

Places, spaces and local customs: honouring the private worlds of out-of-school text creation

Abstract

This paper examines the nature of the out-of-school writing practices of three primary-aged children aged 9-10. In particular, it explores the writing these children chose to undertake at home including 'for school' writing, completed at home. The study's findings reveal the ways in which these three, developing young writers engage and interact with writing and how this differs to writing *for school*, completed at home. To better understand the implications of national surveys that reveal a causal relationship between writing for enjoyment and positive writing attainment (NLT, 2017), this research sought to expose the range and versatility of the children's home and volitional writing practices. The children in this case study were not selected because they were writers but merely that they engaged with writing away from school. The study employs an ecological paradigm (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) to explore the participation and interaction of the children (Goodliff, 2013) with their writing practices within the complex environment of home. The paper makes the case for teachers to be more curious about the private worlds of out-of-school text creation to better appreciate the provenance of home writing events and artefacts.

Key words

Out-of-school; writing practices; sub rosa writing; writing places; writing spaces; writing.

Introduction

Spaces matter, as the way in which people interact with a place often mirrors how they represent themselves within existing spaces (Moje et al., 2004). Consequently, this small-scale case study sought to explore if, and how, children create their own home writing spaces and to document the types of practices that may occur there and for what purpose. This study utilised a multimodal definition of writing as, 'those events and practices in which the written mode is salient yet embedded in other modes' (Heath and Street, 2008:21). Through the examination of written artefacts and in writing conversations with the children, it was hoped to reveal where specific practices originate and to explore the ways in which, through their writing their 'personal and social histories [are] woven' (Kendrick and McKay, 2004:125).

Children's everyday home writing

This study positions writing as a socio-culturally situated practice, where the specific context of home and its associated cultures plays a 'principal role' (Rojas-Drummond et al., 2008; Razfar and Gutierrez, 2003; Goos et al., 2002). Thus, writing is situated; it is located at a particular point in time, in a specific space surrounded by the influence of context and of others. Therefore, the premise of this study was to observe the way children interact and respond through their writing and to document the ways in which their writing is shaped by the expectations of the specific culture, that of the home (Street, 1984).

The theory of how children learn to write and how they become successful writers remains under-researched, and it remains a relatively new area for empirical study (Myhill, 2005; 2001; Kress, 1994). The focus on volitional writing is an area of increasing interest for researchers, academics, and practitioners, in much the same way that the reading for pleasure agenda has gained prominence in the last decade with its causal link to increased attainment in (Cremin et al, 2014; OECD, 2010). A recent large-scale survey of 40, 000

pupils aged 8 to 18 by UK-based charity, the National Literacy Trust (2017), found that those who like writing outside of school are seven times more likely to write above expected levels (23% versus 3%). This is echoed in McClay's research over a decade ago, which determined that children and young people do write for recreation away from school-based tasks (2005).

Middle primary writers

The study explores the writing practices of three children aged 9 and 10, in the middle phase of primary schooling. Whilst there are a number of studies that focus on children's writing in the early years (Rowe and Neitzel, 2010; Dyson, 2009; Rowe, 2009; Pahl, 2001) and others which focus on secondary-aged students (Boscolo, 2009; Moss, 2009; Maun and Myhill, 2005), arguably less research has been undertaken about children in the middle phases of primary education. Unlike older children who are able to access informal out-of-school spaces where they use literacies to suit their own purposes (Georgakapoulou, 2007; Hull and Schultz, 2002; Moll, 1986), for primary-aged children, their external and informally framed out-of-school domains are often limited to those mediated by their parents.

One argument explaining the apparent lack of empirical studies involving younger pupils in interview-based studies is that they are both time-consuming and often take place at school. Studies that have sought to engage with children's feelings about writing have revealed that when asked if they wrote at home, apparent 'reluctant' writers admit to writing across a range of genres (Gardner, 2013). Consequently, the understanding of the child as a whole or complete writer is limited; it may parallel a school-lens perspective or a teacher's perspective (Brady, 2009; Merisuo-Storm, 2006; Moinian, 2006). In order to address this apparent parallel or polarised discourse, this study drew on the work of Aidan Chambers (1993) whose route into children's reading lives was through his 'tell me' approach. In this research study, it was the writing conversation or 'show me' method that enabled children to talk about their relationship with writing through their situated writing artefacts, reflecting Bakhtin's concept of a *chronotope*, literally 'time-space'; where young writers define themselves based on the ways they move through time and space (Compton-Lilly, 2013:401) and through which contexts are shaped (McClay, 2005:88).

