# Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

## Teachers as writers: a systematic review

## Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

Version: Accepted Manuscript

# oro.open.ac.uk

**Teresa Cremin**
(Corresponding author)
Professor of Education (Literacy)
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA
UK
Teresa.cremin@open.ac.uk

Teresa Cremin is a Professor of Education in the Centre for Research in Education and Education Technology, the Open University, UK. Her main areas of research are the relationships between teachers' literate identities and their pedagogic practices; discourse and interaction around reading and readers' engagement; and creativity in teaching and learning from the early years through to Higher Education.

**Lucy Oliver**
Research fellow
Graduate School of Education
University of Exeter
Heavitree Road
Exeter EX1 2LU
UK
l.j.oliver@exeter.ac.uk

Lucy Oliver is a research fellow in the Centre for Research in Writing, University of Exeter, UK. Her research interests include composing processes in writing; how and why writers revise; teachers' and students' concepts of writing process and writing quality. She was previously an English teacher and schools adviser, and also tutors on the Secondary English Initial Teacher Training programme.

**Teachers as Writers: A systematic review**

## Abstract

This paper is a critical literature review of empirical work from 1990-2015 on teachers as writers. It interrogates the evidence on teachers' attitudes to writing, their sense of themselves as writers and the potential impact of teacher writing on pedagogy or student outcomes in writing. The methodology was carried out in four stages. Firstly, educational databases keyword searches located 438 papers. Secondly, initial screening identified 159 for further scrutiny, 43 of which were found to specifically address teachers' writing identities and practices. Thirdly, these sources were screened further using inclusion/exclusion criteria. Fourthly, the 22 papers judged to satisfy the criteria were subject to in-depth analysis and synthesis. The findings reveal that the evidence base in relation to teachers as writers is not strong, particularly with regard to the impact of teachers' writing on student outcomes. The review indicates that teachers have narrow conceptions of what counts as writing and being a

writer and that multiple tensions exist, relating to low self-confidence, negative writing histories, and the challenge of composing and enacting teacher and writer positions in school. However, initial training and professional development programmes do appear to afford opportunities for reformulation of attitudes and sense of self as writer.

## 1. Introduction

Being able to write is a crucial twenty first century life skill and thus the teaching of writing justifiably accrues both professional interest and research attention. In particular, the notion that 'teachers of writing must write' has been extensively debated. This purportedly common-sense view can be traced back to the work of Emig (1971) and is also closely associated with Graves (1983) who contended that to be effective, teachers of writing must control the 'inseparable crafts' of both 'teaching and writing' (1983, 5). The process approach advocated by Graves and his peers, has been heavily critiqued as unsystematic and anecdotal (Hillocks 1979; Martin 1985; Smagorinsky 1987; Smith and Elley 1998), reliant upon both classroom observation and 'evangelical reportage' (Beard 2000, 41). Nonetheless, his assertion that teachers of writing must be writers has remained the focus of considerable international research and professional discussion.

In the 1980s and 1990s, advocates of teacher writing included those, who like Graves (1983) were committed to a writing process approach (Elbow 1973; Susi 1984; Murray 1985; Calkins 1994), and those who recognised its potential for practitioner research and publication (Goswami and Stillman 1986; Bissex and Bullock 1987; Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1993; Dahl 1992). Scholars and practitioners involved in the US National Writing Project (NWP) (formerly the Bay Area Writing Project, established in 1971, and now a national not-for-profit professional development initiative with well over 200 sites), also adopted the central tenet that 'writing teachers must write' (NWP and Nagin 2006). Considerable support for this notion was advanced (e.g. Camp 1982; Sunstein 1994; Perl and Wilson 1998), with claims that enhancing teachers' enthusiasm for writing motivates student writers (Guthrie 1996; Kaufman 2002), and that when teachers share their compositional challenges, younger writers benefit (Susi 1984; Root and Steinberg 1996). Counter claims were also asserted (e.g. Jost 1990; Gillespie 1991; Robbins 1992, 1996; Frager 1994; Gleeson and Prain 1996). These posited for example that when teachers write this reduces instructional time and makes them susceptible to exposure (Gleeson and Prain 1996), and that teacher' perceptions of the importance of writing and faith in their students' abilities are more significant indicators of efficacy than their involvement as writers (Robbins 1992, 1996). However, as Cremin and Baker argue, much of this early work is 'discursive, journalistic and anecdotal in nature' (2014, 30), and unwarranted conclusions appear to have been drawn.

Given the size, scope and sustained nature of the NWP, its research base is neither substantial nor strong (Andrews 2008). Additionally, NWP studies rarely focus on classroom interaction or the pedagogical consequences of teachers' writing practices and positioning in the classroom. Likewise, the New Zealand NWP (established in 1987 and government funded), which also afforded a key role to teachers as writers, has not been comprehensively researched. Initially informal local evaluations predominated (e.g. Pritchard 1989; Carruthers and Scanlan 1990), the later studies were somewhat wide-ranging and did not focus on the

repercussions for student writing (e.g. Locke et al. 2011; Dix 2013). In claiming that NWP-style professional development has transformational potential, Whitney confirms further investigation is urgently needed 'into the specific outcomes of NWP participation for classroom practices and student outcomes' (2008, 151).

The rationale underpinning the tenet that writing teachers must write is that through such engagement teachers may develop new understandings that can inform and potentially enrich their pedagogy, impacting upon their students' achievements (Gennrich and Janks 2013). Internationally in pre-service and in-service contexts, teachers' development as writers is often nurtured and they are encouraged to adopt the position of teacher and writer in school. Significantly, research indicates that teachers' conceptions of literacy, literate identities and pedagogic practice, frame, shape and often limit students' identities, both as writers (Bourne 2002; Mathers, Benson and Newton, 2006; Ryan and Barton 2014) and as readers (Hall et al. 2010; Hall 2012). Yet relatively little appears to be known about teachers' attitudes to writing, their sense of themselves as writers and the potential impact of teacher writing on pedagogy or student outcomes in writing.

Accordingly, in order to ensure that policy and practice are informed by the most rigorous available evidence, and that such evidence is subject to close critical scrutiny, this systematic review seeks to interrogate the empirical research base on teachers as writers. In recognising previous critiques of the field, and seeking to synthesize the evidence, the review also aims to contribute to the shaping of future research. It asks three questions:

1. What is known about teachers' attitudes to writing and to what extent do they view themselves as writers?
2. What is known about teachers' personal writing practices and conceptions of writing?
3. What is known about the pedagogical consequences of teachers' sense of self as writers, attitudes, conceptions and personal writing practices?
4. Is there evidence of any impact on student writing of teachers' sense of self as writers, attitudes, conceptions and personal writing practices?

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Literature search strategy

A systematic review was chosen given its strength as a means of establishing a 'reliable evidence base' (Davies et al. 2012, 81). It is increasingly seen as an important tool for synthesising empirical research and for influencing policy and practice (Torgerson 2007). The selection of literature by systematic procedures and according to specified criteria is assumed to reduce the risk of 'selective', 'biased' or 'partial' accounts, accusations which are frequently levelled at conventional literature reviews (Andrews 2005, 404). The current review followed established guidelines designed to ensure that research questions are addressed comprehensively, using relevant literature which accurately reflects the issue under discussion (Oxman 1994).

Three electronic databases were searched, first in 2013 and again in July 2015, to identify peer-reviewed literature, international in scope, relating to teacher writers: AEI (Australian Education Index), BEI (British Educational Index) and ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center). The search was restricted to literature published between 1990 and 2015. The key search terms used were 'teacher'; 'writing', 'writer'; and 'identity'. Results from the two searches combined are shown in Table 1. In addition, relevant literature was identified through citations and personal contact. The electronic and manual searches together revealed a total of 439 papers (417 electronic and 22 manual) of potential relevance. Titles and abstracts were copied to a file and duplicates removed. After initial screening, 159 were identified for further scrutiny in full text and 43 were found to address teachers' identities and practices specifically in relation to writing. These sources were retrieved, read in full by at least two reviewers, and subjected to further screening using agreed inclusion/exclusion criteria.

