

Foreword

Teresa Cremin and Terry Locke

In the light of increasing international interest in teachers' and students' literate identities and practices, this book addresses the under-researched area of teachers' and students' writer identities and in so doing seeks to advance the field. The volume is premised upon two key assertions, namely that writer identity matters and needs recognition and development in educational contexts, and that young people's writer identities are influenced by the ways in which their teachers identify as writers. It brings together new empirical studies and scholarly reviews on writer identity and the teaching and learning of writing from researchers working in Australia, Canada, Denmark, New Zealand, the UK and the USA. The volume explores what it means to identify as a writer, the issues which surround the concept of 'being a writer', and the consequences which arise when teachers and students do or do not identify as writers. Several contributors also conceive of and examine writing as a significant form of identity work.

It is only relatively recently that an identity lens has been employed by school-focused writing researchers such that teachers' and students' writer identity enactments have been studied in classrooms or professional learning contexts (e.g. McKinney and Giorgis, 2009; Locke et al, 2011; Cremin and Baker, 2010; 2014; Ryan, 2014). Teachers in many countries are expected to model writing and demonstrate their proficiency as writers, even though modelling certain techniques and strategies is a far cry from modelling being a writer in the classroom. Enacting the dual roles of teacher and writer is potentially problematic in school if, as research indicates, practitioners lack self-assurance and positive writing identities (e.g. Luce Kapler et al., 2001; Gannon and Davies, 2007; Cremin and Oliver, 2016). It is equally problematic if teachers are unsure about what it might mean to model a writer identity.

Such issues are compounded by the fact that historically in the high-school context many teachers report being drawn to teach English by a love of reading not writing, and whilst many associate reading with pleasure and satisfaction, few view writing in the same way (Peel, 2000; Gannon and Davies, 2007). In their Australian study, Gannon and Davies (2007) found that a love of literature or an inspirational English teacher prompted most of the respondents to teach the subject, not an interest in writing. Canadian research in the elementary phase also reveals that reading, not writing, forms the backbone of teachers' literacy experiences and that this impacts upon their classroom practice where reading is profiled over composition (Yeo, 2007). In addition there has been a growing call for teachers of all disciplinary areas to view themselves as teachers of writing (Shanahan and Shanahan, 2008, Grimberg and Hand, 2009). However, there is widespread recognition that such teachers are reluctant to assume the mantle of either teacher of writing or disciplinary writer (Carney and Indrisano, 2013; Locke and Johnston, 2016). Alongside this it is argued that performativity discourses have distorted professional understanding of the nature and purpose of composition (Cremin & Myhill, 2012; Locke, 2013).

A recent systematic review of research into teachers as writers (from 1990-2015) underscores these difficulties. It suggests there are multiple difficulties and tensions including practitioners' low self-assurance as writers, adverse writing histories, and limited conceptions of writing and being a writer, such that there is a genuine challenge in composing and enacting the positions of teacher and writer in the classroom (Cremin and Oliver, 2016). The review concludes that:

‘Pre-service and in-service training programmes appear to have important roles to play in developing teachers’ conceptions of writing and sense of self as writer. Findings suggest that sustained opportunities to reflect on personal writing histories, engage in writing, discuss textual processes and participate in a community of practice, can influence teachers’ self-assurance as writers and their pedagogical approaches’. (Cremin and Oliver, 2016)

However the review states that the evidence base in relation to the pedagogical consequences of whether teachers identify as writers and the influence of their understanding of and attitudes towards teaching writing remains ‘extremely thin, particularly regarding impact on student outcomes’ (Cremin and Oliver, 2016).

In order to examine these complex potentially interrelated issues more closely we invited scholars researching in the field to contribute to this volume and to share their new data and current perspectives on writer identity. We divided the resultant text into four sections. In turn these examine: conceptions of writing, writers and identities; the development of teachers’ writer identities; the shifting practices and positions adopted by teachers in classrooms; and students’ identities as writers, both within and beyond school. Working mainly but not exclusively from a sociocultural perspective, the contributing scholars employ a range of methodological approaches and timescales. Most use multiple-method qualitative strategies such as case study, ethnography, and naturalistic inquiry, whilst others combine qualitative and quantitative methods. In relation to their research instruments, interviews, observations, questionnaires, and scrutiny of writing samples are commonly used to explore the ways in which writers perform and enact their identities in different contexts. Some of the contributors offer diverse perspectives on the common sense, yet much debated, contention that in order to teach writing, teachers need to ‘be writers’, or in some sense to identify themselves as writers. Other contributors focus on students’ writer identities and the ways young people position themselves and are positioned as writers within and beyond school. Professional writers’ identities are also examined with a view to illuminating possible consequences for the teaching of writing and young writers’ identities.

