the classroom:

*Clare*: I often feel a real urge to put my hand up and share my writing when I am writing as one of the class with Jeff

*Researcher*: Do you ever?

*Clare*: Not often. When I’m writing in there I’m somehow invisible- one of the writers if you know what I mean

*Researcher*: Not a teacher?

*Clare*: Well not unless a boy throws a rubber or something... But the rest of the time they can see I’m a writer and it’s catching- we’re all writers, me, Jeff, Debbie and the children.

Clare’s desire to ‘put her hand up’ and her sense of being ‘invisible’ both stand in marked contrast with her normal role as teacher of the class. These suggest that as a consequence of Jeff’s particular pedagogical approach, she is enabled at times to position herself as a writer-teacher and become ‘one of the writers’. However, she does comment that she is pulled back to her teacher role (the teacher-writer on the continuum) by disruptive behaviour or children’s requests for help. This resonates with the analysis offered in our earlier work (Cremin and Baker, 2010), suggesting that the institutional force of the teacher’s role as helper/disciplinarian is strong, drawing teachers away from an authentic engagement with their compositions. Indeed, as discussed above, when Jeff sat amongst the children to continue his writing on his gran his intent focus meant that he occasionally ignored requests for help from his ‘fellow’ writers and Clare was pushed to support those children.

The teaching assistant’s experience

As Clare’s teaching assistant, Debbie was involved in offering one-to one learning support to pupils with particular needs beside whom she sat. Nonetheless, during Jeff’s lessons and as a member of this ‘community of writers’, she also engaged in writing alongside the pupils. She perceived that the experience of doing so was not only helpful for developing children’s writing, but that it helped to foster closer relationships between pupils and staff:

I think it helps us all writing and talking, as I didn’t realise Charlie had four brothers and sisters like me and I told him I come from a big family too… Also I felt I learnt quite a bit about the two girls and they did about me- I told them my favourite place would be the Bahamas and that my daughter’s at university and they seemed to like that- you know knowing about me.

The experience of sitting with the children and, significantly, behaving as a co-writer in this session, prompted Debbie and her focus children to share personal information with one another, exchange contextual and relational knowledge and comment on each other’s writing. However, while such sharing may prompt connections and help
to build relationships, it is important to recognise that some teaching assistants, like some teachers, may be uncomfortable in such situations that call for a reduction in professional distance and the positioning of the adult as co-learner. As research indicates, not all teachers are confident writers (e.g. Morgan, 2010), and teaching assistants too may find such re-positioning problematic. Debbie did not, although she acknowledged “I found it hard to start today, but then I adapted his ideas and I enjoyed it then”.

The children’s experience

Following the third observed session, a table of five children were asked to participate in a focus group interview and give their thoughts on Jeff’s literacy teaching, which they perceived as somewhat different compared with their other teachers. They brought their writing books to this session, and unprompted, shared some of Jeff’s responses to their writing. When asked about the kinds of responses Jeff gave, the children indexed his investment in their writing – and themselves as writers. The notion that a ‘community of writers’ was developing as a result of the pedagogical approaches and related identity positions adopted by Jeff was echoed in their responses. They perceived that Jeff was genuinely interested in them, both as individuals and in what they wrote. For example Will typically noted: ‘I think he’s interested in, like what you write about because you, he wants to know what has gone on in your life before like you’ve came to like Year Six and that’ and Ben observed ‘He kind of writes like, nice comments and like says if you don’t like the comment, or agree with him, he’ll like say yeah that’s fine and he will like say something else and see if you agree with that’. These descriptions of Jeff’s feedback suggest that he is attentive to individuals and open to contestation, to discussion, to detail and context.

On being asked what they thought was the most important thing about writing, several children mentioned the significance of expressing their feelings in and through writing. For example, Jack observed: ‘How do you say it? Like your emotions and that, like how you feel and everything’. This was reinforced in part through Jeff’s use of ‘traffic lights’ as a tool for reflection at the end of literacy sessions. In England at the time these were used for self-evaluation. Children would draw a set of traffic lights at the end of their writing and colour in one light to denote the extent to which they believed they had achieved the lesson’s set objective. Somewhat counter-cultural, Jeff invited the children to use the traffic lights to reflect upon how their writing made them feel, how pleased or proud they were with their draft thus far.

Jeff’s pedagogic intention to support the children as writers and his respect for their feelings, and investment in their lives and experiences was mirrored in his written responses to their writing. He not only commented upon each piece of writing, but eschewed the common practice in England at the time of giving each piece of writing a ‘level’. Instead he offered personal comments, including for example:

Well done Ben, you, your writing reminds me about how important it is to have someone in our family who we can look up to, and want to be like. It sounds like your Grandad was a great role model to you.

Jack, Thank you for writing about Jed (his dog). I totally understand the part where you say he’s like a brother to you. Dogs are so great and no matter how you are feeling they always greet you with a waggling tail and a lick! Does Jed jump up too?
The children expressed considerable satisfaction and interest in their teacher’s responses; Jeff focused on their chosen topics and often made connections to his own views and life. In several cases in the writing books the children shared, there was evidence of sustained written interchanges between Jeff and the child writer, some of these written conversations involved three turns each. In these, the adult and the child writer conversed about an issue in the written text, connected to the child’s life. For example:

Jeff: Well done Brad, Great writing. I really liked finding out about Callum’s birthday. Do you all still enjoy the X box?
Brad: Yeah but it’s funny because one day it didn’t work and he [Callum] shouted downstairs, Brad !!! What have you done?
Jeff: Oh Brad – you nearly got blamed for it! That happened a lot to me when I was younger.
Brad: My dad came up and plugged in a wire. That day I called him [Callum] a nutter!