[Insert Table 1 near here]

**Table 1: Electronic search results**

| Search Terms | Total hits | AEI | BEI | ERIC |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher, writer (TI) | 71 | 8 | 7 | 56 |
| Teacher, writer, identity (AB) | 77 | 7 | 7 | 63 |
| Teacher, writing, identity (AB) | 269 | 29 | 40 | 200 |

*2.2 Selection criteria*

The inclusion criteria required that studies focused on teachers' identities and practices as writers; addressed primary, secondary or pre-service teachers in mainstream education; and were peer-reviewed reports of empirical investigations with some connection to the classroom. Studies were excluded if they were not published in English; were EFL focused; or were autobiographical accounts from writing teachers rather than investigations. Of the 43 studies finally examined, 31 met all of the inclusion criteria. These were then quality assessed in order to eliminate any which might cause the 'phenomena under investigation to be misinterpreted' (Watts and Robertson 2011, 38) or limit the strength of conclusions drawn (Oxman 1994).

To establish the relevance and trustworthiness of the studies selected, two reviewers independently rated each as high, medium or low on two key measures: methodological detail (research questions, sample, methods of data collection and analysis); and contribution of findings to the review questions. An overall weight of evidence was arrived at by combining the two judgements. Inter-rater differences were minor and resolved in discussion. Sources which were judged low were excluded. Sources in the medium categories were included or excluded by agreement: owing to the paucity of directly relevant research, an inclusive approach was adopted where, for example, relevance was reasonable and methodological detail adequate. 22 papers were judged by both reviewers to satisfy all criteria and were selected for in-depth analysis and synthesis.

## 2.3 Data extraction and synthesis

Initial data extraction was conducted using a review template which recorded key information about the sample, location, duration, data sources, methods, and main findings of each study. These digests were completed separately by two reviewers, combined and mapped in the form of a summary table. A synthesis of findings in relation to each of the research questions was then conducted independently by the two reviewers, and key themes discussed. The process of agreement and aggregation of findings took place through exchange of drafts which were revised collaboratively.

## 2.4 Characteristics of included studies

Table 2 shows the key characteristics of included studies. The studies identified for in-depth review ranged in date of publication from 2000 – 2015 and were undertaken in the USA (14), UK (4), New Zealand (2), Canada (1), and Australia (1). Seven addressed pre-service teachers; 14 addressed practising teachers; and one addressed both. Of the practising teachers, participants were elementary teachers in eight studies; middle or high school teachers in four; and a mix of elementary and high in two. Of the pre-service teachers, participants were elementary trainees in four studies, middle or high school trainees in three, and a combination of early childhood, elementary, middle and high school trainees in one. Across all of the studies reviewed, sample sizes ranged from single teacher respondents to 115; pre-service studies tended to have larger samples (5-124) and in-service studies smaller (1-35). Two studies also collected data from students to identify impact on their writing (Locke and Kato 2012; Whyte, Lazarte, Thompson, Ellis, Muse and Talbot 2007). The student sample size in these studies was 10 and 551 respectively. In relation to context, the pre-service studies tended to be single-site and the in-service studies multi-site. Professional development programmes provided the focus for 12 studies: participants were or had been engaged in NWPs (Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Locke and Kato 2012; Whitney 2008, 2009; Whyte et al. 2007); other in-service programmes - Writing is Primary (Cremin and Baker 2010, 2014); Creativity and Writing (Cremin 2006); Teaching Writing (McKinney and Giorgis 2009); or pre-service writing methods courses (Daisey 2009; Gardner 2014; Morgan 2010; Norman and Spencer 2005).

The methodological approaches adopted within the selected studies varied. The majority (17) employed multiple-method qualitative strategies such as case study, ethnography, naturalistic inquiry and collaborative action research. Four of the studies were quantitative. Of these, three were mono-method studies using questionnaire survey (Daisey 2009; Gallavan, Bowles and Young 2007; Street, 2003) and the fourth (Whyte et al. 2007) combined teacher survey with analysis of students' writing scores. Two studies (Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Locke and Kato 2012) combined quantitative and qualitative methods. Teacher interview was the most frequently used instrument (17), followed by teacher questionnaire (14), classroom observation (10) and scrutiny of teachers' writing samples (8). The number of data sources used in individual studies ranged from 1 to 6, although not all sources were necessarily discussed in detail in the papers reviewed.

[Insert Table 2 near here]

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies

## 3. Findings

### *3.1 What is known about teachers' attitudes to writing and to what extent do they view themselves as writers?*

16[1] studies explicitly addressed aspects of teachers' sense of self as writers. Of these, seven considered the views of pre-service teachers, eight those of practising teachers and one explored the perceptions of both student teachers and of experienced practitioners who were also accomplished writers. Recognising links between cognitive, social and affective dimensions of writing, these studies examine teachers' attitudes to, beliefs or feelings about writing. Taken together, the findings suggest that, irrespective of phase or experience, teachers of literacy differ in their attitudes to writing and in the extent to which they view themselves as writers, but tend towards negativity.

Pre-service studies document the very different attitudes, beliefs and experiences that prospective teachers brought to teacher education programmes. Not all trainees considered themselves 'writers' or professed a love of writing, although paradoxically they were sometimes keen to instil a love of writing in their future students (Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich 2000). The four trainees in Street's (2003) study reported diverse writing identities, ranging from enthusiastic writer of fiction to 'avoider'. Daisey (2009) found that 65% of trainees who reported enjoying writing throughout their lives saw themselves as writers, whereas those who did not rate their enjoyment highly were much less likely to think of themselves as writers. Gallavan, Bowles and Young (2007) identify a discrepancy between trainee teachers' beliefs about the importance of writing and their view of themselves as writers: whilst the majority attached high value to writing, particularly for their students, it was apparent that many disliked writing, perceived themselves as poor writers and were unsure how to teach writing effectively. In some surveys, the majority of student teachers reported less than positive attitudes to writing (Gardner 2014), or lacked both confidence and enjoyment (Morgan 2010). The self-given labels of 42 early childhood trainees ranged from 'accomplished' and 'talented' to 'struggling' and 'ashamed' (Morgan 2010). Trainees cited grammar, spelling, punctuation, organization, creativity, sentence structure, handwriting, neatness, and vocabulary as areas of concern (Morgan 2010). By contrast, Norman and Spencer (2005) found that more pre-service teachers viewed themselves positively as writers than negatively. These trainees expressed a preference for personal/creative writing and described the satisfaction they derived from expressing their ideas, engaging in the creative process, reflecting on their lives and sharing writing with family and friends. They were noticeably less positive when describing their experiences with analytic/expository writing.

Mixed attitudes and self-perceptions were also observed amongst experienced literacy specialists and 'exemplary' teachers of writing. Self-descriptions ranged from 'love' of writing to 'fearful and reluctant' (McKinney and Giorgis 2009); 'avid' to 'avoider' (Brooks 2007). McKinney and Giorgis (2009) found that teachers narrated diverse writer identities, both writer and non-writer, constructed over time through different life and school experiences. Two studies found that teachers of English/literacy were more likely to present themselves as keen readers than keen writers. The majority of secondary trainees in Gannon

---

[1] Brooks 2007; Cremin 2006; Cremin and Baker 2010; Daisey 2009;Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich 2000; Gallavan, Bowles and Young 2007; Gannon and Davies 2007; Gardner 2014; McKinney and Giorgis 2009; Morgan 2010; Norman and Spencer 2005; Street 2003; Whitney 2008, 2009; Yeo 2007.

and Davies' (2007) study cited a love of reading as their motive for becoming English teachers – only 10 of 73 mentioned writing in their responses. They were more likely to describe their strengths in reading and the satisfaction afforded by reading than any equivalent in writing. Of the 12 practising teachers in Yeo's (2007) study, only two considered themselves 'writers'. By contrast, all were 'passionate' readers and many had been so since childhood.

