2015

The Negotiation and Development of Writing Teacher Identities in Elementary Education

Shartriya M. Collier
California State University, Northridge, shartriya.collier@csun.edu

Suzanne Scheld
California State University, Northridge, suzanne.scheld@csun.edu

Ian Barnard
Chapman University, barnard@chapman.edu

Jackie Stallcup
California State University, Northridge, jackie.stallcup@csun.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Educational Methods Commons, Higher Education Commons, Rhetoric and Composition Commons, and the Secondary Education and Teaching Commons

Recommended Citation

T/W

The Negotiation and Development of Writing Teacher Identities in Elementary Education

Shartriya M. Collier, Suzanne Scheld, Ian Barnard, and Jackie Stallcup
California State University, Northridge

While a number of scholars have explored writing instruction in general, little is known about how to best prepare teacher candidates to teach writing. Additionally, few studies have examined the writing identity development in teacher candidates and how this may potentially impact their experiences in their teacher preparation programs. Napoli (2001) and Norman and Spencer (2005) document the inadequacy of instruction regarding how to teach writing in teacher preparation programs. They argue that reading holds a more exalted position than writing in college methods courses. Moreover, once new teachers are hired in schools they, too, focus on reading rather than writing instruction. Additionally, once they begin teaching, many teachers of writing do not know how to modify writing instruction to meet the needs of diverse populations including English learners and struggling writers (Ganske et al., 2003; Lee, 2011). In short, the place of writing within the context of "language arts" is unclear (Coker & Lewis, 2008; Gilbert & Graham, 2010; Paulson & Armstrong, 2010; Park, 2013). As a result, it is challenging for teacher education programs to determine how to include lessons on writing for future teachers. Moreover, inquiry by educators regarding whether they should seek to develop a writer's identity among teacher candidates preparing to teach writing has been notably absent.

Other issues have been identified that can potentially impact the preparation of teacher candidates to teach writing. For example, in the instances when students are exposed to writing pedagogy, researchers argue that teacher education programs do not provide enough opportunities for students to apply what they are learning about teaching writing (Street, 2003, 2008). The National Council of Teachers of English (2004) suggests that writing teachers must be prepared to understand the relationship between the writing process, curriculum, learning, and pedagogy. Totten (2005) argues that," schools of education must require every teacher candidate to take a course on how to incorporate writing

effectively into his or her content area. Ideally, the course should focus on powerful writing to learn strategies that can be used to facilitate students' learning of content, to deepen their understanding of what they are learning and to foster thinking at increasingly higher levels" (pg. 2).

As one reviews these assessments of need, it becomes clear that addressing the broader range of requirements of teacher candidates is a difficult one for several key questions involving teachers of writing remain unanswered. : 1.) What variables influence the development of a writing teacher's identity among teacher candidates in a university language arts methods course; 2.) How do their student teaching experiences impact their writing teacher identities, dispositions and practices as future teachers of writing?

This paper examines these questions utilizing data gathered through an initiative involving a cohort of 21 prospective elementary school teachers in a teacher education program in a large public university in California. We present the outcomes of research that is part of a larger project that sought to understand the forces that interact to affect the formation of elementary school teachers who are prepared to teach writing. Preliminary to a discussion of the methods used to explore the described questions is the need to describe the theoretical framework that served as the context for this study.

Sociocultural Perspectives on Writing

Sociocultural perspectives on writing pedagogy suggest moving beyond viewing reading and writing as discrete, isolated, unconnected skills. Adherents to this perspective view language and literacy as social practices that embody a broad range of multiple literacies as one enters into a writing classroom (Calkins, 1994; Graves, 1994; Gee, Hull, and Lankshear, 1996; New London Group, 1996, 2001). Thus, teacher candidates must draw upon technology and media as they write and as they teach writing. Teacher candidates must develop the sensitivity needed to allow their students to socially construct and critically reflect upon and create a variety of texts and discourses. Teacher candidates must be trained to use multiple literacies that include, "ways of being, saying, doing, valuing, and believing (Hull, Milukey, Clair & Kerka, 2003 p.1)." And, continuing to use this framework of sociocultural theorists, teacher education programs must make teacher candidates aware that students will be socialized into discourses through their academic experiences in school and that these experiences will eventually carry over into the world of work. Furthermore, the development of a writer's

identity is closely linked to one's ability to negotiate two or more contrasting, and oftentimes, conflicting identities (Nasiri, 2012).

.   Specifically, according to the New London Group (1996) teacher candidates must also engage in a process of critically reflecting upon these resources, and they must "reproduce and transform" their own practices. As can be seen, this theoretical framework allows educators to specifically focus on making the connections between the real world and academic discourses. It also addresses the institutional constructs that propel or inhibit teacher candidates in the area of writing from achieving success within their prescribed communities of practice.

Writing is not only a mechanical process but it is also deeply connected to the internal construction of one's identity as a writer, and to the social construct of one's identity as a future educator. Ivanic (1998) offers an interesting definition of a writer's identity. He contends that a writer's identity consists of four aspects: the autobiographical self, discoursal self, self as author, and possibilities for selfhood. Ivanic defines the autobiographical self as," the identity which people bring with them to any act of writing, shaped as it is by the prior social and discoursal history. The term, autobiographical self, emphasizes the fact that this aspect of identity is associated with a writer's sense of their roots, of where they are coming from, and that this identity they bring with them to writing is itself socially-constructed and constantly changing as a consequence of their developing a life history (p.25)."