Section A: Writing, writers and identity

Commencing the examination of identity and writing which threads through the volume, Eyres offers a conceptual examination of these terms drawing on multiple theoretical perspectives and standpoints. Initially he contrasts different conceptualisations of literacy, recognising that policy-makers and educators who adopt traditionally ‘asocial’ and ‘autonomous’ models (Street, 1984) of literacy, tend to dislodge cognitive skills ‘from their socio-cultural moorings in human relationships and communities of practice’ (Richardson, 1998, p. 116). Eyres takes a sociocultural view of literacy, recognises it is embedded within specific social and cultural contexts, and is underpinned by an ‘ideological’ model in Street’s (1984, 2008) terms. He links this social model to the ways in which participants in any community of practice move from peripheral participation to full membership (Lave and Wenger, 1991) and highlights the influence of classroom literacy/writing practices which have a direct bearing on the literate identities of all involved. Consistent with this standpoint, Eyres then examines identity as situated performance, and considers the influence of culture and context upon individuals’ identity enactments. He also considers various frameworks to account for the fluidity and multiplicity of identities, including that of ‘figured worlds’ and identity positioning (Holland et al., 1998; Holland and Lave, 2001).

Whilst recognising the socially ascribed and constructed nature of identity, Eyres also draws attention to identity as an internalised process and the role of personal agency. In examining the significance of autobiographical narrative (written or spoken), he posits this can be seen as identity performance rather than text. Additionally Eyres considers connections and intersections between writing, identity and learning to write. He argues that learning to write involves the adoption of a writer identity through inter- and intra-personal identity work, engagement in literacy practices and with cultural artefacts, and highlights the role of agency and personal subjectivity, as well as the interplay between teachers' own identities as writers, their perceptions of students, and their students' own sense of themselves as writers. His exploration of the multiple conceptualisations of writing and identity establishes a focused context for the volume.

The first empirically-based chapter attends to the voices, not of teachers or young novice writers, but highly experienced professional writers. Cremin, Lillis, Myhill and Eyres draw upon a cross-university study to reflect upon these professionals' histories and identities as writers. Their subjects have published widely and are both well-known and well respected within their primary writing domain. The range includes novelists, a poet, journalists, screen-writers, magazine columnists and academic writers (all of the last group are UK science professors). The team adopted a biographical approach to examine the professional writers' identities as expressed and constructed in interviews. In this chapter they focus on the writers' memories of formal education and the influence of childhood reading. In so doing, Cremin and colleagues ensure that the writers' voices and views complement those offered elsewhere in the volume from an educational perspective. They analyse the professional writers' 'master narratives' (Hammack, 2011) as revealing identity enactments in their own right and also as a form of exploration in order to consider possible implications for the development of young writers and the teaching of writing.

Reflecting upon their experience of formal education, the professional writers reported a range of constraints on their early development as writers: a systemic lack of attention to and interest in imaginative writing in classroom settings and some challenging and discouraging relationships with teachers, many of whom expressed scant interest in their writing. In addition, specific, negative, school-based writing memories appeared salient in their narrated life stories. Many of the professional writers described their childhood determination to succeed against these odds, fuelled it appeared by a deep pleasure in reading and a desire to make and shape their own narratives, through play, talk and writing. Indeed despite their adverse recollections, most of the participants positioned themselves as having been child writers, although some acknowledged that this may have been partly a retrospective reconstruction. The writers' memories of early reading were detailed and specific, encompassing both books and other media and they frequently referred to drawing upon childhood favourites in their later writing, naming particular texts that they perceived had influenced their later writing. This study, in highlighting the motivating power of narrative and the impact of early reading and listening-to-print practices, demonstrates the shaping influence of writers' early and social experiences of learning to write and becoming writers, and underscores the value of adopting an identity lens to understand writers and writing.

Section B: Writing identity and the development of teachers

The next section of the book focuses its attention on the formation of teachers' identities as writers in both pre-service and in-service settings. Three chapters explore this, both through new empirical studies with teachers engaging in pre-service and in-service learning (Morgan, and Street and Stang) and through a reflective examination and re-conceptualisation of work in this area (Whitney).