Jeff’s comments to the children, illustrate his engagement, his empathy and his attempts to understand and validate their experiences. At this early stage in the year he had written very little in their books that focused on the pupils’ writing skills, indeed he observed he was consciously “reading and responding to what they have to say- that’s what’s important just now”. Jeff’s desire to connect and demonstrate his understanding of their ‘special people’ and the written dialogues affirm his emotional investment and intention to develop a community of writers in the classroom.

Discussion

The themes of vulnerability and risk-taking identified by Cremin (2006) and Woodard (2015) in their case studies of teachers writing certainly appear to resonate with Jeff’s experience presented here. Although he moves across the teacher-writer continuum throughout the observed session (see Fig.1), and experiences a not dissimilar continuum of positive and negative feelings about his writing, Jeff is above all a ‘brave writer’. In choosing to compose an unrehearsed text in the public forum of the classroom, Jeff engaged in a ‘performance of authenticity’: attempting to demonstrate how writing is often iterative and disjointed, and on this occasion, was tense, joyful, sad, and frustrating. As a consequence of this performance, Jeff exposed his emotional self to the class and the other adults present. In seeking to model how to move from his drawing to composing in the ‘writing community’ he was trying to establish, Jeff experienced conflict in both the process and the topic affective states suggested by D’Mello and Mills (2014). Jeff’s frustration with his demonstrated composition, and his later irritation at the children’s disruptive chatter was likely a result of his process affective state; indeed D’Mello and Mills (2014) assert that frustration is one of four emotions that emerge from the composition process (along with engagement/flow, boredom and confusion). It was clear too that Jeff was at moments also deeply engaged with the flow of his writing and was at other points confused and unsure. Unlike the other teacher who took part in this study (Elaine; see Cremin and Baker, 2010; 2014), Jeff did not appear bored with his writing – at least not in the interaction described here.

Moreover, while Jeff wanted to offer his fellow writers an honest example of what it is like to write, he simultaneously wanted to protect the integrity of his chosen ‘special’ person and this also contributed to his frustration, especially when writing
alongside. Jeff’s investment in the topic of his gran seems to have heightened his topic affective state; a predictable consequence, according to D’Mello and Mills, as engaging in descriptive writing “activate[s] emotional memories related to those topics” (2014, p. 153). Jeff’s identification with children through his pedagogical actions – in terms of the content of their writing and in the processes and practices of writing – position him as a human teacher in the classroom: a knowing, experiencing, feeling person. This intentional positioning supports and is supported by the actions of demonstration writing, writing alongside and offering personal responses to the content of the children’s writing. As VanDeWeghe (2004) observes: ‘responding well calls for not only identifiable skills, but also intra- and interpersonal skills, along with such crucial emotional and cognitive dispositions as empathy and reader-based anticipation (p.96). There is evidence that through his use of traffic lights focused on children’s feelings about their writing and his written feedback, Jeff is cognisant of the emotional demands of composing and seeks to offer responsive support.

Interestingly Jeff’s sense of vulnerability and exposure that emerged out of his demonstration writing were not echoed in the reflections of Clare, Debbie or the children. Instead, it appears that they both recognised and celebrated the results of his intention to create a community of writers – a deepened sense of familiarity, a common sense of purpose and shared experience of composition – as long as it did not diverge away from the rules of teaching, such as using correct spelling or controlling the noise level.

**Conclusion**

The data presented in this chapter offer a much-needed empirical account of the emotional work that is an integral part of teaching writing. What teachers of writing need to understand, Yeo (2007, p. 127) asserts, ‘is the relationship between teaching, composition and life’; this, our analysis suggests, is underpinned by an awareness of affect. The exploration of the interactions within Jeff’s teaching of writing, which include observations of him demonstrating writing and then writing alongside, as well as his post-teaching reflections and those of the class teacher, the teaching assistant and pupils, clearly illustrate how much is at stake emotionally for the teacher-writer. The process of spontaneous composition at the front of the class offers little in the way of protection from the emotional exposure that writing in this public context brings. In Jeff’s case, the exposure was multi-layered: disclosing his experience of writing, his competence as a writer, his spelling, his humanity and his sense of self and life experiences. In emotionally investing in spontaneous demonstration writing to support the children as writers, Jeff allowed himself to be both human and humane in the classroom, two subject-positions that may have been relatively unusual to the children, particularly given the prevailing culture of performativity (Ball, 1998) in the UK school context. The audit-driven environment evident in primary schools tends to position teachers as technicians whose job is merely to raise ‘standards’; this has the potential, as Fielding (2006) asserts, to create an increasingly dehumanised context for learning. Nonetheless, as this analysis of Jeff’s positioning shows, if teachers choose to position themselves as fellow writers, then whilst they will be submitting themselves to the emotional risks involved in public composition (which need to be recognised and supported), they will also be working towards building communities of writers that are attentive to the social and affective nature of writing and being a write.
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