While a definitive body of research does not exist on the development and negotiation of a writing teacher's identity much has been written regarding the development of a professional identity on teacher candidates in general. The following section briefly summarizes the topic of professional identity development and teacher candidates and extrapolates findings to the more narrow issue of the development of a writing teacher's identity.

Teacher Candidates and Professional Identities: The Act of Becoming

Many researchers have sought to understand the processes that individuals undergo as they cultivate a professional identity as a teacher. This research can be applied to the development of a writer's identity. For example, Knowles and Holt-Reynolds (1991) identify four key components in the development of a professional identity in teacher education. First, role models, especially positive ones, influence the growth of a professional identity. This suggests that teacher candidates as writers may be able to benefit from exposure to professional writers.

Second, previous teaching experiences, as well as significantly positive or negative teacher education classes shape one's professional identity. Third, remembered childhood experiences about learning and family activities can influence the development of a professional identity and perhaps, a writer's identity.

Fernstein (2009) documents how the previous academic experiences of a Korean American teacher candidate, convinced the student that she was not a good writer as a result of the deficit model often applied to ESL students. Yet, despite her lack of confidence as a writer, Mandy's responses to the assumptions of others regarding English Language Learners generated thoughts, feelings, and responses that demonstrated the multiple constructions of her writer's identity. This is the case with many teacher candidates. Many have negative perceptions of writing and even "writing phobias". Yet, it is these life histories that improve one's experience with writing.

Korthagen (2004) adds depth to this discussion by acknowledging that teachers are constantly in the process of "becoming." Reynolds conceptualized this process as an onion model - the layers of this "onion" consist of the teacher candidates' environment, behaviors, competencies, beliefs and the overall program mission. In addition, the concept of "becoming" can be extended by acknowledging that the process of renegotiation can be experienced by students when encountering two or more conflicting pedagogical paradigms or contradictory sets of experiences regarding their writing. This notion of the "act of becoming" is an "additive" approach to defining experience and knowledge. The layers of an onion grow, but they are never in conflict with one another. However, a writer's identity may involve conflicting definitions of knowledge of writing and other areas and conflicting identities as a part of the process of "becoming".

The development of a professional identity is not only an internal reflective process; it is reliant upon external relations and interactions as well. Again, this may also be the case in the development of a writer's identity by teacher candidates. Schepens, Aelterman, and Vlerick (2009) state that, "…the most important predictors of self-efficacy, commitment, and professional orientation are the extent to which teachers feel prepared (p. 375)." Thus, teachers of writing who develop a professional identity, as a writer may feel more prepared to teach writing. This also indicates that students do not simply robotically apply what they learn during their teacher education programs, their application of the concepts learned may differ depending upon their own

assessment of their learning experiences. For example, teacher candidates of writing may have educational experiences that challenge the writer's identity/ies.

Ronfeldt and Grossman (2008) further expand upon the processes that students undergo as they develop a professional identity by exploring the teacher preparation program's role in helping students to see their "possible selves". Coursework, fieldwork, and student teaching expose students to potential pathways of professional development. This concept suggests that these three components may also play a role in the development of a writer's identity among teacher candidates. However, this access to possible selves can oftentimes create contradictory and sometimes conflicting realities. Moreover, recent research has explored how one's writing identity impacts classroom writing instruction.

Writing Teacher Identity and Its Effect on Classroom Instruction

The National Writing Project, one of the lead advocates in the writing and identity movement, has recognized for many years the need to create supportive and collaborative environments for writing teachers. Smith and Griffiths (2014) argue that writing groups for teachers creates a community of practice that provides spaces for teachers to construct professional knowledge and establish teaching identities. With this recognition, many NWP trained teachers also create communities of practice in which they engage students in peer conferencing, peer editing and shared writing, in which the students and the teach "share the pen". Lee (2013) furthers this discussion in his study of EFL (English as a foreign language) writing teacher development. Through his analysis of four EFL pre-service teachers experiences, he argues that writing identity is discursively constructed. Thus, their writing teacher identities were situated within their own social, cultural, and historical experiences. Once made aware of this, instead of adhering to the traditional curriculum many began to test new strategies such as blogging, journal writing, and a more process approach. Bearmouth, Berryman, and Whittle (2011) examined students' identities as writers in a classroom in which the teacher was nationally noted as extremely successful. They discovered that that both the low and high achieving students were developing positive writing identities and this was largely due to the teacher's engaging process – approach to teaching writing in which she recognized and validated peer to peer interaction and teacher-student interaction during writing time.

Best Practices in Writing Teacher Education

As the sociocultural theorists suggest, best practices for teaching writing are far from linear. For example, many analysts argue that modeling the writing process by writing for and writing with one's students is an effective strategy for teaching writing. Other investigators suggest that students can gain experience more rapidly by engaging in small group conferences, team teaching, and by receiving consistent feedback (Colby & Stapleton, 2006). In other words, beginning teachers must learn to teach writing by drawing upon a variety of sources. This body of literature also addresses to a lesser degree factors that impact how teacher candidates apply what they have learned about how to be effective with their own writing processes as they engage in productive pedagogical practices as future teachers of writing (Grossman et al, 2000; Napoli, 2001; Norman & Spencer, 2005; Pardo, 2006). The recommendations of those few who have sought to broaden pedagogy in the teaching of writing can be described.