The starting point of Morgan's chapter is that many teachers are not well prepared to teach writing, and often demonstrate negative attitudes to writing stemming from their own schooling experiences, together with a lack of actual, recent, positive writing experiences. 'I argue', she writes, 'that the writing identity that may be most helpful to teachers is one where they identify as a writer who understands *how* and *why* writers enact their craft'. Morgan's study set out to explore how teachers (both pre-service and in-service) participating in a US graduate education course, designed and delivered by herself, came to develop or modify understandings of writing and teaching writing. Cognisant that many teachers express concerns about teaching writing and that pre-service courses offer relatively limited preparation in this area (Morgan and Pytash, 2014), she sought to enable her course members' to develop their identities as writers. The course afforded opportunities for participants to engage in process writing in a programme of study, in which multiple goals were manifest, including: reading as a writer, textual study, the use of mentor texts, and writing, as well as planning a unit of work on a self-chosen genre. In essence, Morgan aimed to 'help teachers rediscover writing while developing their understandings of principles, practices, theories, and research related to writing development and instruction.'

Her findings indicated that the lines between what the teachers learned as writers and as teachers of writing were often blurred, and that as teachers and writers, the participants identified common ground in respect of these two identity positions. As a result of their involvement in the project, some if not all of the participants, were better able to articulate aspects of the writing process itself, to make use of "mentor texts" to support their own and their students' growth as writers, to help students in choice-making around writing, and to view themselves as writers. For Morgan, the participants learned both from living inside the process and from seeing the ways in which their fellow writers in the group were influenced, but particularly in and through critical conversations about writing which were at the core of their work as an emerging community of writers. As a consequence, she argues, some of the teachers' previously held conceptions about writing, their awareness and ability to talk about writing craft, and to see themselves as writers, were modified and enhanced.

Street and Stang also focus on the importance of developing communities of writing practice. However, their emphasis is more on writing across the curriculum and the resistance to assuming identities as teachers of writing and writers we alluded to earlier, attributable in part to teachers' own writer biographies. Their premise is that if teachers are going to view themselves as members of writing and teaching communities, 'teacher educators would do well to consider issues of biography, self-confidence, and proficiency with writing in undergraduate and graduate courses'. Based on a National Writing Workshop model, Street and Stang developed and evaluated a US in-service, graduate writing course aimed at changing the attitudes, skills and practices of a cross-disciplinary group of middle- and high-school teachers. As an initial activity, participants wrote and shared a 'writing autobiography' as a community-building exercise and as an induction into the productive use of peer-response practices, which became a cornerstone for additional written assignments. Response groups often formed spontaneously in response to a shared content area and/or a shared work setting and became the source of collegial support and constructive criticism. Through the experience of

being student-writers again, the teachers, Stang and Street argue, working alongside their colleagues developed their confidence as writers. In their evaluation of the course, the authors found that, in particular, participants viewed peer sharing and peer response positively, saw their own writing as evolving over time, and indicated certain changes in their attitudes to writing itself (including changes in self-confidence).

For Street and Stang, the study findings were a powerful reminder of the importance of acknowledging teachers' biographies as writers as a first step in their 'escaping' them. Like other contributors to this book, they highlight the importance of exposing pre-service teachers to supportive communities of practice models of induction, where the affective domain is acknowledged and respected. They claim that the existence of the University's unlimited revision policy enabled the teachers to make real gains as they sought to continually revise and redraft their work. For some of the teachers on the course, this mediating tool contributed to a new-found pleasure in writing and an enhanced sense of self-efficacy as writers. Their work suggests that within communities of practice, peer feedback plays a vital part in supporting the development of positive attitudes to writing.

In the last chapter in this section, Whitney extends the argument that 'teachers must be writers' by situating historically the growth of the teacher-as-writer movement in the US, offering an informed analysis of what she perceives as a conceptual shift from 'teachers as writers', to 'teachers as researchers', and more recently to 'teacher-writers'. In doing so, she adopts a broad stance on the National Writing Project referred to by Street and Stang in the previous chapter. She begins by observing that while the notion that 'the teacher of writing should also write' has become a commonplace, the reality in many classrooms is that many teachers both dread and avoid writing. At the same time, she asserts, there is a growing number of teachers who assume the identity of 'teacher-writers', who not only model writer identities in their classrooms, but manifest writing practices in both professional and political spheres as a mean of reclaiming and asserting their autonomy. In particular, she highlights the value of teachers writing for publication, and widening their knowledge and influence as pedagogues supporting their colleagues.