The nature of out-of-school writing

A small-scale research project of four middle-primary children's home literacy revealed a layer of private practice associated with writing events not intended for external audiences (Burnett and Myers, 2002). Studies have postulated as to possible reasons why young writers may choose to keep their written texts private, possibly for fear that they may not be valued by adults, or simply that children wish to keep their set of 'sub rosa' literacy skills private by remaining, 'below the desk' (Gilmore, 1984). Whilst accepting the existence of hard-to-get-at practices, it is also important not to assume that crossing the borderlines from home to school is desirable for children, as they may wish for these practices to remain in the home and not shared with teachers or used in school (Yee and Andrews, 2006). This contrasts with studies that posit revealing out-of-school practices and places for writing gives teachers opportunity to develop curricula and pedagogy which work with, rather than against children's personal practices (Moje, 2004:37).

Places and spaces

In exploring the intersection of children's writing lives, this study appropriates an ecology framework made explicit through the work of Bronfenbrenner (1979). Ecological systems theory seeks to conceptualise not only the role of the home domain in shaping children's writing practices, but it acknowledges the complexity of children's relationships with these practices within the microsystem of home. Leander and Boldt (2012) further develop the

influence of a microsystem by arguing that individuals operate within time and space as physical bodies (p.29).

The premise of ecological systems theory is the conceptualisation of layers of ecological structures, which places the child and their experiences and activities at the centre. In reviewing his original work, Bronfenbrenner (2005) disputed the emphasis that the more recent literature placed on the, 'developmentally relevant environments rather than on the characteristics of developing individuals' (p.95). The notion of the importance of specific places as being multi-layered is reflected in the work of Soja (1999) whose four-year ethnographic study of seven teenagers, revealed the importance of the, 'interwoven complexity of the social, the historical and the spatial' (p.261). Such spaces matter, as the way in which people interact with a place often mirrors how they represent themselves within existing spaces (Moje et al., 2004). The research project from which this data is drawn, also focussed on observed writing in school and interviews with teachers, but this paper examines the research question:

- *What is the nature of the practices that children undertake out-of-school?*

Research methods

The study employed a case study approach (Cresswell, 1998) and was bound by place and time; with 'place' defined as the settings of home and school, and the number and nature of the visits determined the 'time'. Three children, one girl and two boys, were the focus of the case study; all attended different and average-sized urban schools in the south of England and were selected using convenience sampling. At the time of the study, both Milly and Sid were 9 years old, and Simon turned 10 during the course of the data collection (names used are pseudonyms). Whilst the aim of sampling in qualitative research is to allow for typicality (Birks and Mills, 2011), this case study did not seek to generalise but to best document the experience of three specific children. There was no expectation that the children would be 'writers', other than that they engaged with writing practices at home. A broad definition of writing was employed for interested parents, with suggested examples of 'doodling and using the computer' reflecting the multimodal definition of writing (Heath and Street, 2008). In the initial conversations and in the information sheets shared with parents, teachers and children, it was made clear the focus of the research was on the children's experiences as writers, rather than on judgements about writing attainment.

Each visit, over an 11-month period (approx. 4 months per child), comprised: writing conversations with children and adults (parent and teacher); field notes; artefacts (both kept and created between visits); observed writing; school free-form observations; and, the child's choice of capturing their home writing practices (video or photographs), which were discussed in the final home visit. Milly and Simon were observed writing at school (once in an independent writing lesson and once in a collaborative writing lesson, as determined by the teacher), and Sid was observed once (as he found the researcher's presence uncomfortable in a school context). Both Simon and Sid's teachers were interviewed, whilst due to time constraints Milly's teacher was unavailable. Only data relating to home writing feature in this paper.