Dymoke and Hughes (2009), for example, analyzed teacher candidates' participation in a poetry wiki. These authors demonstrated how the wiki provided students who had never written poetry with an opportunity to experiment with a form that they might one day have to teach. In addition, the wiki prompted teacher candidates to integrate personal experiences, past histories, and voice in their writing. Furthermore, Wilder and Mongillo (2007) found that the integration of technology tools such as referential communication tasks and online modules increased expository writing skills for teacher candidates and, as a result, may assist students in reflecting upon their identities as writers and future teachers of writing, as well as on the integration of new literacy technologies and media. These authors found that multiple exposures to academic language are important to skill development among teacher candidates.

Additionally, Street (2003) asserts that teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching writing can significantly impact learning outcomes. Important to the theme of this paper, he also contends that students' histories as writers can have a significant impact upon their abilities as future teachers of writing. Thus, university and student teaching experiences need to be situated within contexts in which students consistently reflect upon their attitudes towards writing. He further asserts that cultivating a "writer" identity within the context of a supportive writing community is key.

Street and Stang (2008) add to this argument by suggesting that not only do students need pedagogical applications, but they also require reflective opportunities to examine writing in their daily lives. These examples suggest that preparing teachers to teach writing is no longer just a matter of determining whether teacher candidates can or cannot write, and then presenting candidates with a host of "best practices". It must also entail understanding how writing itself is changing and diversifying the cultural forms that are practiced and interpreted by different sets of people in different ways. Clearly, writing is not only a mechanical process but is also deeply connected to the internal construction of one's identity as a writer, and to the social construct of one's identity as a future educator.

Although teacher-writer pedagogy is widely discussed in education circles, few studies highlight how teachers in training negotiate their identities as writers and future teachers of writing. In this regard, this exploratory research study sought to examine the effectiveness of key pedagogies in facilitating the development of a writing teacher's identity in a cohort of 21 teacher candidates.

Methodology

This paper presents outcomes from research that was part of a larger study of teacher preparation for elementary school classrooms. The broader goal of our study was to chart and improve teacher candidates' effectiveness as writers and as teachers of writing. Our research team consisted of faculty from English, Anthropology, Liberal Studies, and Elementary Education. Each researcher brought to the project a unique disciplinary language and research criteria. This study expands findings from this earlier work by seeking to illuminate how prospective teachers relate their previous experiences of learning to write including the development of a writer's identity to the acquisition of pedagogical content and their first field experiences. To examine these relationships, we undertook a case study of prospective teachers who were enrolled in a required language arts methodology course in the elementary school teacher preparation program at our university. The language arts course was equally divided in content - 50% was dedicated to best practices for the literacy instruction of English learners and 50% of this course was dedicated to writing instruction. The students were required to participate in 20 hours of observation. One course assignment involved creating an English Language Development Unit. This module integrated best practices for language arts instruction including the integration of writing and support for ELLs. The students conducted three mini-

lessons as part of their observation and participation. One assignment included a mini-lesson on effective writing with their elementary school pupils. Students also kept a writing journal in which they were to go through the writing process and eventually publish a final piece. This assignment was specifically designed to support the teacher candidates' development of a voice, life histories and writer identity. As is known, a first question asked of any individual who identifies, as a writer is "What have you published?"

At the end of this series of learning activities, students were to include a writing process reflection that provided insights into their beliefs, attitudes, and opinions about themselves as writers. Students were taught to use the Writing Workshop Approach to writing instruction (Calkins, 1994, 2002). Therefore, emphasis was placed on teaching writing as a process that is supported through teacher modeling, peer feedback, journaling and conferring.

The students in this language arts course were also students in the Freshman Accelerated Student Teaching (FAST), a cohorted pathway in which students are provided an opportunity to earn a B.A. degree in Liberal Studies while simultaneously obtaining a preliminary teaching credential in elementary education. In total, there were 21 students in the course. All but two were female. The students were in their final year of study. Additionally, all subjects were student teaching while also taking a language arts methods class.

We decided to recruit students from only one particular pathway in order to reduce the number of confounding variables. In general, the FAST students are highly motivated, highly focused, and well prepared. Moreover, this group was most likely to have developed a writer's identity because they had earned the highest scores on their writing samples in Year 1 of the study. Their presence in the FAST program was a result of their having decided early in their college careers that they wanted to be elementary school teachers.

Data Sources and Analysis

The ethnographic component of this research project followed a strong tradition of well-regarded ethnographic research methodology in the observation and analysis of K-12 teaching or writing (Perl & Wilson, 1986; Grossman, 1990) as well as research methods in the field of composition as a whole (Bridwell-Bowles, 1991; Health, 2008).