Both pre-service and in-service studies note the emotional aspects of teachers' orientations towards writing. 74% of prospective teachers in Gardner's (2014) study referred to affective dimensions, identifying the expression of emotion in writing, the feelings induced by the act of writing and the effect of past experience of writing as significant. Gannon and Davies (2007) observed the strong positive affects of 'love', 'enchantment' 'passion' and 'immersion' which characterised the writing dispositions of teachers who were also accomplished authors. This contrasts markedly with the negative emotions expressed by many less confident teachers. Several studies report the fear and anxiety experienced by teachers invited to write as part of professional development or research programmes, particularly their concerns about having nothing worthwhile to say and the potential value judgements of others. Five of the seven practising teachers in Whitney's (2008) study described painful emotions of self-doubt, unworthiness, guilt, shame, paralysis, and the sense of being an 'imposter'. The unease experienced by teachers in Cremin's (2006) study was such that their head teachers requested the story-writing challenge be abandoned: all participants encountered periods of intense insecurity and expressed considerable emotional discomfort, even distress, during composition. Similar discomfort is described by pre-service teachers participating in Writing Methods courses: two trainees in Morgan's (2010) study, for example, reported wanting to cry at the thought of sharing their writing with the class. Cremin and Baker (2010) further observed the emotional struggle experienced by teachers when composing in the classroom and the conflict participants felt between their identities as writer-teachers and teacher-writers.

Studies also highlight the strength of teachers' feelings about their own experiences of school writing. Almost half of the student-teachers in Gardner's (2014) study and all of the practising teachers in McKinney and Giorgis' (2009) reported negative school experiences, as did those who reported low enjoyment of writing in Daisey's (2009) study. One experienced teacher in Cremin and Baker's (2010) study recalled writing at primary school with 'horror' and could bring to mind no positive memories of writing at secondary school either; he began to find value and enjoyment in writing only when afforded greater freedom as an undergraduate. Only four of the 48 trainees surveyed by Gannon and Davies (2007) recalled high school as the site of their most enjoyable or successful writing whereas almost half identified university. Teachers often linked enjoyment or dislike of school writing with particular writing pedagogies, associating negative memories with teachers who emphasised 'prescriptive correctness over meaning and expression' (Street 2003, 42) or 'secretarial skills…over content' (Gardner 2014, 141). Student teachers who did not regard themselves as writers associated early story-writing with 'copying' and 'rote' or 'drill-like' approaches whereas confident writers associated composition with creative process (Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich 2000), positive feedback (Daisey 2009) and recalled workshop-style classes where they felt nurtured as writers (Street 2003).

Findings are consistent in suggesting that teachers' identities as writers were powerfully affected by early experiences at school and these often informed their subsequent self-identification as 'writer' or 'non-writer'. 90% of the pre-service teachers in Norman and

Spencer's (2005) study acknowledged the role particular individuals, and especially teachers, had played in the construction of their identities as writers. Whilst almost all perceived elementary teachers to have had a positive impact, the impact of secondary teachers was more commonly judged as negative. They cited creative opportunities, teachers who cared about their ideas, and praise or good grades, as instrumental in shaping positive self-perceptions as writers. The impact of teachers who over-valued correct form, were critical, or held views about writing that conflicted with their own, was considered detrimental. The pre-service teachers in Morgan's (2010) study also identified specific interactions with teachers as contributing to their sense of self as writer. Teacher comments, both negative and positive, left a lasting impression and obtaining a certain grade on a paper was the 'pivotal' point for some, informing their self-given labels as writers and serving to establish their perceived ability. Daisey (2009) and Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich (2000) report that the writing histories of trainees who perceived themselves as 'writers' differed from those of trainees who did not. In the latter study, the 'writers' described strong, positive early writing experiences and high levels of home support whereas the 'non-writers' described negative and frustrating early experiences and little home support. Whilst both groups recalled positive and negative experiences, the memories of those who identified themselves as 'non-writers' were predominantly negative and continued through school and college years. Both positive and painful school experiences were found to have had long-term repercussions for personal and professional identities. For some prospective teachers, the negative impact was such that as adults they remained fearful of writing and doubted their ability to teach it (Street 2003). For one experienced literacy specialist, memories of school writing were so distressing that she chose not to engage in writing or teach writing to students (McKinney and Giorgis 2009). By contrast, a practising teacher in Cremin and Baker's (2010) study attributed her growth in confidence to a single teacher and his commitment to writing tutorials. The successful teacher-writers in Gannon and Davies' (2007) study cited inspirational teachers as important contributors to their love of writing; 22 of the 73 trainee teachers questioned mentioned a teacher/s, many by name, who had brought them to a love of English (although not explicitly writing).

All of the eight studies that examine initial training and professional development initiatives suggest that focused opportunities to participate in a community of practice, or to write in a range of forms, can 'transform' teachers' attitudes, self-esteem, and sense of self as writer. Pre-service studies describe the positive impact of writing methods courses or writing workshops on trainees' confidence. Almost 60% of the student teachers in Morgan's (2010) study lacked confidence in their writing abilities at the start of their course but reported increased self-assurance and enjoyment as it progressed; trainees who feared or initially disliked writing came to new realizations about themselves as authors. All of the trainees in Street's (2003) study, regardless of their initial attitudes or perceived ability, found their methods course a transforming event and felt validated as writers. Likewise the trainees in Daisey's (2009) study reported the course enhanced their writing identity. Gardner (2014) found that writing workshops enabled trainee teachers to re-evaluate the purpose of writing and discover its creative power, changing both their self-perceptions and understanding of the writing process. They made connections with their future students' needs and could identify implications for teaching writing. Practising teachers were also found to make both personal and professional gains from writing workshops, reframing their conceptions of themselves as writers, as teachers of writing and as effective professionals (Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Locke and Kato 2012; Whitney 2008, 2009). The benefits of supportive feedback from peers and educators and of sustained opportunities for collaboration over time are cited as particularly significant.

### 3.2 *What is known about teachers' personal writing practices and conceptions of writing?*

16[2] studies examined teachers' personal writing practices and/or conceptions of writing, although often more in passing than in detail and with greater attention to concepts than to practices. Six focused on pre-service teachers and nine on practising teachers.

Regarding personal writing practices, findings overall suggest that both pre-service and in-service teachers differ in their engagement; they also identify that many teachers of writing do not write themselves except for functional purposes. Of the pre-service teachers surveyed by Gardner (2014), only 1.8% reported writing frequently for pleasure, whereas 49.5% claimed they never gained pleasure from writing. Whilst the majority wrote regularly, this was largely in the form of emails, mobile texts, instant messages and lists, rarely extended writing. Similarly, only six of the 42 trainees in Morgan's (2010) study claimed they currently enjoyed writing and did so regularly, spending their free time writing poems, cards, song lyrics, and keeping journals. The non-recreational writers blamed the rigours of college work and assignments which left them with no time or energy to write for themselves. Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich (2000) also found that most student teachers saw their writing practices as merely academic and reported little writing for pleasure, although it was evident that many were doing more than they initially realised or acknowledged as writing. By contrast, many of the student teachers in Norman and Spencer's (2005) study claimed to write for personal and creative purposes as part of their daily lives, not just in response to school assignments; this included stories, poems, songs, journals and diaries.

In-service studies suggest that experienced teachers' engagement in recreational writing is similarly variable. Of the four literacy specialists in McKinney and Giorgis' (2009) study, one positioned herself as a frequent writer, currently collaborating on a children's book; one claimed to write 'out of necessity'; one categorized herself as a non-writer; and another to write only when required. Brooks (2007) similarly found that 'exemplary' teachers of writing did not necessarily write often for either professional or personal purposes: one of his four case study teachers claimed to write for multiple purposes and another to enjoy writing fiction, a third wrote for practical purposes only and one avoided writing altogether. Yeo (2007) observed that the practising teachers in her study were more dedicated readers than writers and few used digital media in their writing lives.