The writing conversations were framed as a 'friendly conversation' (Spradley, 1979:58) and held in a place of the child's choosing; two children chose the kitchen table (Milly and Sid), whilst Simon was interviewed in both the lounge and dining room. The three children's parents were interviewed and in all cases it was the child's mother. Three types of artefacts were reviewed during the home visits: writing referred to as 'kept' are artefacts created

prior to the study; writing completed in-between visits writing and shared with the researcher is referred to as *created* writing. The final category refers to *captured* writing, collected through video or photographic footage. The children chose to collect their writing in different ways: Milly collected and created a chronological scrapbook of writing (not stuck in); Simon collected his examples on the computer; and Sid found fragments of his writing during home visits. Video footage and photographs were used in order to capture naturalistic observations of the children’s writing practices at home. The children were given a choice of technology; Milly and Sid used loaned Flip cameras, whereas Simon engaged his mum and her smartphone to take photographs. As it was impossible for the children to capture all their home writing activities, it was agreed they would capture their usual and ‘dominant’ writing activities (Maddock, 2006:155). Prior to the final interview, the researcher viewed each film clip and photograph and prepared a transcript of visual notes, highlighting points of interest. The notes were the starting point for the final home visit interview. The final data set included transcripts of home conversations; 38 pieces of video footage (30 minutes) and 15 photographs evidenced as the children’s captured home practices and 62 *kept, collected, created or observed* writing artefacts.

All data was uploaded to the Dedoose (CAQDAS) platform and analysed using the five-phase thematic analysis process suggested by Braun and Clarke (2008). Initial codes were created from the transcripts and then applied to an analysis of writing artefacts, photographs and video stills. Having generated initial codes, and due to the interpretative nature of the study, a process of code-occurrence and code application was applied. Across the final three phases of analysis, an initial 12 codes were clustered according to two sub-themes ‘Getting ready for and doing writing’ and ‘Places and spaces for writing’ before the candidate theme of ‘Places, spaces and local customs’ was put forward and defined (Table 1).

Theme	Definition
PLACES, SPACES AND LOCAL CUSTOMS	<i>Where and when writing happens, in relation to the rituals and routines that occur both prior and during the writing. Descriptions of home and school writing events and practices, which are defined by place and position.</i>

Table 1 Phase Five – Defining and naming themes

The process of data collection and analysis followed the ethical guidelines of both the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011) and the Open University. The research design also anticipated ethical issues surrounding researcher access to children’s private writing practices. An initial conversation with Milly and her mum revealed some of the private places that she liked to write; it was agreed that any writing that took place in her bedroom, would not be filmed or photographed. Therefore, the study was cognisant that in attempting to capture authentic writing practices a degree of censorship was applied by both child and parents. However, rather than being a criticism of the study, the research findings makes transparent that some writing practices remain *sub rosa* and out of reach of the researcher.

The final dataset comprised of captured photographs and video stills, field notes and interviews (Table 2), and it is from this dataset that the findings are drawn.

	<i>Writing examples</i>	<i>Photographs/ Video stills</i>	<i>Field notes, interviews</i>
Milly	Door poster, Designer magazine	Garden writing, Creating Grandma’s card, Kumon	Field notes, Milly, Parent transcripts

		practice	
Sid		Japanese script, random bedroom, Pokémon kitchen, Minecraft coding, lounge room, bedroom and dining room writing	Field notes, Sid, Parent transcripts
Simon		Dining room space for writing, Fire Safety cub writing, dining room space for cub writing	Field notes, Simon, Parent transcripts

Table 2. Places, spaces and local customs dataset

Findings

The findings are presented through two observed types of home writing experiences, writing at home and writing at home for school. The children are presented holistically, with each child presented separately before drawing out the similarities between them. The intention is to avoid potential criticism that in documenting the writing practices, the artefacts rather than the young writers have become the focus of discussion.

Writing at home

Milly

Much of Milly's home writing takes place in her bedroom where she sits and surrounds herself with her cartridge paper, notebooks and 'something to inspire' her to write:

I get a notebook and some paper and some pens or some pencils. And I get whatever I can find, well, and something to inspire me to do that writing. (Milly,

HV1)

She writes in different places depending on the writing she is doing: in the dining room; in the kitchen; in the garden, or she remains in her own bedroom. As her mother notes, '*She will go and happily occupy herself in her room for ages. And at the weekend when she wakes up she'll often just stay in bed for ages reading or writing or playing, whatever*' (Milly, Parent Visit 1). Milly protects this private space with a warning on her door alerting any uninvited visitors of the consequences of charging in unannounced.