Our research participants completed open-ended written surveys regarding their writing preferences and ideas about teaching writing at the beginning of the Fall semester. We were interested in developing a baseline picture of how students defined their knowledge of teaching writing at the beginning of the

semester. Near the end of the semester, we invited the research subjects to participate in a 45-minute semi-structured interview with one or more of the researchers to answer questions about what they had learned during the semester; their development as writers and future teachers of writing; their disposition toward and knowledge about writing instruction; the impact of their student teaching experiences; and their plans and expectations as writing teachers in the future. 10 of the 21 students accepted the invitation to be interviewed. While we are confident that the 10 interviews reflected a broad range of FAST student experiences and knowledge, we are also aware that these 10 students may represent a self-selected group who are not necessarily representative of FAST students as a whole. Nevertheless, the findings can be used as exploratory research that highlights the variables that help shape the development of a writer's identity. Survey and interview responses were coded and analyzed in terms of the diversity and patterns of themes that emerged from students' responses.

In addition to collecting survey and interview data, we conducted one two-hour unobtrusive observation in the language arts methods classes in which the students were enrolled. The objective of the visit was to gain a sense of what and how our subjects were learning in this course. The visit also assisted in the collection of data that could help to triangulate survey and interview data. A second dynamic significantly shaped our research process. A number of members of the research team had taught the FAST students at one time or another. One research member was currently teaching the students at the time of the study. We are well aware that the researchers' connections to our research subjects may have impacted the data we collected. At one level, the student and teacher relationship may have prevented some students from expressing themselves openly and honestly during the interviews. Conversely, the relationships between these faculty members and the subjects may have generated higher levels of respondent comfort when compared to those subjects who were interviewed by relative strangers. In this case, the pre-existing relationship may have enabled the students to express themselves more freely. In addition, the researcher observing the methods class may have consciously or unconsciously suppressed or expressed particular observations or comments due to the fact that the course instructor was herself a member of the research team. In order to demonstrate how our students created and negotiated themselves as future writers and future teachers of writing, we first examined their early experiences with learning how to write, their classroom-based training, and the realities that were used in applying their past experiences into the pedagogical development as student teachers.

In accordance with the traditions of qualitative research, we monitored preliminary findings by writing analytical memos on emerging themes, similarities, and differences amongst the participating students. Key themes that emerged included early childhood experiences with writing, conflicts with opportunities to teach writing during student teaching, increased awareness of genres, making personal connections and taking ownership of writing. Using the constant comparative method for within-case and cross-case analysis we coded interview transcripts, field notes, and documents for patterns, insider (emic) perspectives, and discrepant data to write up in case reports (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Thomas & James, 2006). Each of the four researchers met frequently to triangulate key findings in order to ensure reliability and validity of the data.

Findings

What variables influenced the development of a writer's identity among teacher candidates in a university methods course?

The course was based upon readings by Gail Tompkins and Lucy Calkins, Teacher candidates used journal writing throughout the course. They received mini-lessons on writing, and shared the outcomes of a personal writing project at the end of the semester. Students were encouraged to explore topics that were interesting to them, controversial, contradictory, and relevant to their lives. A large portion of the course was dedicated to teaching students how to hold peer conferences to hopefully propel each other forward in their writing. The professor would frequently model and demonstrate writing lessons and the appropriate way to conduct a writing conference. Students produced a variety of writing genres including poetry books, expository student teaching survival guides, persuasive essays, memoirs, and other writing "products". Many candidates wrote about serious life issues. Grappling with these issues through writing and peer conferences they demonstrated their abilities to negotiate multiple voices as writers. For example, one student wrote about a close aunt who had died from cancer, another wrote a fashion book for full-figured women, and another created her own modern-day fairy tale. One of the reasons why the FAST cohort students were willing to explore such personal topics was because they had spent so much time together and had truly created a family unit among each other. One student emailed the following in an "impromptu" journal:

> "Thank you for this writing workshop assignment that we are doing. Because of it, today, I realized something about myself; I had been suppressing a horrible memory of my childhood and all it took was

someone to question why and how I became the way that I am. After reading my entry, Lena asked, "What was your home life like?" That spurred me to ask myself that question and I just realized that I had both subconsciously and consciously blocked out memories of my past. I want to thank you because I now have courage to explore this past. Not enough courage to include it into my journals, but enough to make me question things about myself and my parents and my childhood friends. I feel like this revelation has made me a much better person: both understanding and sympathetic. I really needed this to help me be the best educator that I can be. I have issues and I used comedy and sarcasm to cover them. This assignment alone has helped a lot of us find ourselves. As adults, we really need to know who we are before we truly decide where we are going." (Teacher Candidate, Julie, Writing Reflection)

Through the statement "find ourselves", the candidate makes an explicit connection regarding the use of writing as a site for identity negotiation. This student began to not only rethink who she was as a writer, but who she was as an educator and individual. However, this segment also demonstrates the role a university instructor can play in assisting students to develop an identity/ies as a writing teacher. Central to the pedagogy of multiple literacies is the notion of designing. Designing often includes some radical transformation of knowledge given through overt instruction. In this case, writing gave her the courage to dig deeper into her past, to make connections, and to design possible options for her future as an educator. One could say that the act of conferring and journaling in and of itself allowed students to enter into the "third space" where, with the guidance of the professor, they could construct and deconstruct their writing and the writing of their peers.