The main emphasis of Whitney's chapter is to argue for a range of in-service teacher education strategies that can contribute to the formation of such teacher-writer identities. When students are taught by a teacher-writer, she contends, they are more likely to experience someone who empathises with their writing difficulties and understands the writing process. However, there are also benefits for the teacher, when she/he assumes the identity of teacher-writer. The identity, she contends, offers an expansion of the self, and allows for an enrichment of one's classroom experiences. Whitney argues for two avenues whereby teachers might develop identities as teacher-writers, National Writing Project involvement and participation in teacher writing groups. Finally, she draws attention to the crucial role being a teacher-writer can play in fostering a teacher's professional agency as someone who writes back to some of the policies and practices currently working to the detriment of teachers and students. Describing teacher writing as 'disruptive', she stresses the significance of teacher-writers' voices and their role in challenging the prevailing performative orthodoxy in education. Alongside other contributors to this volume, Whitney recognises writing as a significant form of identity work. She believes that through their writing, teacher-writers can work to reject the persistent policy positioning of pedagogues as 'technicians', who merely deliver the given curriculum, and can both voice and demonstrate that there are alternative, more effective and more humane ways to enable learning.

Section C: Teachers as writers: Shifting practices and positions in the classroom

Practitioners are often supported in developing their identities as writers through involvement in University credit-bearing courses such as those run by Street, Stang, Morgan and our next contributor McKinney. Her work, alongside four other contributors in this next section, focuses on investigating teachers' practices and positions as writers and as teachers, both those reported and those enacted and observed in the classroom.

In her study, McKinney examined the views and reported practices of six novice teachers (four male and two female), whom she believed had identified themselves as writers through various assignments and activities during her US Teaching Writing course the previous semester. Nonetheless she recognises that teachers are 'positioned and position themselves as capable or not capable, and agentive in some spaces but not in others depending on contexts, time and space, resources, mentors and a host of other factors'. Through the dual lenses of Ellsworth's (1997) concept of pedagogical mode of address and Phelan's (1993) conception of the politics of performance, McKinney examines the teachers' perceptions of being a writer and teaching writing. In particular, through close analysis of interview data and their reflections on teaching writing (submitted as part of the course), McKinney seeks to explore the reported intersections between writing identity and classroom performance with regard to pedagogical relationships.

McKinney's participants clearly demonstrate that they are, in Whitney's earlier terms, 'teacher-writers'; these novice teachers saw themselves as writers and asserted their professional autonomy in different contexts in order to nurture positive writer identities in the young. All wrote with enthusiasm about writing lessons, units or experiences that fostered a sense of creativity, agency, and empowerment of their students' voices. All were committed to their students and to building classroom writing communities which specifically included practices that demonstrated connections between their writing and their teaching identities; their teaching encompassed reciprocal intersections between their identity positions as teachers and as writers. The examples illuminating this are highly engaging, as are the ways in which these novice teachers seek to offer relational spaces for themselves and their students as writers. McKinney highlights the salience of developing a pedagogical mode of address in the classroom from a writer's perspective and the potential of teachers using their experiences as writers, especially in the US system which she argues, through the narrow and prescribed curriculum, limits opportunities for students to engage in writing for real purposes.

In the following chapter, drawing on observational data gathered in the classroom, Baker and Cremin focus their lens on the affective dimension of writing and identifying oneself, or being identified by others, as a teacher-writer. In an earlier study by these UK authors, emotion had emerged as a salient intrapersonal force shaping how teachers position themselves and are positioned in their roles as teacher-writers/writer-teachers in the classroom (Cremin and Baker, 2010). In particular, teachers' relationships with their unfolding compositions and their emotional engagement/disengagement with their writing had influenced their situated sense of self-as-writers in this classroom. Their chapter revisits this earlier dataset and offers a multi-agent account of the emotional experience of participating in a writing classroom. It explores the experiences of a teacher Jeff, the teaching/support staff sitting amongst the pupils, and the pupils themselves. As the authors observe, there is relatively little research which addresses the emotional involvement of

teachers or students as writers, although studies of teachers writing in pre/in-service programmes evidence considerable insecurity, anxiety and discomfort (e.g. Cremin, 2006; Gardner, 2014; Morgan, 2006; Whitney, 2008). Through an analysis of Jeff's talk and actions during demonstration writing, the authors seek to make manifest his anxiety and genuine nervousness in composing a particular piece about his gran in the public forum of the classroom and they document how he handles this.