She chooses to write in her bedroom and whilst there is more space, it is the peace she enjoys, '*So, like, somewhere that's quiet, I'm alone and I can think because there's not so much noise*' (Milly, HV1). Milly's bedroom writing happens on her high-up bed, as there is limited space for a table, but her mum feels this gives her the opportunity for, '*personal cosy writing*' (Milly, Parent Visit1). As Milly chose which writing events to capture on film, there are no photographs of her bedroom writing and whilst mentioned by both Milly and her mum, there are no visual images to support their descriptions.

Milly says she enjoys drawing and writing in the different home spaces and her writing artefacts often travel from room to room. Her *Designer* magazine begins upstairs and travels to the communal space of the kitchen. She adapts the magazine, a published proforma, by adding a heading and colouring in the white spaces, i.e. the hairstyles and nail varnish colours. She personalises it by adding a front-page panel proclaiming, '*Sels [sic] back with even more fashion tips.*' *Sels* is the name of an imagined fashion designer and links

with Milly's love of clothes shopping. Her vocabulary choices and direct appeal to the reader reflect the type of magazines that she buys with her pocket money. Whilst the magazine begins in her bedroom, it migrates across places and spaces, and surfaces downstairs in the kitchen where the computer is located. Here, she prints off additional information and accesses the stapler in order to add extra pages she has written with a friend.

Milly's writing practices also move away from the house and into the garden. Here, she writes messages on a chalkboard to her grandmother and mum who sit to the side of her. However, when they leave and she is writing on her own using the same chalkboard, she explains, '*I'm writing, I'm just writing...*' (Milly, HV4). Milly's focussed position and engagement with her chalkboard writing reflects the physicality of her writing interaction, and whilst there are no captured images of her bedroom writing, there is a suggestion that her positioning in this garden writing image could reflect her creation of comfort and may be mirrored in bedroom writing practices.

Within the home places Milly chooses to work, she creates smaller bounded spaces for writing. For example, when creating Grandma's card, she chooses to sit in the shared space of the dining room table. Her writing area is well-defined, demarcated at the corner boundaries by two pen pots with a small rubber within reach. There is space around her to write, and her physical position presents as open with a relaxed approach to the writing.

Sid

For Sid, his home writing spaces are activity-dependent, for example, if using the computer for writing then he will be upstairs, but if he is writing for homework or calligraphy this happens downstairs.

Sid sits in the lounge working on Japanese hiranga handwriting, copying into a textbook, a self-taught practice he describes, '*Learning it myself or my mum teaches it*' (Sid, HV2), and is activity that does not have a set time or place. His self-labelled 'random writing' takes place in the bedroom, and is an example of writing that remains in this private space, '*That's a phone number book that I got when I left my old house and I'm writing some addresses in it*' (Sid, HV3). Sid describes his writing events as taking place, '*Sometimes on this table, sometimes in the kitchen, sometimes in my bedroom*' (Sid, HV1).

Sid has a large folder for his Pokémon cards in which he writes captions for the Pokémon stickers and which is not confined to one place but instead travels throughout rooms in the house. The family computer sits on the hall landing and Sid and his brothers take it in turns to play on their games. Much of Sid's Minecraft activity revolves around key activities which use on-screen writing practices, including searching for cheat codes on Google, or downloading texture packs used to alter the appearance of Minecraft worlds.

Like Milly, Sid's writing can start and finish in different rooms; one example which might travel is, '*Sometimes my homework will; I sometimes do it in my bedroom*' (Sid, HV2). Sid offers a flexible view of himself as a writer, not fixed to a particular genre of writing and not tied to a specific place where writing takes place. His captured home writing practices document twenty-five writing events taking place across five rooms in the house (compared to Simon's 4 captured photographs and Milly's 13 film clips).

Simon

Simon's personal writing occurs in more distant home domains, and he explains that he spends time at his grandparents' house in Devon, England (some 130 miles away) writing at their large dining room table. His description paints a vivid image of a writer engaged in his studio, carefully crafting a masterpiece:

I would really just have, on the dining room there would be just me on one chair with a huge table around me and I'd have to walk a long way just to get one piece of paper, then come back, then walk a long way to get a pencil [laughs], and come back. So I just had them all spread out in front of me and I had my bit of paper here.
(Simon, HV1)

He says he enjoys writing in his own home and here his practices revolve around music-making or song writing, in addition to his school topic work, characterised by the designing of PowerPoint presentations or note-taking for research work (Simon, HV1). Whilst Simon reports that writing events take place upstairs in his bedroom, his captured practices show them mostly taking place in the dining room, where he sits at the table.