As part of the class assignment, another student wrote a series of letters to a friend who had passed away. She stated the following in her Writing Process Reflection assignment:

"It was only through the grace of conference, that I was able to turn my piece around. I kept beginning a letter to Kyle, but I changed my audience. I wasn't telling stories anymore, I was writing letters. In the end, I wrote six letters to Kyle and added a cover letter addressing all who would read my piece. I am proud of it and it was only by constant revision that I was able to turn it into what it is today: a real piece of writing." (Teacher Candidate, Emma, Writing Reflection)

This excerpt demonstrates how this student was, through the assignment, able to begin to take ownership of her writing. First, she became aware that authors exercise a certain amount of agency in writing. Therefore, the lessons covered helped her to know that a genre is something that is not static but constantly shifting in the writing process. More importantly, once she began to recognize her audience (her cohort peers and others who had experienced loss), writing became something that had a purpose. This understanding empowered her to see that she had a variety of options as a writer. She also acknowledged that going through the writing process allowed her to refine and reshape her piece. Through her own transformation, this student was better able to stimulate the writer's identity in her future pupils.

According to the New London Group, overt instruction consists of "languages of reflective generalization that describe the form, content, and function of the discourses of practice (p.18)." Her statement "a real piece of writing" indicates that she had shifted the way she viewed her writing. Perhaps writing without purpose gave her a sense of detachment about writing but writing content that was valuable to her allowed this student to take pride in her efforts. In many ways, she began to integrate the discourse of an author and not simply the self-talk of just a student who writes. However, the question becomes how did they take this knowledge about themselves as writers and translate this to their pedagogical practices as teachers of writing?

When initially surveyed about what they knew about teaching writing, 14 (70%) of the 21 students responded that they knew that writing was a process and that all students progress at different rates. The interviews revealed that the teacher candidates were conceptually aligned with the current theories and approaches toward writing learned in the methods course. These elements included attention to the writing process, holistic responses to pupil writing, writing tools and strategies, and differentiated instruction. Considering the previous two excerpts, it is not surprising that candidates were guided by the philosophy that children needed to be excited about writing. They felt that the best way to do this was to begin with writing as a creative process. Later they focused on the mechanics of writing as a secondary concern. Many candidates felt that that their role was to to serve as "writing coaches" by providing positive encouragement to their pupils. The students felt it was important to not only offer encouragement to pupils but also encourage ownership and voice in writing as demonstrated by the quote below.

> "I feel that I need to stress the fact that their ideas and the thoughts that they come up with are really important and when teaching it I need to make it enjoyable. That's when I wrote the best pieces: when I was mad or passionate about something. For students, something that they are interested in that they want to find out more about. Reading and writing—they go together. I think exposing them to simple structure and format as much as possible is great because that will get them more comfortable with writing in general and give them a good feeling about writing, if they know the basic structure." (Teacher Candidate, Carl Interview)

This student emphasizes how critical it is for pupils to know that "their thoughts and ideas" are important. She sees writing as a social literacy and perceives it as a wholistic process. This student makes a connection to her own experiences and how her best pieces came about when she was "mad or passionate" about something. She largely viewed pedagogical development as making pupils see that effective writing, to a certain extent, begins with individual experiences that can support a writer's identity. Moreover, writing is a personal and interpersonal process. In many ways, this student is challenging traditional views of writing. Cervetti, Damico, & Pearson (2006) stated, "In order for teachers to embrace a view of literacy that recognizes its social dimensions, teacher education programs should help scrutinize traditional views of literacy (p.380)."

The teacher candidates had also begun to reflect upon their possibilities as future writing teachers. Students' responses revealed a renegotiation of previous assumptions about what they were or were not capable of as future teachers of writing. One student connected this to simply feeling more confident about teaching writing. Others went beyond simply viewing the impact of the interventions as improved confidence. Rather, these students focused on particular strategies that they wanted to take and apply such as conferring and free writing. The "pedagogical stance toward writing" mentioned above includes not only an increased awareness about writing strategies, but also the ability of teacher candidates to see themselves as a guide or writing coach to their future pupils.

> "I know how to teach creative writing now. I just hate it so much but I feel like that helps. I hate math but I'm really good at teaching it. I know what they are going to struggle with because I have struggled with it myself. Plus, I have more methods for teaching creative writing. Different ways to focus. Picturing a character, doing a quick write or brainstorming ideas." (Teacher Candidate, Lena, Interview)

First, one must note that this student views the writing that she learned in the methods course as "creative" writing. Although, a portion of the instruction in the course dealt with expository writing, this student saw the sociocultural writing approach used in the classroom as a "creative" approach to writing instruction. Even though this teacher candidate did not like "creative writing", she began to see herself as being capable of teaching writing. She also viewed the learning process as a struggle but felt that she had become equipped to navigate pupils through the struggle.

As these passages indicate, overt instruction through a methods course that has been tailored to develop or strengthen the writing identity of students can be effective. Of even greater importance, the use of strategies to develop a writing identity was also observable in the student teaching experiences of participants.

How do their student teaching experiences impact their writing identities, dispositions and practices as future teachers of writing?