Some evidence suggests that negative childhood and school experiences exerted long-term influence not only on teachers' attitudes but also on their writing practices (Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich 2000). Teachers who expressed low self-esteem as writers were also more likely to characterise their writing as functional than recreational or creative. The most reluctant writer in Street's (2003) study only felt comfortable doing 'technical' writing, reporting that she did no writing 'just for [her]self' and could not 'understand why people would…what good does it do?' (38).

Regarding teachers' conceptions of writing, studies identify the limitations and contradictions inherent in many teachers' definitions of purpose, process and success criteria. Both trainee and experienced teachers often lacked inclusive definitions of what counts as writing. The 12

---

[2] Brooks 2007; Cremin 2006; Cremin and Baker 2010, 2014; Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich 2000; Gardner 2014; McCarthey, Woodard and Kang 2014; McKinney and Giorgis 2009; Morgan 2010; Norman and Spencer 2005; Street 2003; Whitney 2008, 2009; Woodard 2013, 2015; Yeo 2007.

pre-service teachers interviewed by Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich (2000), for example, did not consider lists, letters, email messages or personal notes to be a part of their writing. Their implied definitions included only academic writing and narrative or journal writing. In-service studies similarly found that practitioners tended to conceive of writing practices hierarchically and, like their pre-service counterparts, did not always value the myriad of writing in which they engaged for everyday purposes. They frequently associated 'writing' with 'creative writing' in terms of what is widely recognised as distinctive in the field, such as literary works and published material (Cremin 2006; Cremin and Baker 2010; McKinney and Giorgis 2009; Yeo 2007). Yeo identifies 'the presence of absence' in teachers' conceptualisations of composition and literacy (123). Most of the practising teachers in her study considered literacy to be mainly about reading, and thought of composition in traditional text-forms; with two exceptions, there was little interest in or awareness of 'new literacies', 'multi-literacies' or digital media.

In common with teachers' attitudes and practices, the connections between teachers' own histories of literacy and their adult conceptualisations are identified. Yeo (2007) notes the disconnect between practising teachers' reading-oriented, print-based concepts of 'literacy' - consciously or unconsciously echoing the values and experiences of their childhoods - and the kind of literacy practices their students engage in at home; only the two teachers who had an authentic relationship with alternative texts in their own lives defined literacy more broadly.

Teachers' beliefs about how writers develop and what makes a 'writer' were also found to vary. More than half of the pre-service teachers in Norman and Spencer's (2005) study expressed beliefs about writing ability as 'fixed', a talent one either has or doesn't have; far fewer perceived writing as a craft that can be improved with instruction and feedback. Such beliefs served to inform their assumptions about effective teaching and its potential to impact on writing development. A reluctant writer in Street's (2003) study similarly regarded writing ability as 'innate…a gift one possessed or failed to possess' (39), whereas the more confident writers saw writing as a skill that developed socially in supportive environments. Teachers' definitions of 'real' writers also varied and were sometimes disempowering, associating expertise with particular genres or the work of published professionals. One exemplary teacher in Brooks' (2007) study defined a 'writer' as someone who writes for multiple purposes, including letters, songs, poems and personal journals, whilst another claimed a writer was someone who writes books or magazine articles for a living. Similarly experienced teachers in two studies hesitated to call themselves 'writers' because they did not publish their work, even though they wrote extensively outside school and derived considerable satisfaction from this (Woodard 2013; Cremin and Baker 2014). Indeed, the two teacher-writers in Woodard's (2013) study conceptualized writing 'authority' – who is 'authorised' to write – in complicated ways, advising their students that expertise was not synonymous with authority but not always applying the advice to themselves.

A number of studies further suggest that many teachers lack a coherent set of concepts and entertain dichotomous views about writing. McCarthey, Woodard and Kang (2014) found that practising teachers held hybrid conceptualisations of writing and were not necessarily able to resolve the tensions among them. Teachers' beliefs reflected a combination of Ivanič's (2004) discourses (skills, creativity, process, genre and social practices) and contradictory assumptions. Experienced teachers in Whitney's (2008, 2009) studies reported tensions between their beliefs about writing and their own classroom practices; they perceived a dichotomy between providing structure and generating creativity, between ideas

and form in writing. Other studies similarly document teachers' conflicting perceptions of personal and 'school' writing, or personal and professional writing, and the difficulties some teachers experienced reconciling these. Both Cremin and Baker (2010) and McKinney and Giorgis (2009) found discontinuities between teachers' constructions of their identities as writers and as teachers of writing, such that the writing classroom could become a 'site of struggle and tension' as teachers juggled 'more conforming identities: teacher-writer writing for the system and more liberating identities: writer-teachers writing more for themselves' (Cremin and Baker 2010, 21). Woodard (2013) identified three specific tensions between teacher-writers' representations of in-school and out-of-school writing: the purposes for writing, what constitutes writing 'authority', and their roles as teachers and writers.

Both pre-service and in-service studies also highlight the ways in which teachers' concepts of writing, like their attitudes, can be 'transformed' when they are engaged in sustained writing-intensive professional development, enabling them to address such tensions and reconcile contradictory concepts. Whitney (2008) found that participation in an NWP Summer Institute enabled five of the seven teachers in her study to reframe their 'epistemological stance' and reach new understandings of what writing is and who can do it, and consequently of themselves as writers and teachers of writing. Engagement in pre-service writing workshops similarly enabled trainee teachers to re-evaluate the purpose and process of writing and appreciate its socially situated nature (Gardener 2014).

### 3.3 What is known about the pedagogical consequences of teachers' sense of self as writers, attitudes, conceptions and personal writing practices?

Few studies directly addressed the pedagogical consequences of teachers' personal practices or orientations towards writing. Only seven[3] drew on researcher observations to explore the relationship between teachers' writing identities and their classroom practice. The in-depth data from these studies is dealt with separately below.

There is some evidence to suggest that teachers who perceived themselves as writers offered richer classroom writing experiences and generated increased enjoyment, motivation and tenacity amongst their students than 'non-writers'. Street (2003) observed the ways in which the writing attitudes and levels of self-confidence of five novice teachers carried over into their emerging classroom practice. The two more assured teachers who saw themselves as writers were found to offer a great deal to students that the reluctant and developing writers in his study did not: they were able to convey a passion for writing and share their expertise, modelling writing tasks and promoting a community of practice in the classroom. By contrast, the poor attitudes of one teacher towards her own writing carried over into her presentation of the subject to students: she conveyed negative messages through her pedestrian 'task-master' approach to writing poetry and failed to model or inspire creativity.

Similar classroom consequences, both positive and negative, of teachers' writing identities are reported in studies of experienced practitioners. Locke and Kato (2012) document the positive impact on student motivation of one teacher's initial attempt to position herself as a

---

[3] Cremin and Baker 2010, 2014; Locke and Kato 2012; McCarthey, Woodard and Kang 2014; Street 2003; Woodard 2013, 2015.

writer in the classroom. Following participation in an intensive writing workshop, she sought to demonstrate composition processes, share her own poetry writing with students and provide new opportunities for peer review. Over the course of a 5 week classroom intervention, it was found that reluctant writers in her secondary class were 'turned on' to poetry and improved their attitudes towards writing, their enjoyment and their sense of self-efficacy.

In their examination of the relationships among three teachers' beliefs, writing experiences and instructional practices, McCarthey, Woodard and Kang (2014) found that unresolved tensions in teachers' conceptualisations were reflected in incoherent or narrow skills-based approaches in the classroom which were heavily reliant on the discourses of district-adopted curricula. One teacher's negative early writing experiences and limited professional development underpinned her adoption of a skills-based district curriculum, even though this explicitly contradicted her socially oriented beliefs about writing development. Conversely, a more assured teacher-writer was able to harness rich personal experience to illustrate diverse teaching approaches and reconcile contradictory discourses, successfully adapting a district-adopted writing curriculum. Access to high-quality professional development and opportunities for personal writing was found to influence teachers' discourses about curriculum, students and instruction.