As with Milly, some of Simon's writing remained hidden, taking place in private spaces invisible to the researcher. However, his visible writing takes place in the shared kitchen space where Simon and his siblings write and draw at a table designated by his mum as the 'writing table' (Simon, Parent Visit 1). In addition, and like Milly, Simon's writing moves with him into the garden where his mum reflects, '*I think it's just wherever he gets the space that he wants to do it. And I suppose, well it is summertime, they will sit at the garden table as well and do bits and pieces out there*' (Simon, Parent Visit 1).

Simon creates space for himself when completing a task in his Fire Safety booklet for cubs, and chooses to write in the shared space of the living room with his young brother writing nearby, as if mirroring his big brother's position. The majority of his writing events take place in his bedroom and, in order to get ready, he takes, '*one of the chairs with the cushion upstairs and do it on my desk*' (Simon, HV1). The chair in question is a portable deckchair and one that travels from the kitchen to his bedroom.

However, it appears that Simon's desk is not the traditional type, as his mum reveals:

M: He did really want, he did really want a desk and we just don't have the space in there at the moment. And that is something that, you know, I would like for him. There is actually a desk that was my granddad's, that's in the roof, that's a proper flip-down one that I used to use. (Simon, Parent Visit 1)

Simon's current 'desk' is defined by the boundary space he constructs, confirmed by Simon's explanation, '*And so you've got yourself and the deckchair leaning against the chest of drawers with the computer on top*' (Simon, HV3, Field Notes).

Writing for school, at home

In contrast with Milly's boundary setting of defined space through her pen pots, which she displayed when making Grandma's card, her revision maths writing takes place on the same dining room table. This 'at home, writing event' takes place after breakfast, with glasses and dishes yet to be cleared away. The suggestion is, through her body language and the physical space, that Milly has seized the moment to write, rather than prepared for it.

This observable difference between Milly's home and for school writing practices is illustrated through the physical ways she interacts with the geographical space of text construction. For example, one example of school writing, completed at home, is worthy of exposition. During a six -minute clip, Milly moves between two pieces of text: the best copy of a piece of Easter homework, and its first draft. This school writing is completed at home and Milly sits at the dining room table with her writing space bordered by pens and a notebook (1). As Milly works across both texts she stops to review her writing (2), moves forward and then moves closer again to the text (3). Her head rests on the table (a position previously observed across both home and school writing), and for the following two minutes, Milly concentrates on writing the final draft (4). She then sits back from the writing, before re-reading her writing (6) and returning to the writing (7).

Simon also sets himself up for school writing events completed at home, and positions his tools around him as he sits at the dining room table.

R: So that's you sitting?

S: *In the dining room and I'm doing my homework with my old favourite pencil (...), it's just broken. And I'm sitting with my pencil case on my right, that's because I'm left-handed and I'm just going to knock it otherwise.*

(Simon, HV2)

Moreover, whilst Simon is desperate to sit at his own desk, Sid's mum reveals that Sid rejects the given formal space:

P: *And he usually sits on his bed, quite often sits on his bed actually.*

R: And so he's got stuff up there?

P: *Obviously he's got stuff up there and he's got a desk but it's never clear. So he's got a, sort of, bunk bed with a pull-out desk thing, which has got writing materials all over it. But he wouldn't sit at the desk on the chair and do it.*

(Sid, Parent Visit 1)

For all three children, writing for school completed at home, and in the form of homework, appears to be more visible through its geographical positioning in the home. For example, Simon's mum is more likely to see him doing this type of school writing rather than his personal writing, which takes place in other less public spaces:

R: Where do you see him doing writing?

P: *Usually – I mean, obviously it's homework.*

(Simon, Parent Visit 1)

Milly also creates a distinction between personal writing and the writing completed for school, *'I don't have a table in my bedroom. So I've a high-up bed.'* (Milly, HV1), and homework takes place downstairs in the shared and public space of the dining room, a location her mum prefers:

R: Does homework happen down here?

P: *Yes, yes.*

R: Not upstairs?

P: *No, with the beady eye of mum [LAUGHS].*

(Milly, Parent Visit 1)

Thus, for these three children, home writing spaces emerge anywhere, in the garden, on the landing, at self-made desks or on busy beds, but writing at home *for* school begins to echo the physical discourse associated with primary classrooms.