The melding of traditional pedagogies for teaching reading with methods designed to produce writer teachers is not an easy process. Thus, this study also sought to ascertain how the contents of this unique methods course that was designed to develop a writer's identity, affected the student teaching experience. It is instructive that several of the teacher candidates commented on the difficulties of implementing what they had learned in the methods courses in their own teaching. In some cases, they saw much of what they thought of as poor writing instruction coming from the Master Teachers with whom they were student teaching. Many felt that the demands of scripted programs like Open Court and/or the Master Teacher's philosophy of teaching writing seemed at odds with what they had learned in their methods courses. Overall, we saw evidence of a disconnect between the writing that students were seeing in their student teacher placements and the pedagogy that they were learning in their teacher preparation courses, or at least the perception of such a disconnect on the part of our interviewees. For example, one student stated that she was not using her university methods-based writing materials. She felt that the professors were not in touch with the realities of the classroom. She also felt that professors were not communicating with the students effectively or with the local school district and its Open Court approach.

The Open Court curriculum was used by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) in order to address the low achievement of ELLs and students

of color, at the time of the study. It included the use of a mandated curriculum, Open Court. However, Open Court, because of its rapid pacing and minimal opportunities to scaffold knowledge, was found to be ineffective (Peck & Serrano, 2002; Lee, 2007) and has now been replaced. Although Open Court used the writing process approach, the fast pace and rigor of the program often left students struggling with basic skills while teachers had already moved on to new ideas. For one of their fieldwork assignments, students had to conduct a writing mini-lesson with an individual child or a group. One student commented:

> "The class just finished reading the story of Galileo in OCR. The class has a writing process folder and goes through the writing process, but they seem to skip the most important step, which is prewriting. The teacher greatly focuses on the structure and format of their writing. Billy got started on his draft, without pre-writing, and showed his teacher. It was shocking to see how the teacher automatically pointed out his grammatical mistakes without even talking about the content or commenting on his piece." (Teacher Candidate, Francis, Interview)

Another important part of the assignment was that the mini-lesson had to be conducted with an English language learner. Students were taught in the course that pre-writing was one of the most critical steps for English learners. Furthermore, immediately focusing on errors was likely to raise pupils' affective filters or anxiety levels and discourage them from writing (Krashen, 1982).

We can see that this student had developed a philosophy towards writing that includes valuing process, content, and providing feedback. The student later mentioned that she did not focus on the Galileo writing prompt because she did not want to "discourage" the pupil any further. She decided to allow Billy to choose a topic of his own. He chose wrestling. She then described how her conference focused on helping Billy to write descriptively about his favorite wrestler "The Undertaker". Thus, again we see that instead of focusing on structure, the student felt it was more important to spark the desire and the passion to write in elementary pupils. The questions still remain, "How will students continue to draw upon pupils' life worlds as writers while also addressing content area standards? How can teacher preparation programs and district personnel bridge the "reality" of school settings and the research based/theoretical applications taught in methods courses? How much teacher preparation programs should emphasize mandated curricula in methods courses? The comments of another teacher candidate demonstrated this disconnect:

"Here they tell us to do a lot of amazing things but in actuality you are doing Open Court…in schools you don't get to veer off the path. When I have my own class, I can apply them. In the future it will help. My Master Teacher gave me lots of feedback….she was wonderful….. no complaints there…she was amazing." (Teacher Candidate, Julie, Interview)

This student felt that the only strategy from her course that she had employed in her student teaching concerned the use of phonics as phonics related to writing. This was what she learned from her language arts methods class. She felt that Open Court did not allow her to use the methodologies or strategies that she had learned simply because of its prescriptive nature. The Master Teacher was a proponent of Open Court and adhered to the guidelines set forth by that teaching program. For example, the student mentioned that students in her kindergarten placement were learning rhyming words. Because of the novel methods course taken, the student teacher felt that it was a missed opportunity to explore poetry. Again, many of the teacher candidates felt that writing should focus on content and not mechanics and serve as a creative process for children. The focus on content versus mechanics was very different from the mandated curriculum that focused on mechanics.

"That writing is a process and I think at first it's more important to concentrate on the content and then the structure. If that's not there you can't make it into anything. Less on things like spelling and grammar and indenting and more on what the writer is trying to say." (Teacher Candidate, Lena, Writing Reflection)

Many students related focusing on content with providing more opportunities for pupils to be creative. This focus on content was also connected to guiding and modeling for students as they write. This focus on content demonstrates how students were beginning to critically frame their philosophies towards teaching writing. Students were beginning to create "possible selves". In other words, although many said that there was a disconnect between what they learned and what they saw in the classroom, many still saw the possibility for teaching writing in a way that was connected to student's lives and the curriculum instead of teaching writing as an isolated unconnected procedure. There were, however, several students who did feel that writing mechanics were of utmost importance. However, it appeared that the students who were able to apply the contents from the methods course learned how to , perhaps, "think out of the

box". One student mentioned how she supplemented instruction using by pictures and varied questioning techniques. Another felt that an important part of implementation was "knowing the students well". Another was able to work with students one-on-one and the pupils eventually became excited about writing.