In a solo study, Woodard (2013) observed the ways in which conflicting purposes of in- and out-of-school writing impacted on teacher-writers' classroom representations. Whilst the two participant teachers wrote for varied audiences and purposes in their personal lives, and drew on aspects of their experience when teaching, they tended to align their instruction with more limited curricula or state standards. The complicated dialogic interaction between personal and instructional practices is further explored in a subsequent study (Woodard 2015) which records how two teacher-writers appropriated and repurposed language and textual practices from their participation in creative and online writing groups when they discussed composition processes with their students. Their different writing experiences and communities of practice were found to inform the values and strategies they brought to the classroom. Drawing on the textual practices of creative writers, for example, one teacher was concerned to encourage radical revision and 'show not tell' strategies, whilst the other highlighted the importance of 'bridge building' and advocacy, drawing on the literate practices of online, networked writers. The study highlighted ways in which teachers' personal practices can provide powerful resources for teaching.

By contrast, Cremin and Baker (2010, 2014) illustrate the tensions that may be created when teachers draw on their personal writing experiences and attempt to move between the identity positions of teacher-writer and writer-teacher in the classroom. They found that for two teachers, their 'demonstration' writing – writing which was spontaneously generated in front of the whole class – was often a source of struggle or discomfort and impacted upon their sense of self as writers. Whilst this did not deflect them from their commitment to demonstrating writing, issues of emotional engagement, personal authenticity and authorial agency were identified as salient in a complicated teacher-writer relationship. Additionally, the constant negotiation and renegotiation of teacher/writer roles was not always understood by students. Woodard (2013) similarly identifies the tensions between writing and teaching writing that affected the instructional practices of both teacher-writers in her study. She found that the purposes and audiences these teachers prioritised for themselves differed from those they prioritised for students, and whilst both teachers utilised their own writing practices as

classroom resources, they restricted their modelling to align with limited curricula or state standards, neglecting topics or genres that were personally meaningful.

Seven studies[4] addressed the *potential* pedagogical consequences, as offered through self-report, of teachers' engagement as writers in pre-service or professional development courses. These suggest that interventions or programmes which included attention to teachers' development as writers and/or offered regular writing and reflection opportunities, impacted on teachers' projected classroom practice. However, the extent to which participants articulated possible classroom consequences was relatively limited, and claims concerning intended practice were not followed-up or compared with the practices of non-attending teachers.

Morgan (2010) and Gardner (2014) explore the potential outcomes for teaching of pre-service courses which emphasized writing methods and workshop approaches. Gardener (2014) found that engaging student teachers in supported writing and reflecting upon their experience changed some of their self-perceptions as writers and enhanced their understanding of the writing process; 74% of the trainees perceived that this would impact on their teaching, increasing their empathy for students' challenges, their awareness of the role of personal life experience and the importance of the affective dimension of writing. Some also articulated the relationship between reading and writing, although the possible consequences of this for practice were not clearly stated. Morgan (2010) found that after one semester of instruction the pre-service teachers in her study came, through their engagement in writing workshops, to appreciate the potency of writing regularly and exercising choice about topic content and the value of 'reading like a writer'. Having similar writing experiences to their future students was seen as significant in shaping their practice. Daisey (2009) found that trainees planned to decrease students' writing apprehension through promoting ownership, feedback and positive role models.

Case studies of practising teachers also identify the perceived classroom consequences of writing-intensive professional development courses. Like Locke and Kato (2012), Dix and Cawkwell (2011) found that participation in writing workshops enabled one teacher to embrace her identity as a writer and 'transform' her pedagogy: with enhanced understanding of the writing process and growing assurance as a writer, she reported feeling able to model for her students ways of providing and responding to feedback, enabling them to review and revise writing with new understanding. The teacher in Whitney's (2009) study similarly described a more collaborative, oral approach to teaching writing following her participation in an NWP Summer Institute. Cremin (2006) found that teachers who engaged reflectively as writers when composing a short story experienced discomfort and anxiety, reporting enhanced empathy for younger writers as a consequence. They identified the need to increase opportunities for extended composition, offer greater choice and agency in terms of form and content, and build less prescribed and more secure environments in which young writers could share their uncertainties. Thus it was again reported that the affective dimension of writing was underscored in the classroom as a result of the adult's reflective engagement as writer.

Additionally, two studies focused on teachers' perceptions of the relationship between their identities as writers and as teachers of writing. These suggest that teachers vary in the extent to which they associate their writing lives with their classroom practice or their effectiveness

---

[4] Cremin 2006; Daisey 2009; Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Gardener 2014; Morgan 2010; Whitney 2008, 2009.

as teachers of writing. There are also discontinuities in the writer identities and teaching practices declared by some teachers. Brooks (2007) found that 'exemplary' teachers of literacy did not necessarily see any connection between their personal writing practices and their teaching, nor did those who shared an enjoyment of writing in their own time necessarily write with or in front of their students. Brooks concludes that whilst teachers' writing competence and life experiences 'may play a role in their teaching' (189), his four case study teachers assumed other factors, particularly their response to student's needs, had more influence upon their efficacy as teachers of writing. This is perhaps unsurprising given that the teachers concerned tended to define writing and students' writing 'needs' in terms of state standards not personal practices. McKinney and Giorgis (2009) drew on experienced teachers' narratives to examine the assumption that the 'ways we see ourselves as writers impact the way we teach writing' (108). They found that whilst the teacher-writer relationship described by these literacy specialists was complex and inconsistent, nevertheless for several their writing experiences and attitudes had specific classroom repercussions. For example, one teacher who expressed considerable self-doubt in relation to writing avoided teaching it altogether and instead foregrounded reading on the premise that 'reading was a prerequisite to writing'.

### 3.4 Is there evidence of any impact on student writing of teachers' sense of self as writers, attitudes, conceptions and personal writing practices?

There is very little empirical evidence of the impact on students' writing; only three studies examine this question directly and findings are inconclusive.

In their large-scale quantitative study, Whyte et al. (2007) found that the extent of teachers' reported writing lives was associated with their students' achievement in writing. The study explored the patterns of association among the three variables of teachers' NWP affiliation; the extent of their reported writing lives outside of school; and their students' writing achievement. NWP and comparison teachers were sub-classified as high- or low-frequency writers and their students' pre- and post-course writing scores compared. Whilst the post-course writing scores of students across all participating classes were higher than pre- course scores, there was a significant difference only in the achievement of students whose teachers were both NWP affiliates and had reported more extensive writing lives; there was no significant difference in the scores of students taught by comparison teachers or by NWP teachers with less extensive writing lives. The findings suggest therefore that the interaction between teachers' NWP involvement and extensive writing lives may impact positively on students' writing achievement but cannot determine, as the authors acknowledge, whether NWP affiliation prompts, or is prompted by, teachers' personal writing practices.

In Locke and Kato's (2012) case study, the impact on students' writing of a short poetry-writing intervention is inconclusive. Whilst more students improved their overall scores than reduced them, and there was some increase in the range of poetic devices used, the authors note that this does not in itself indicate any improvement in writing quality. Similarly, in Dix and Cawkwell's (2011) case study, the introduction of a peer-response model was successful in prompting the primary students to add detail to their writing and the teacher reported that both quality and depth increased as students devoted more time to the writing process. However, no pre- and post-textual evidence was analysed to support this view.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1: Limitations of the research reviewed

Overall the evidence base in relation to teachers as writers is not strong. It is noteworthy that despite searching literature from 1990 onwards, only post-2000 studies were considered sufficiently rigorous for inclusion in the review; earlier studies tended to be anecdotal and lacked analytic detail. The studies included in the review were of variable quality, with some evident weaknesses: notably, unstated or implicit conceptual framing and restricted data collection.

As a whole, the database reviewed is uneven in several respects. It is unbalanced in terms of the phases and contexts investigated, and the teaching experience of participants. The majority of studies are US-focused. Only four address the UK context, three of them authored/co-authored by the same researcher; fewer still emanate from Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The teachers studied are predominantly elementary in phase. There is also a preponderance of pre-service respondents: participants in one third of studies are trainee teachers, comprising 612 of the 737 respondents across the review as a whole. By contrast, only three studies consider the perspective of school students (Cremin and Baker 2010, 2014; Locke and Kato 2012) and two draw on students' writing assessments (Locke and Kato 2012; Whyte et al. 2007). Evaluations of impact are therefore rarely supported by data from learners.