Discussion and conclusion

The overall conclusion from this study is that these three children engage with a range of writing formats and design choices maintained by versatility over their writing practices afforded in the home domain. Employing an ecological paradigm made visible the complexity of participation and engagement with different forms of home writing and the ways in which children interact both physically and emotionally during, and beyond, text creation.

The places the children found to write are important for the specific writing practices that occur there (Mills and Comber, 2013). Home writing spaces are defined by more than just the location of the rooms or space outdoors, but also through the locally-based customs the children engage with in the process of getting ready for writing. These findings challenge the notion of situated writing being defined and bound by the specific space or location; for example, that writing at home is distinct and different from writing completed at school. For these children, the influence of school was apparent in their writing completed at home but for school and this differed from their personal writing completed in the same space. In bedrooms, the writing was personal and private, whilst within the context of family spaces writing was jointly constructed. Writing for school, in the form of homework or practice tests, took place in the presence of others, often at the kitchen table, providing an opportunity for parents to monitor and mirror the role of the teacher, a finding acknowledged in other studies (Knobel and Lankshear, 2003; Pahl and Burnett, 2013; Rowe and Neitzel, 2010). However, what remains unique to out-of-school writing is the way in which the home affords opportunities for practices to spill over and travel to other spaces and rooms providing context and opportunity for new writing events.

All three children chose to write at home in particular spaces for specific writing activities, but what was unexpected was the children's almost visceral interaction with their writing within the physical spaces observed. This interaction and vacillation across texts may represent a difference in the personalisation of a writing space that Milly, in particular, demonstrates through sustained home writing. In addition, having the physical space to move around a text, back and forth and in and out, suggests a confidence over, and ownership of, the writing experience. Whilst not as apparent, this practice was also displayed, to a lesser extent, by both Simon and Sid through their curled up positions and physical boundary setting for writing. This alternative home discourse is framed differently from the spatial expectations of school writing, as it is one that demands close proximity to the paper or screen and primarily represented as a solo activity. At a physical level, both in terms of the environment and the personal writing space, school writing does not look or feel like home writing.

However, the findings caution against recreating a home writing space to enhance learning within school settings with the sole aim of facilitating the reshaping of academic content. The children's home writing practices reveal active and experienced writers, where artefacts are valuable in, and of, themselves, rather than only being of worth if viewed through a lens of academic success. This research emphasises that being curious about children's writing lives and their out-of-school writing interactions can lead to positive shifts in writing pedagogy. Encouraging teachers to employ one of this study's data tools that of the writing conversation, could lead to better understandings about the nature and importance of time

and space for writing, leading to more meaningful and enjoyable relationships with writing across the domains.

References

- BERA (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, London, BERA.
- BIRKS, M. AND MILLS, J. (2011) *Grounded Theory: a practical guide*. London: Sage.
- BOSCOLO, P. (2009) Engaging and Motivating Children to Write, in Beard, R., Myhill, D., Riley, J., et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*. London: SAGE pp. 300 - 312.
- BRADY, J. (2009) Exploring su' Perceptions of Children's Imaginative Writing at Home. *English in Education*, 43.2 pp. 129 - 148.
- BRAUN, V. AND CLARKE, V. (2008) Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Quarterly Research in Psychology*, 3.2, pp. 77 - 101.
- COMPTON-LILLY, C. (2013) The Temporal Expectations of Schooling and Literacy Learning: Jermaine's Story, *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 56.5, pp.400-408.
- CRESSWELL, J. (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research*. London: Sage.
- CREMIN, T. MOTTRAM, M. POWELL, S, COLLINS R AND SAFFORD K. (2014) *Building Communities of Engaged Readers: Reading for pleasure* London, Routledge.
- DYSON, A. H. (2009) Writing in Childhood Worlds in Beard, R., Myhill, D., Riley, J., et al. (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*. London: SAGE pp. 232 - 245
- GARDNER, P. (2013) Writing in Context: Reluctant Writers and Their Writing at Home and at School. *English in Australia*, 48.1 pp. 71 - 81.
- GEORGAKAPOULOU, A. (2007) *Small Stories, Interaction & Identities*. PA, USA: John Benjamins.
- GOOS, M., GALBRAITH, P. and RENSHAW, P. (2002) Socially mediated metacognition: Creating collaborative zones of proximal development in small group problem solving. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 49.1, pp. 193 - 223.
- HEATH, S. B. and STREET, B. (2008) *On Ethnography*. Oxford: Routledge.
- HULL, G. and SCHULTZ, K. (2002) *School's Out: Bridging Out-of-school Literacies with Classroom Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- KENDRICK, M. and MCKAY, R. (2004) Drawings as an alternative way of understanding young children's constructions of literacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4.1, pp. 109 - 128.
- KRESS, G. (1994) *Learning to Write*. Oxon: Routledge.