Conclusions and Implications: Teacher Educators Strengthening Writing Pedagogy

The data presented demonstrate that a variety of factors influence the development of a writing teacher's identity within the context of teacher preparation programs. In order for teacher candidates to effectively negotiate, build upon and expand their identities as writers, they must have opportunities to reflect upon their own conceptions of what effective writing is, have access to multiple materials and resources for writing, and be encouraged to develop their own philosophies.

The New London Group (1996, 2001) would assert that our students have a variety of "available designs" from which to draw as they enter their respective classrooms to teach writing. These designs are defined as "a given social space - a particular society, or a particular institution such as a school or a workplace, or more loosely structured spaces of ordinary life encapsulated in the notion of different life worlds (p.97)." However, in many cases, the use of the Open Court and/or other highly structured curricula used in schools requires an emphasis on writing mechanics, i.e. punctuation, form, structure of writing. Such approaches allowed minimal opportunities for candidates to reflect upon their writing pedagogy and apply concepts learned in their methods course.

Nonetheless, students were acutely aware of this tension or disconnect between the two contexts-student teaching and university methods courses. Within this space of conflict, students then began to grapple with their own future possibilities as writers and future teachers of writing. In general, these teacher candidates were very reflective about their own experiences. A few even talked about the fact that they had come to value the act of reflecting and of writing. It is incumbent upon teacher education programs to serve as a mediator between the students whom they train and school systems characterized by dysfunctional rigidity. It is also necessary for teacher education programs to serve as intermediators with students who are impacted by these roles.

Even in the methods class observation, the observer noted students in the class reflecting on their relative skills at pedagogical activities and questioning whether this work was really their "calling." Although this questioning suggests

insecurities and ambivalences about a future as a teacher, the very fact that these students were already reflecting on their pedagogical effectiveness and imagining themselves as education professionals suggests a fairly sophisticated and rapid ability to self-assess and an incipient sense of a professional writer identity at this early stage in their teaching careers. However, they also needed validation that their concerns did not suggest an absence of the skills needed in a writing classroom.

The New London Group asserts that students as individual entities will not necessarily draw upon all available designs. But they will begin "designing". "Designing transforms knowledge in producing new constructions and representations of reality. Through their co-engagement in Designing, people transform their relations with each other, and so transform themselves (p.98)." The students who participated in this study certainly began "designing" themselves as writers and writing teachers. They also began to situate themselves not as consumers but as producers of knowledge. In other words, this was not a case of "monkey see, monkey do". This trend places an even greater burden upon methods courses to integrate elements of both the skill-based approach and more creative methodologies.

Yet, despite this disconnect, our students did to some extent, "see" themselves as potential vessels to guide pupils through writing. Some of the ways that they saw this possibility was by "making writing fun", by modeling for pupils, by personalizing writing, by having individual conferences with pupils and by teaching the writing process. As one student mentioned, "I know how to teach creative writing now. I just hate it so much but I feel like that helps." This is exemplary of how this student is reconstructing and renegotiating previous ideas of writing and writing instruction. The traditional notion of the value of student teaching has been based in the notion of "doing" for the purpose of "gaining experience" (i.e., if one doesn't practice writing/or the act of learning in general, they know not how things works and will not be able to reproduce lessons for others.). This traditional notion of "experience" is very narrowly defined, and the concept of "multiple literacies" helps to illuminate this narrowness (i.e. the training of today's teachers has to move beyond thinking of experience as something that fills an empty vessel). In this age of technology and abundant access, teacher educators must make teacher candidates aware of how to develop, engage, and draw upon multiple literacies to teach writing.

Based upon our findings, we recommend: 1.) frequent analysis of district reading/writing programs on behalf of teacher candidates; 2.) opportunities to

determine what is important to them as a writing teachers, how this aligns or does not align with district policies and how this impacts their identities as teachers of writing. This may occur through reflective journals and/or peer interviews; and 3.) encourage students to draw upon their communities of practice both within their classroom contexts with students and in professional development contexts with colleagues and/or Master teachers. Through such strategies, more pre-service teachers will become writers, and as a result, will be able to train students with the writing skills needed to navigate a world driven by multiple literacies.

T/W

References

Bridwell-Bowles, L. (1991). Research in composition: Issues and methods. In E. Lindemann & G. Tate (Eds.) *An introduction to composition studies* (pp. 94-117). New York: Oxford UP.

Calkins, L. (1994). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cervetti, G. N., Damico, J. S., & Pearson, P. D. (2006). Multiple literacies, new literacies, and teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, *45*(4), 378-386.

Colby, S.A., & Stapleton, J. N. (2006). Pre-service teachers teach writing: Implications for teacher educators. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 45(4), 353-376.

Coker, D. , & Lewis, W. (2008). Beyond writing next: A discussion of writing research and instructional uncertainty. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*(1), 231-251.

Dymoke, S. & Hughes, J. (2009). Using a poetry wiki: how can the medium support pre-service teachers of English in their professional learning about writing poetry and teaching poetry writing in a digital age. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique,* 8 (3) 91-106.

Fernsten, L. (2008). Writer identity and ESL learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(1), 44-52.

Graves, D. H. (1994). *A fresh look at writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ganske, K., Monroe, J., & Strickland, D. (2003). Questions teachers ask about struggling readers and writers. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(2) 118-128.

Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Gilbert, J. , & Graham, S. (2010). Teaching writing to elementary students in grades 4-6: A national survey. *Elementary School Journal*, *11 0*(4), 494-518.

Grisham, D. , & Wolsey, T. (2011). Writing instruction for teacher candidates: Strengthening a weak curricular area. *Literacy Research & Instruction*, *50* (4), 348-364.

Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P.L., Valencia, S.W, Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S. & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 32 (4), 631–662.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Philadelphia: Johns Benjamin Publishing.

Jenifer, S., & Rebecca, G. (2014). Writing Spaces, Professional Places: how a teachers' writing group can nurture teaching identities. *FORUM: For Promoting 3-19 Comprehensive Education*, *56*(1), 131-138.

Knowles, J. G., & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). Shaping pedagogies through personal histories in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 93 (1), 87-113.

Koch, K. (1970). *Wishes, lies, and dreams: Teaching children to write poetr*y. New York: New York Vintage Books.
　　Koch, K. (1974). *Rose, where did you get that red?: Teaching great poetry to children*. New York: Vintage Books.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 20(1), 77–97.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Lee, S., Ajayi, L., & Richards, R. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of the efficacy of the Open Court program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(3),19-43.

Lee, I. (2011). L2 writing teacher education for in-service teachers: Opportunities and challenges. *English in Australia*, *46*(1), 31-39.

Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 330-345

Lunsford, A. A. (1991). The nature of composition studies. In E. Lindemann & G. Tate (Eds.), *An introduction to composition studies* (pp. 3-14). New York: Oxford UP.

McCarthey, S. (2008). The impact of No Child Left Behind on teacher's writing. *Written Communication* 25 (4), 462-505.

Morgan, D. N. (2010). Preservice Teachers as Writers. *Literacy Research & Instruction*, *49*(4), 352-365.

Napoli, M. (2001). Pre-service teachers' reflections about learning to
        teach writing. (Report No. ED459472). Washington, DC: US Department
        of Information, Education Resource Information Center.

Nasiri, S. (2012). Academic writing: The role of culture, language
        and identity in writing for community. *International Journal of Learning*
        and Development, *2*(3), 1.

National Council of Teachers of English. (2004). *NCTE beliefs about*
        the teaching of writing. NCTE Guidelines retrieved on April 5, 2009 from
        http://www.ncte.org.

New London Group (1996). The pedagogy of multiple literacies: Designing
        social futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66 (1), 60-92.

New London Group (2000). A pedagogy of multiple literacies: Designing social
        futures. In Cope, B. & Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiple literacies: Literacy*
        learning and designing social futures (pp.9-38). New York: Routledge.

Norman, K. A., & Spencer, B. H. (2005). Our lives as writers: Examining pre
        -service teachers' experiences and beliefs about the nature of writing and
        writing instruction. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32 (1), 25-40.

Olick, J. & Robbins, J. (1998). Social memory studies: From 'Collective memory'
        to the historical sociology of mnemonic practice. *Annual Review of*
        Sociology. 24 (1), 105-140.

Pardo, L. M. (2006). The role of context in learning to teach writing:
        What teacher educators need to know to support beginning urban teachers.
        Journal of Teacher Education, 57 (4), 378-394.

Park, G. (2013). 'writing is a way of knowing': Writing and identity.
        Elt Journal, *67*(3), 336-345.

Paulson, E. , & Armstrong, S. (2010). Postsecondary literacy: Coherence in
        theory, terminology, and teacher preparation. *Journal of Developmental*
        Education, *33*(3), 2-13.

Peck, S., & Serrano, A. M. (2002). "Open Court" and English language learners:
        Questions and strategies. Based on paper presented at the annual meeting
        of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, April 2002.
        Retrieved from ERIC Database

Pella, S. (2011). A situative perspective on developing writing pedagogy in
        a teacher professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly*,
        38(1), 107-125.

Perl, S., & Wilson, N. (1986). *Through teachers' eyes: Portraits of*
        writing teachers at work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Street, C. (2003). Pre-service teacher's attitudes about writing and learning to teach writing. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30 (3), 33-50.

Street, C. & Stang, K.K. (2008) Improving the teaching of writing across the curriculum. A model for teaching in-service secondary teachers to write. *Action in Teacher Education* 30(1), 37-49.

Reid, E. (2011). Preparing writing teachers: A case study in constructing a more connected future for CCCC and NCTE. *College Composition and Communication*, *62*(4), 687-703.

Ronfeldt, M. & Grossman, P. (2008). Becoming a professional: Experimenting with possible selves in professional preparation. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 35 (3), 41-60.

Schepens,A., Aelterman, A. & Vlerick, P. (2009). Student's professional identity formation between being born a teacher and becoming one. *Educational Studies* 35 (4) 361-378.

Schuster, C. I. (1991). Theory and practice. In E. Lindemann & G. Tate (Eds.), *An introduction to composition studies* (pp. 33-48). New York: Oxford UP.

Totten, S. (2005). Writing to learn for pre-service teachers. *The Quarterly of the National Writing Project*. 27 (2) 17-28

Wilder, H. & Mongillo, G. (2007). Improving expository writing skills in an on-line teaching environment. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* 4(1), 47-489.