Baker and Cremin argue that the pedagogy of spontaneously composing texts as a teacher in front of a class may support children to develop their nascent authorial confidence, but it also poses an open risk for teachers who are emotionally invested in their roles as writers and teachers. Throughout the observed session, the teacher in this study experienced writing as a struggle. As he moved across the teacher-writer/writer-teacher continuum (Cremin and Baker, 2010), he experienced a not dissimilar continuum of positive and negative feelings about his writing. Nonetheless, as the voices of the teaching assistant, class teacher and pupils indicate, by composing authentically and revealing his concerns, Jeff was not only successfully positioning himself as a writer-teacher at moments during demonstration writing and when writing alongside his pupils, but was helping to build a classroom community of writers. His vulnerability was not echoed in the reflections of the others present, but his intention to create a community of writers was both recognised and celebrated. In particular, Jeff's written comments on the children's writing illustrated his engagement, his empathy and desire to understand and validate their life experiences and authorial voices. In the highly performative culture characterising compulsory education in the UK, Baker and Cremin posit that the work of teachers who are emotionally invested in writing and teaching writing may offer a more 'human and humane' way forward, which recognises the place of affect and seeks to foster children's own identities as writers with something to say.

Extending this exploration of the consequences of teachers positioning themselves as writers in the classroom, Woodard offers a case study of a teacher, Hannah, who had participated in a four-week, US National Writing Project Summer Institute and was subsequently observed in her classroom over a period of seven months. Also adopting a positional view of identity which reflects its situated nature, Woodard utilises Bucholtz and Hall's (2006) 'tacits of intersubjectivity' analytical framework to examine specific relational processes through which identities are narrated and performed across contexts and over time. The six relational processes comprise: adequation and distinction, authentication and denaturalization, and authorization and illegitimation. These are used to analyse and interpret Hannah's journeys as a writing teacher. Woodard's analysis reveals that whilst this English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher never saw herself as a particularly good writer, lacked self-assurance as a writer (due to negative past experiences), and rarely wrote volitionally for her own pleasure before the NWP Summer Institute, she worked hard to create a palpably different school experience for her students.

In a manner not dissimilar to McKinney's study, Woodard analyses the ways in which Hannah sought to authorize her young students' writerly identities. These included legitimizing their diverse personal experiences, their fan writing and their drawing. Examples of each of these strategies are offered, including for example, a country project which positioned the students as experts on their cultures and enabled them to draw on their funds of knowledge (Moll et al, 1992). Students also had the opportunity to draw and compose speech bubbles, which Hannah found was particularly important for her emergent ESL writers. In the process of legitimising such practices, Hannah appeared to be redefining, for her students,

what counts as writing in her classroom and also reshaping the students' relationship to writing and potentially their views of themselves as writers. The extent to which this influenced her view of herself as a writer is not known, but the study reveals the kinds of practices which may emerge when teachers work intentionally to legitimize students' writerly identities and raises a number of questions for research and practice. As Woodard observes, 'for teachers interested in authenticating identities as writers and writing teachers, it might be productive to closely examine their own beliefs about what counts as writing and who counts as writers, as well as tensions in those beliefs'.

In the following chapter, Locke, drawing on studies from a range of schools and with teachers representing different subject areas and disciplines, also examines teachers' classroom practices and the consequences for students as writers. These New Zealand-based studies examine connections between teachers' engagement in writing workshop-based professional learning experiences and their shifting identities as writers. In addition, the chapter offers instances of classroom practice that evidence the impact of subsequent, changed pedagogical practice on students as writers. Initially Locke explores the concept of writer identity, and argues that Ivanič's (2006) seminal framework does not sufficiently 'tell a story about what it means to write or be a writer'. He offers his own definition of writer identity as 'the subscribed-to discourse or story about what it means to be a writer that is implicit in one's own beliefs and practices' and links this to notions of teacher professional identity and disciplinary literacy. In recognition of the disciplinary diversity in his data, gathered from two projects with a total of 21 teachers, Locke argues that there is a need to expand the mantra that 'every teacher is a teacher of writing' to 'every teacher is a teacher of certain types of writing'. Alongside attention to the transformative potential of sustained writing workshops as part of professional learning and a focus on cross-disciplinarity, he examines the challenges secondary schools face in becoming cultures of writing, the importance of classroom inquiry, and the need for whole-school and community commitment.

The interviews with the teacher-researchers from the schools after they had experienced the first year of their respective projects, indicate a gradual shift in their identities both as writers and teachers of writing. These teachers had, Locke asserts, developed a deeper understanding of writing and the writing process, and they expressed more empathy for students' challenges as writers. Additionally their classroom practices had changed. Many were more willing to write alongside students, and spent more time on process and the use of subject specific metalanguages, all of which the teachers perceived impacted on students themselves, in terms of motivation, performance and identity. Locke argues that to move the research and practice agenda forward at the level of each school, the value of intensive transformational professional experiences, such as writing workshops aligned with opportunities for critical inquiry and the facilitation of cross-disciplinary dialogue within and beyond the school, need to be integrated into the development of professional learning communities as change-agents. Only then, Locke suggests, will a school culture of writing be achieved in which teachers and students' own identities as writers are nurtured.