- KNOBEL, M. and LANKSHEAR, C. (2003) 'Researching young children's out-of-school literacy practices', in Hall, N., Larson, J. and Marsh, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Literacy*. London: Sage pp. 51 – 63.
- LEANDER K. and BOLDT, G. (2012) Rereading 'A pedagogy of multiliteracies': bodies, texts and emergence. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 45.1, pp. 22-46.
- MAUN, I. and MYHILL, D. (2005) Text as design. *English in Education*, 39.2, pp. 5-21.
- MCCLAY, J. K. (2005) World Enough and Time: The Handmade Literacies of Young Adolescent Writers. *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 29.1 pp.87-101.
- MERISUO-STORM, T. (2006) Girls and Boys Like to Read and Write Different Texts. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50.2 pp. 111-125.
- MILLS, K. and COMBER, B. (2013) 'Space, Place, and Power: The Spatial Turn in Literacy Research', in Hall, K., Cremin, T., Comber, B., et al. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell pp. 412 – 426
- MOINIAN, F. (2006) I can tell it as it is! Exploring how children write and talk about themselves in school. *Ethnography and Education*, 1.2, pp. 231-246.
- MOLL, L. (1986) Writing as Communication: Creating Strategic Learning Environments for Students. *Theory into Practice*, 25.2, pp. 102 – 108.
- MOJE, E., CIECHANOWSKI, K., KRAMER, K., ELLIS, L., CARRILLO, R. and COLLAZO, T. (2004) Working third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39.1, pp. 38 - 70.
- MOSS, B. (2009) Writing in the Wider Community, in Beard, R., Myhill, D., Riley, J., et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*. London: SAGE pp. 561 - 573,
- MYHILL, D. (2005) Ways of Knowing: Writing with Grammar in Mind. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4.3, pp. 77 - 96.
- NATIONAL LITERACY TRUST (2017) Writing for Enjoyment and its Link to Wider Writing, London, NLT.
- OECD (2010) PISA 2009 Results: Learning to Learn – Student Engagement, Strategies and Practices (Vol. III). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264083943-en> (accessed 10.10.17).
- PAHL, K. (2001) Texts as artefact crossing sites: map making at home and school. *Reading*, 35.3, pp. 120 - 125.
- PAHL, K. AND BURNETT, C. (2013) Literacies in Homes and Communities in Hall, K., Cremin, T., Comber, B., et al. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell pp. 3 - 14,
- RAZFAR, A. and GUTIERREZ, K. (2003) 'Reconceptualising Early Childhood Literacy: the Sociocultural Influence', in Hall, N., Larson, J. and Marsh, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Literacy*, London: Sage pp.34-50.

- ROJAS-DRUMMOND, S. M., ALBARRÁN, C. D. and LITTLETON, K. S. (2008) Collaboration, creativity and the co-construction of oral and written texts. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 3.3, pp. 177-191.
- ROWE, D. R. (2009) Early Written Communication, in Beard, R., Myhill, D., Riley, J., et al. (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*. London: SAGE pp. 213 - 231,
- ROWE, D. R. AND NEITZEL, C. (2010) Interest and agency in 2 & 3 year olds' participation in emergent writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45.2 pp. 169 - 195.
- SOJA, E. (1999) 'Third Space: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination', in Massey, D., Allen, J. and Sarre, P. (Eds.), *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press pp.261-278.
- SPRADLEY, J.P. (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanich College Publisher.
- STREET, B. (1984) *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- YEE, W. C. AND ANDREWS, J. (2006) Professional researcher or a 'good guest'? Ethical dilemmas involved in researching children and families in the home setting. *Educational Review*, 58.4 pp. 397-413.