The range of writing genres considered is also narrow. The studies reviewed focus primarily on creative writing – notably poetry and personal narrative. Almost no attention is paid to digital practices; with the exception of Yeo (2007), Gardner (2014) and Woodard (2015), all retain a largely print-based conceptualisation of writing. Writing as design, multimodal and digitally-produced texts are rarely commented upon by participants or researchers.

From a methodological perspective, the divergence of sample size and methods employed presents a particular challenge for evaluation. The studies included tend to be either small-scale, descriptive case studies, or larger-scale quantitative surveys. Both have distinctive strengths and drawbacks in the context of teachers' writing identities and classroom impact. Employing an identity lens tends to necessitate close focus on a small sample. Consequently, several studies provide in-depth data from very few teachers: four studies examine single cases (Cremin and Baker 2014; Dix and Cawkwell 2011; Locke and Kato 2012; Whitney 2009) and only one investigation of pedagogical impact has a sample larger than three (Whyte et al. 2007). In addition, sample composition is sometimes highly specific – 'exemplary' teachers of writing (Brooks 2007) or teachers who are also published poets (Gannon and Davies 2007). It is not known how these findings might relate more widely. Conversely, whilst the larger-scale studies may offer more representative samples, the appropriateness of surveys as a means of examining complex 'identity' or 'impact' questions is debatable. Survey methods are said to be better at 'gathering relatively simple facts … or reports of behaviour' than attitudes or explanations (Gorard 2003, 90). It is therefore a less effective tool for examining teachers' beliefs. Gallavan, Bowles and Young (2007) employ an 8-item Likert-style questionnaire and Daisey (2009) uses open-ended and Likert–style questionnaires for this purpose, but in neither study is additional data collected to elaborate or qualify teachers' responses. Whyte et al. (2007) employed survey methods to examine the association between teachers' writing lives and students' achievement in writing. A 10-item questionnaire concerning the frequency and range of writing undertaken outside school was used to create

the variable 'teacher's writing life'. Whilst this offered an innovative conceptualisation, further evidence such as analysis of samples of teachers' writing would have strengthened the investigation.

In many studies findings are reliant primarily or exclusively on teachers' self-reports. Inferences made on the basis of self-report alone have been described as 'impressionistic', 'incomplete' and 'unreliable' (Smagorinsky 1994, ix-x) on the grounds that self-reports are particularly susceptible to external influence and selective 'performance'. Additional data sources are often judged necessary to strengthen the findings from surveys and interviews, particularly if these are one-off events. Brooks (2007), for example, conducted interviews to explore how four teachers described themselves as readers/writers, and teachers of reading/writing; given that these interviews were either single occasion or telephone/email exchanges, the field notes and observations referred to in the methods section would seem important additional evidence. However, the use of these data sources to support or challenge teachers' self-reports is not apparent in the write-up.

In some studies, researchers adopt an initial theoretical stance, notably the belief that teachers who love writing, assume the identity of 'writer', and write alongside their students, are likely to have a more positive impact on motivation and learning than non-writers. Locke and Kato (2012), McKinney and Giorgis (2009), and Dix and Cawkwell (2011), for example, regard this conviction as central to their research project. Whilst transparency in this respect contributes to trustworthiness, it also has implications for the interpretation of data. As Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich (2000) concede: 'our perspective can be considered a biased one in that we do not believe that teachers who dislike reading and writing can effectively foster the love of reading and writing in the children they teach' (187).

Notwithstanding these qualifications, and the apparent shortage of relevant research in the field, the studies reviewed provide a sufficient body of evidence to shed light on the questions posed by this review and to highlight where further investigation is needed.

### 4.2: Contribution of the review to answering the research questions

Few of the studies included address the research questions posed by this review directly – relevant evidence is more commonly embedded in wider inquiries. Of the dozen studies which examine teachers' responses to professional development programmes, for example, some identify the potential impact on teaching, but the link to teachers' writing identities and classroom outcomes is oblique. Others provide an indication of the pedagogical consequences of particular interventions but it remains unclear whether these are attributable to changes in teachers' sense-of-self as writers or simply the transfer of approaches advocated by the programme. These studies raise the question of applicability of findings more broadly to 'everyday' teachers who have not had experienced such interventions.

From the evidence base as a whole however, it is clear that the relations amongst teachers' beliefs, attitudes and concepts, their writing experience and their pedagogy are complex and often uncomfortable. There are more unresolved tensions than positive connections between teachers' personal attitudes and writing practices and their teaching of writing. Some of these tensions stem from teachers' poor self-confidence and anxieties about writing, often associated with negative writing histories and marked by strong emotional responses. Other tensions reflect conflicting concepts of writing for oneself and writing for school purposes, particularly the perceived discrepancies between curriculum policy and assessment priorities

and teachers' own values and beliefs about writing. Even for confident writers, tensions emerge from teacher-writers' relationships with their unfolding compositions in the classroom and the problems they experience moving between teacher-writer and writer-teacher identities.

The tensions and difficulties teachers experience in these respects appear to impact on classroom practice and suggest that many encounter the teaching of writing as problematic - an uncomfortable space - with potential repercussions for student motivation and achievement.

### 4.2.1 Teachers' attitudes to writing and their sense of self as writers

The findings in respect of teachers' attitudes offer a diverse picture, but with a tendency towards negativity, often marked by the language of self-doubt and self-critique. Such a tendency may represent cause for concern with regard to pedagogical consequences, although the picture is complex. Studies of emotions *during* writing suggest that anxiety and frustration are also common to college students and professional writers (Brand and Leckie 1988; D'Mello and Mills 2014). Yet in education, most of the efforts to increase students' writing proficiency have focused on the cognitive aspects of writing, at the relative expense of the emotional dimensions (Schutz and Pekrun 2007).

Past school experiences appear to play a highly influential role in framing attitudes and shaping teachers' subsequent writing identities (more so than home experiences), and are recalled with emotional intensity. The sustained impact of school experiences is also evident in research focused on professional writers' identities (Day 2002) which underscores the potency of teachers' pedagogies on the dispositions and identities of young writers. Affective dimensions are prominent in teachers' thinking about writing and themselves as writers, and sometimes manifest themselves in avoidance of writing both personally and professionally. Writing is arguably an act of self-identification that echoes biography, history and a sense of place; it 'is sometimes directly and almost always indirectly an exposure of self to others' (Daly and Wilson 1983, 329). Since writers' emotions and self-esteem are inexorably intertwined, it may be challenging for a teacher to enact the dual persona of teacher and writer in the classroom. In this respect the review indicates that teachers' (and students') identities as writers and the role of the emotions in composition deserve increased recognition and attention.

Initial training and professional development programmes do seem to afford opportunities for reformulation of attitudes and sense of self as writer, and may therefore have significant potential for promoting positive attitudes and broader conceptualisations of writing in education.

### 4.2.2 Teachers' personal writing practices and conceptions of writing

Whilst teachers' personal writing practices evidently vary, what is meant by personal writing or 'writing life' is framed differently in individual papers and interpreted differently by participants. Nevertheless, findings reveal teachers' narrow conceptions of what counts as writing or what makes a 'writer', often centred on print-based text, 'authorship' and narrative/expressive genres (in parallel perhaps with traditional hierarchies in reading which reify serious literary fiction). Many teachers appear to discount everyday writing or digital practices, and may not self-identify as writers for this reason. It appears that the work of the

New Literacy Studies (Barton and Hamilton 1998; Street 1984), which highlights the ordinariness of writing (and reading) practices, has not yet impacted upon teachers' conceptions of writing. As Yeo (2007) also observes, teachers' conceptualisations have little to do with current theories or practices in literacy and composition, or with what is formally taught in teacher education programmes; rather they are rooted in teachers' past experiences, historical conceptions of writing and policy codifications. What Street (1984) describes as an autonomous model of school literacy, appears to remain highly influential in teachers' thinking about writing. This model, prevalent in accountability cultures that measure progress against sets of normalised sub-skills, fails to take account of difference. In contrast Street's (1994) 'ideological' model recognises the diversity and complexity of literacy practices; they are everyday, situated, and multiple.