Section D: Students' writing identities

In the concluding section of the volume, the focus is on students' identities as writers and the interplay between teacher positioning (and being positioned) and the identity positions adopted and made available to students as writers in the classroom. As noted earlier, there is very little research which explicitly examines the interplay between teachers' and students' identities as writers, and documents the consequences with regard to students' writing competence and confidence. Three chapters examine these issues following an opening chapter in which Brady explores students' writing identities in the world beyond school.

Drawing upon a study which investigated the role of writing in the lives of 15 self-identified home writers (aged 7 -13 years) in the north of England, Brady explores the experiences and understandings of these young writers, and examines if their attitudes towards home and school writing differ. Atypically, she positioned this work in out-of-school contexts and located her sample through the library system and writing events for children. Brady commences by debating the concept of 'home', and explores connections with Bhabha's (1994) third-space theory, and argues that home writing can take place anywhere and at any time an individual feels 'at home'. The significance, she asserts rests in the conceptual aspects of home (security, warmth, feeling comfortable), and 'the way of inhabiting it' (Boym, 1994: 166). This may offer a useful description for those teachers who write volitionally at NWP institutes, on University writing courses and in teachers' writing groups for example, as detailed in several previous chapters. Brady's focus however is on the students themselves – those young writers who choose to write 'at home'. She employs Archer's (2003, 2007) work on reflexivity and the concepts of agency and structure in order to undergird her analysis of the multiple interviews and pieces of home writing gathered over a year.

The findings from this ethnographically styled study indicate that the young people had markedly different relationships with home and school writing. These were distinctively described as 'writing for self' and 'writing for others'. The former was characterised by a sense of personal agency; the latter by a perceived lack of choice and control. Brady argues that the former emerged from a space where the young people felt empowered and the latter was required in a space in which they often felt powerless. Based on this research Brady offers a newly conceived home writing continuum which seeks to capture and display information about an individual's home writing, the individual home writer and, most importantly, the relationship between each home writer and their home writing. Applying this to a thirteen-year-old home writer, Brady demonstrates that for this teenager home writing represents a source of empowerment; it offers her an outlet to explore challenging issues, reflect upon them and then move forwards. Her relationship with her poetry in particular is powerful and dynamic, existing in the present rather than the past. Through this analysis Brady evidences the critical role that reflexivity plays in the process of writing.

Collier too employed ethnographic methods in order to understand the writing practices and identities of two young 'becoming' writers - Kyle and Stephanie - in the middle years of elementary school. Although she visited the children at home, Collier mostly moved in and out of observer and participant roles in their school, where she positioned herself as a becoming writer also. During a two-year longitudinal study of Canadian children's text-making, Collier wrote alongside Kyle and Stephanie in the classroom and in the computer lab at school. This involved her in 'glancing sideways' at the children and making detailed observational notes in order to view these young writers' multiple identities through the intersection of their writing, their social identities and their talk about both of these. This concept of 'glancing sideways' as a method of data collection draws on Kendrick's (2005) study of a five-year-old at play, and focuses on ongoing processes, and accepts, Collier

asserts that change and flux is normal. She also seized opportunities for informal ongoing, sideways conversations with the young writers and examined the processes of writing drafts and polishing final products.

Viewing writer identities as fluid and multiple, Collier conceives of writing as a form of narrative play and an expression of literate identity (Kendrick, 2005; Wohlwend, 2009, 2011). This latter focus enables her to document what happens in the children's literacy classrooms, even during conventional literacy practices when they are writing in more formalized and potentially routinized ways about set themes. Collier's analysis offers a detailed sense of the two writers as unique individuals with different interests, passions and preferences. It also reveals how these writers are constructed and construct themselves through particular practices. Both seemed concerned to follow conventions and expectations as they perceived them, and both were positioned by their teacher in different ways according to their perceived academic abilities. As Collier observes, learning from children through glancing sideways is reminiscent of the work of early educators who conceptualized 'kidwatching' (Owacki and Goodman, 2002). Such observations facilitate the recognition of difference and enable Collier to highlight the shaping influence of relationships on the children's developing social and academic identities. Such informal yet formative documentation and the detailed knowledge of each writer which accrues over time, is, as Collier also notes, a far cry from more usual standardised or mandated assessments. It allows nuanced details of the complex relationship between writing identities, texts and contexts to be understood as part of children's journeys of becoming.