Teachers' limited conceptualisations tend to reinforce a dichotomy between school and personal writing, and/or between personal and professional writing, ensuring that potentially productive connections are neglected. Arguably, as a consequence, many teachers are unlikely to recognise or make use of the diversity of students' everyday writing experience and 'funds of knowledge' (Moll et al.1992), or to capitalise on their own range of textual practice in an inclusive representation of what it means to be a writer.

### 4.2.3 The pedagogical consequences of teachers' sense of self as writers, attitudes, conceptions and personal writing practices and impact on student writing

The evidence base in relation to pedagogical consequences is extremely thin, particularly regarding impact on student outcomes, and review findings are therefore inconclusive. However, some tentative evidence from recent small-scale studies suggests that teachers' histories and identities as writers, both negative and positive, can make a difference in the classroom. Teachers' confidence as writers appears to influence their pedagogical choices and may dictate, for example, whether they simply follow policy requirements and skills-based models or whether they offer a more reflective approach which acknowledges and attempts to reconcile diverse models.

The studies which drew on observational data suggest that teachers who are more cognisant of their writing identities are able to harness their own textual practices in the classroom as a means of sharing the complexities involved and possible strategies. In these circumstances, the bridging between personal writing practices and teaching appears to have value for student motivation and to influence potential outcomes, with implications for writing achievement.

### 5. Conclusion and implications

This systematic review drawing on studies from 1990-2015 reveals that there is insufficient data to support the oft-advanced tenet that teachers of writing must write. In particular the evidence base with regard to the impact of teachers' writing on student outcomes is both limited and inconclusive. Additionally the review indicates that teachers have narrow conceptions of what counts as writing and being a writer and that multiple tensions exist. These relate to low self-confidence, negative writing histories, and the challenge of composing and enacting the positions of teacher and writer in the classroom. This suggests that for many teachers the teaching of writing is experienced as problematic. This is likely to have consequences for student motivation and achievement.

The findings point to a number of implications for future research and for policy and practice. In particular, since most of the studies reviewed are from the US and the majority of participants were trainee elementary teachers, further high-quality research is clearly needed with practising teachers and their students, particularly at secondary level and in different cultural contexts. Longitudinal studies with clear conceptual underpinnings are needed: as Collier (2010) observes, researching identity, and specifically how one thinks of oneself as a writer, requires in-depth, longitudinal studies of events and processes in diverse writing contexts. These are scarce. Specifically, more observational data are required to investigate how teacher writer identities are enacted in school contexts and how students respond. Systematic analysis of written outcomes needs to be encompassed in such research. Additionally, ethnographic documentation of teachers' (and students') everyday writing practices, in the domains of home and school, could serve to foster wider professional recognition of the modes, materialities and technologies of literacy practices in which they engage, and enhance understanding of the social and textual functions of these practices.

Future research would also benefit from a closer focus on the ways in which teachers' representations of writing affect students' inclination to write. Any evaluation of impact on student writing needs to recognise the central role of affect in learning to write and in developing writers. Whether, as in reading (OECD 2010), there is a bi-directional relationship between motivation and skills development, requires investigation. In the context of rapidly changing concepts and practices, it is evident that teachers need a more inclusive definition of what counts as writing and what it means to be a writer in the 21st century. Greater attention in policy to digital and multi-modal writing processes, for example, and more explicit recognition of the multiple acts of writing that teachers and students engage in in their daily lives, might help dispel fossilised notions of authorised writing and writers.

Pre-service and in-service training programmes appear to have important roles to play in developing teachers' conceptions of writing and sense of self as writer. Findings suggest that sustained opportunities to reflect on personal writing histories, engage in writing, discuss textual processes and participate in a community of practice, can influence teachers' self-assurance as writers and their pedagogical approaches. Given the societal importance afforded proficiency in writing, and the influence of education on young writers, it is recommended that such opportunities are more widely utilised and in particular that the classroom consequences and influence on student outcomes are more extensively and rigorously researched.

## References

Andrews, R. 2005. The place of systematic reviews in education research. *British Journal of Educational Studies*  53, no.4: 399-416

Andrews, R. 2008. *The case for a National Writing Project for teachers*. Reading: CfBT.

Beard, R. 2000. *Developing writing 3-13*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Bissex, G. L., and R.H. Bullock (eds.) 1987. *Seeing for ourselves: Case-study research by teachers of writing.* 1st ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bourne, J. 2002. 'Oh what will miss say!': Constructing texts and identities in the discursive processes of classroom writing. *Language and Education* 16, no.4: 241-259.

Brooks, G. W. 2007.Teachers as readers and writers and as teachers of reading and writing. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 100, no.3: 177-191.

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

Camp, G. (ed.) 1982. *Teaching writing: Essays from the Bay Area Writing Project.* Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook.

Carruthers, A., and P. Scanlan. 1990. Report on the New Zealand Writing Project: An informal evaluation. *English in Aotearoa* 11: 14–8.

Cochran-Smith, M., and S. Lytle. 1993. *Inside-outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Collier, D. R. 2010. Journey to becoming a writer: Review of research about children's identities as writers. *Language and Literacy: An e-journal* 12, no.1: 1-18. http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/langandlit/article/view/9348

Cremin, T. 2006. Creativity, uncertainty and discomfort: teachers as writers. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 36, no.3: 415-433.

Cremin, T. and S. Baker. 2010. Exploring teacher-writer identities in the classroom: Conceptualising the struggle. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 9, no. 3:  8–25.

Cremin, T. and S. Baker. 2014. Exploring the discursively constructed identities of a teacher-writer teaching writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 13, no.3: 28-53.

Dahl, K. L. (ed.) 1992. *Teacher as writer: Entering the professional conversation.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers.

Daisey, P. 2009 The writing experiences and beliefs of secondary teacher candidates, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Fall, 157-172.

Daly, J. A. and Wilson,.D. A. 1983. Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 17: 327-341.

Day, S. X. 2002. 'Make it uglier. Make it hurt. Make it real': Narrative construction of the creative writer's identity. *Creativity Research Journal* 14, no.1: 127-136.

Davies, D., D. Jindal-Snape, C. Collier, R. Digby, P. Hay and A. Howe. 2012. Creative environments for learning in schools. *Thinking Skills and Creativity.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2012.07.004.

Dix, S. 2012. Discursively complex identities of New Zealand teachers of writing in times of contestation and change. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28: 405-417.

Dix, S. and G. Cawkwell. 2011. The influence of peer group response: Building a teacher and student expertise in the writing classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 10, no. 4: 41-57.

D'Mello, S. and C. Mills. 2014. Emotions while writing about emotional and non-emotional topics. *Motivation and Emotion* 38, no.1: 140-156.

Draper, M.C., M. A. Barksdale-Ladd and M.C. Radencich. 2000. Reading and writing habits of preservice teachers. *Reading Horizons* 40, no3:185-203.

Elbow, P. 1973. *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Emig, J. 1971. *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: The National Council of Teachers of English.

Frager, A. 1994. Teaching, writing and identity. *Language Arts* 71: 274–278.

Gallavan, N.P., F.A. Bowles and C.T. Young. 2007. Learning to write and writing to learn: Insights from teacher candidates. *Action in Teacher Education* 29, no.2: 61-69.

Gannon, S. and C. Davies. 2007. For love of the word: English teaching, affect and writing. *Changing English* 14, no.1: 87-98.

Gardner, P. 2014. Becoming a teacher of writing: Primary student teachers reviewing their relationship with writing. *English in Education 48, no.2:* 128-148.

Gennrich, T. and H. Janks, 2013. Teachers' literate identities. In K. Hall, T. Cremin, B. Comber, and L. Moll (eds.) *International handbook of research on children's literacy, learning and culture*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell pp.456-468.