The next chapter also draws on a longitudinal case study, this time in the context of Danish middle- and high-school education with students aged 14-18 years. Elf examines the development of Amelie, an adolescent Danish student's writer identity and in, so doing, debates what is meant by this, theoretically and empirically/analytically. The case study he presents is part of a four year ethnographic study of adolescent writers (2009-2013). Theoretically, Elf, like Collier and most of the other contributors to the current volume, positions his work within a sociocultural approach to writing, emphasising that learning about writing occurs through participation and the use of mediating tools in a situated community. Regarding writers' development, Elf draws on Lemke's (2002) claim, further developed by Burgess and Ivanič (2010), that student writers coordinate writing and identification processes that unfold on many timescales in contexts inside and outside school. This theoretical framework informs the heuristic model and tool for analysing writer development as a sociocultural and textual practice in school which Elf employs.

In following the teenager Amelie from her last year in middle school and into the high-school education program called *htx*, a 3-year higher technical education programme, Elf engaged in intensive field work, including participant observation of her writing at school, collecting all writing prompts for and the actual written assignments, all the feedback she received on these assignments, and ongoing interviews. Elf conducted a timescales analysis of how and why this young adolescent develops as a writer and found that Amelie was 'taught by bitter experience' to write, as she reflects in a late interview. She makes some rather dramatic turns in terms of writer identification, from 'loving' writing in science in middle school to 'hating it' in high school, due to lack of feedback, amongst other reasons. However, at the end of high school, Elf indicates that there are signs that Amalie is restoring her old interest through the writing of and reflection upon an interdisciplinary writing project that includes social science and science. On the basis of this case study, Elf argues that both researchers and teachers need to be wary of making any absolute conclusions about students' 'linear'

development of writer identity; rather, he asserts, the evidence reveals their fluid, idiosyncratic, and patterned nature (Andrews and Smith, 2011). Additionally, Elfs's timescales approach to writer development offers new methodological and empirical insights on how to understand such developments in practice.

The final chapter by Ryan considers the ways in which students and teachers shape texts and identities together. Drawing on data from linguistically and culturally diverse primary phase children in Australia, Ryan focuses on writing as a social performance and as a significant form of identity work. Conscious that young people perform their identities through writing in diverse ways and particularly in incongruent and fluid social media contexts beyond school, she argues that the teaching of writing in school needs to support students in navigating such highly visible contexts to make writing decisions that represent themselves and others in appropriate and intended ways. She posits that students need to be enabled as reflexive writers with access to diverse repertoires from which they can choose, and with an accompanying self-awareness of the implications of writing choices in different contexts. Drawing on the work of Archer's (2007, 2012) critical realist theory of reflexivity (as Brady also does), Ryan further argues that teachers need to understand their own and their students' modes of reflexivity, in order that they can create enabling pedagogic conditions that prompt the reflexive processes of action and re-action, and engender satisfying and successful writing practices for all.

Illustrative examples of children's writing samples and interviews are presented through Ryan examination of Archer's (2007) four reflexive modes: communicative, autonomous, meta-reflexive and fractured. She notes that, whilst writers may use all four, each tends to have a predominant mode. Ryan highlights the indicators that constitute each mode and reflects upon the conditions that may produce and/or perpetuate it. Importantly, she also considers the potential constraints for students who enact that mode. For example she demonstrates that when students who tend to be communicative reflexives are given constant guidance and direction about every aspect of writing, their reflexivity may only be 'enabled' to rely on their teacher's suggestions. Ryan recognises the many tensions and complexities involved and makes recommendations for the teaching of writing that enable a meta-reflexive approach to the identity work involved. She argues that developing students' reflexive writing identities is an imperative for contemporary times and asserts that meta-reflexivity is the mode that will most enable students to negotiate variable conditions of writing and develop identities as writers with something to say.

The volume as a whole adopts the view that reflexive debate amongst scholars about writer identity and the teaching and learning of writing will likewise enhance the potential for developing young writers with something to say and the assurance to say it, in part through generating intellectual energy and discussion about teachers', professional writers' and students' writer identities and continued exploration of the consequences for pedagogy and practice. Additionally it is hoped that through the identification of alternative approaches to examining writers' identities and the opening up of compelling new lines of inquiry, the volume will make a valuable contribution to the field.

References

Andrews, R., & Smith, A. (2011). *Developing Writers: Teaching and learning in the digital age*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

Archer, M.S. (2003) *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M.S. (2007) *Making Our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. 2012. *The reflexive imperative in late modernity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge.

Boym, S. (1994) *Common Places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004) 'Language and identity', in Duranti, A. (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Malden, MA, Blackwell, pp. 369–394.

Burgess, A., & Ivanič, R. (2010). Writing and Being Written: Issues of Identity Across Timescales. *Written Communication*, 27, 228-255.

Carney, M. & Indrisano, R. (2013) 'Disciplinary literacy and pedagogical content knowledge', *Journal of Education*, vol. 193, no. 3, pp. 39–49.

Cremin, T. and Oliver, J. (forthcoming) Teachers as Writers: A systematic review, *Research Papers in Education*.

Cremin, T. (2006) 'Creativity, uncertainty and discomfort: Teachers as writers', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 415–433.

Cremin, T. and Baker, S. (2010) 'Exploring teacher-writer identities in the classroom: Conceptualising the struggle', *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 8–25.

Ellsworth, E. (1997) *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Gardner, P. (2014) 'Becoming a teacher of writing: Primary student teachers reviewing their relationship with writing', *English in Education*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 128–148.

Grimberg, B. and Hand, B. (2009) 'Cognitive pathways: Analysis of students' written texts for science understanding', *International Journal of Science Education*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 503–521.

Hammack, P. (2011) 'Narrative and the politics of meaning' *Narrative Inquiry*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 311-318.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D. and Cain, C. (1998) *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Holland, D. and Lave, J. (2001) History in person in *Enduring Struggles: Contentious practice, intimate identities*, (1-32) Sante Fe: School of American Research Press.

- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursual construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Kendrick, M. (2005). 'Playing house: A "sideways" glance at literacy and identity in early childhood', *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5–28.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. 2000. Across the Scales of Time: Artifacts, Activities, and Meanings in Ecosocial Systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 7, 273-290.
- Locke, T. Whitehead, D. Dix, S. and Cawkwell, G. (2011) 'New Zealand teachers respond to the 'National Writing Project' experience', *Teacher Development*, vol. 15, no. 3), pp. 273–291.
- Locke, T. and Kato, H. (2012) 'Poetry for the broken-hearted: How a marginal Year 12 English class was turned on to writing', *English in Australia*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 61–79.
- Locke, T. Whitehead, D. and Dix, S. (2013) 'The impact of "Writing Project" professional development on teachers' self-efficacy as writers and teachers of writing', *English in Australia*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 55–69.
- Locke, T. (2013) 'Assessing student poetry: Balancing the demands of two masters', *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 23–45.
- Locke, T. and Johnston, M. (2016) 'Developing an individual and collective self-efficacy scale for the teaching of writing in high schools', *Assessing Writing*, vol. 28, pp. 1–14.
- Lortie, D. 1975, *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Luce-Kapler, R., Chin, J., O'Donnell, E. and Stoch, S. (2001) 'The design of writing: unfolding systems of meaning', *Changing English*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 43–52.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D. and Gonzalez, N. (1992) 'Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms', *Theory into Practice*, **31**, pp. 132-141.
- Morgan, W. (2006) "'Poetry makes nothing happen": Creative writing and the English classroom', *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 17–33.
- Morgan, D.N. and Pytash, K.E. (2014), 'Preparing preservice teachers to become teachers of writing: A 20-year review of the research literature', *English Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 6-32.
- Owocki, G. and Goodman, Y. (2002). *Kidwatching: Documenting children's literacy development*. Heinemann: Portsmouth.
- Phelan, P. (1993) *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, New York, Routledge.

Richardson, P. (1998) 'Literacy, learning and teaching', *Educational Review*, vol.50, no. 2, pp. 115–134.

Riessman, C. K. (2003). Analysis of personal narratives. In J. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.) *Inside interviewing: new lenses, new concerns*. London: Sage, 331–346.

Ryan, M. E. 2014c. Writers as performers: Developing reflexive and creative writing identities. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 13, 130-148.

Shanahan, T. and Shanahan, C. (2008) 'Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 40–59.

Street, B.V. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B.V. (2008). New literacies, new times: developments in literacy studies. In Street, B.V. and Hornberger, N. eds. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Volume 2: Literacy, New York: Springer, 3-14.

Wohlwend, K.E. (2009). 'Damsels in discourse: Girls consuming and producing identity texts through Disney princess play', *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 57-83.

Wohlwend, K.E. (2011). *Playing their way into literacies: Reading, writing, and belonging in the early childhood classroom*. Teachers College Press, New York.

Yagelski, R.P. (2011). *Writing As a Way of Being: Writing Instruction, Nonduality, and the Crisis of Sustainability*, New York: Hampton Press.