Gillespie, T. 1991. Joining the debate: Shouldn't writing teachers write? *Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy* 13, no.3: 3-6.

Gleeson, A. and V. Prain, 1996. Should teachers of writing write themselves? An Australian contribution to the debate. *English Journal 85*, no.6: 42-49.

Gorard, S. 2003. *Quantitative methods in social science: the role of numbers made easy*. London: Continuum.

Goswami, D. and P. Stillman (eds.). 1986. *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Graves, D. 1983. *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Guthrie, J. T. 1996. Educational concepts for engagement for literacy, *The Reading Teacher* 49: 432-446.

Hall, L.A. 2012. Rewriting identities: Creating spaces for students and teachers to challenge the norms of what it means to be a reader in school. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 55: 368-373.

Hall, L., A. Johnson, M. Juzwik, E. Stanton, F. Wortham .and M. Mosley. 2010. Teacher identity in the context of literacy teaching: Three explorations of classroom positioning and interaction in secondary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26**:** 234-243.

Hillocks, J. R. 1979. Another review of 'the development of writing abilities. *Research in the Teaching of English* 13, no. 3: 284–8.

Ivanic, R. 2004. Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education* 18, no.3: 220-245.

Jost, K. 1990. Rebuttal: Why high-school writing teachers should not write. *The English Journal* 79, no. 3: 65-66.

Kaufman, D. 2002. Living a literate life, revisited. *The English Journal* 91, no.6: 51-57.

Locke, T. and H. Kato. 2012. Poetry for the broken-hearted: How a marginal year 12 English class was turned on to writing. *English in Australia* 17, no.1: 61-79.

Locke, T., D. Whitehead, S. Dix and G. Cawkwell. 2011. New Zealand teachers respond to the 'National Writing Project' experience, *Teacher Development* 15, no.3: 273-291.

Martin, J. 1985. *Factual Writing*. Geelong,Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Mathers, B. G., S.K. Benson and E. Newton. 2006. "The teacher said my story was excellent": Preservice teachers reflect on the role of the "external" in writing. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 50, no.4: 290-297.

McCarthey, S.J., R. Woodard and G. Kang. 2014. Elementary teachers negotiating discourses in writing instruction. *Written Communication* 31, no.1: 58–90.

McKinney, M. and C. Giorgis. 2009. Narrating and performing identity: Literacy specialists' writing identities. *Journal of Literacy Research* 41:104–149.

Moll, L., C. Amanti, D. Neff and N. Gonzalez.1992. Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31: 132-141.

Morgan, D. N. 2010. Preservice teachers as writers. *Literacy Research and Instruction* 49: 352–365.

Murray, D. 1985. *A writer teaches writing: A practical method of teaching composition.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

National Writing Project and C. Nagin. 2006. *Because writing matters: Improving student writing in our schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Norman, K. A., and B.H. Spencer. 2005. Our lives as writers: Examining preservice teachers' experiences and beliefs about the nature of writing and writing instruction. *Teacher Education Quarterly* Winter: 25-40.

OECD (2010) PISA 2009 Results: Learning to learn – student engagement, strategies and practices (volume III). http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264083943-en

Oxman, A.D. 1994. Systematic reviews: checklists for review articles. *British Medical Journal* 309: 648–51.

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

Pritchard, R.1989. The National Writing Project in New Zealand. In D. Philips, G. Lealand and G. McDonald (eds.), *The impact of American ideas on New Zealand's educational policy, practice and thinking* pp.147-152. Wellington, NZ: NZ-US

Root, R.L. and M. Steinberg (eds). 1996 *Those who do, can: Teachers writing, writers teaching.*  Urbana IL: NCTE.

Robbins, B. W. 1992. EJ update: It's not that simple: Some teachers as writers. *The English Journal* 81, no.4: 72-74.

Robbins, B. W. 1996. Teachers as writers: Tensions between theory and practice. *Journal of Teaching Writing* 15, no.1: 107-128.

Ryan, M., and G. Barton. 2014. The spatialized practices of teaching writing in elementary schools: Diverse students shaping discoursal selves. *Research in theTeaching of English* 48, no. 3: 303-328.

Schutz, P. and R. Pekrun (eds.). 2007. *Emotion in education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Smagorinsky, P. 1987. Graves revisited: A look at the methods and conclusions of the New Hampshire study. *Written Communication* 14, no.4: 331–42.

Smagorinsky, P. 1994. Introduction: Potential problems and problematic potentials of using talk about writing as data about writing process. In P. Smagorinsky (ed.) *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology*: ix-xix. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, J. and W. Elley, W. 1998. *How Children Learn to Write*. London: Longman.

Street, C. 2003. Pre-service teachers' attitudes about writing and learning to teach writing: Implications for teacher educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly* Summer: 33-50.

Sunstein, B. S. 1994. *Composing a culture: Inside a summer writing program with high school teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Susi, G. L. 1984. The teacher/writer: Model, learner, human being. *Languages Arts 61*, no. 4: 712 – 716.

Torgerson, C. J. 2007. The quality of systematic reviews of effectiveness of literacy learning in English: A tertiary review. *Journal of Research in Reading* 30, no.3: 287-315.

Watts, J. and N. Robertson. 2011. Burnout in university teaching staff: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research* 53, no.1: 33-50

Witney, A. 2008. Teacher transformation in the National Writing Project. *Research in the Teaching of English* 43, no.2: 144-187.

Whitney, A. 2009. Writer, Teacher, Person: Tensions between personal and professional writing in a National Writing Project Summer Institute. *English Education* 41, no.3: 236-259.

Whyte, A., A. Lazarte, I. Thomson, N. Ellis, A. Muse and R. Talbot. 2007. The National Writing Project, teachers' writing lives, and student achievement in writing. *Action in Teacher Education* 29, no.2: 5-16.

Woodard, R.L. 2013. Complicating 'writing teachers must write': Tensions between teachers' literate and instructional practices. In *IRA yearbook:* 377-390.

Woodard, R.L. 2015. The dialogic interplay of writing and teaching writing: Teacher writers' talk and textual practices across contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English* 50, no.1: 35-59.

Yeo, M. 2007. New literacies, alternative texts: Teachers' conceptualisations of composition and literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 6, no.1: 113-131.

**Table 2: Characteristics of included studies**

| Author, Year, Country | Research questions/focus | Sample | Methods , context, duration | Key findings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brooks (2007), USA | How do 'exemplary' teachers describe themselves as readers and writers? | 4 practising teachers: elementary. | Interviews. | Exemplary teachers differed as readers and writers and did not necessarily read and write often for professional or personal purposes. |
| | How do they describe any relationships, between their reading and writing and their reading and writing teaching? | | | Three of the four teachers perceived a connection between their own reading practices and their teaching of reading. There was more diversity regarding perceived relationships between themselves as writers and their teaching of writing. |
| | What factors are most influential in their reading and writing teaching? | | | Factors considered as influential in teaching reading and writing included identifying and targeting learning needs of individual students, state guidelines and published curricula. |

| Cremin (2006), UK | What are teachers' experiences of composing a short story for publication in the classroom and an adult teacher-writers group? | 16 practising teachers: elementary. | Questionnaires, writing histories, composing logs, interviews, observations in adult sessions, written text. 5 months (part of 2 year writing project). | The self-reported experiences of composing a short story were diverse. Commonly experienced themes included: an acute awareness of constraints, recognition of intuitive insights and a deep sense of personal engagement or disengagement in the process. Teachers encountered periods of intensely experienced insecurity and uncertainty, and expressed considerable emotional discomfort, even distress during the compositional process. The tension experienced appeared to mobilize a kind of creative energy; a resolution seeking, temporarily useful response, until another compositional problem emerged. This involved teachers in taking risks as writers: relying more on unconscious intuitive insights, trialling unconventional options and unexpected routes. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cremin and Baker (2010), UK | What are the factors which influence how teachers are positioned and position themselves as teachers and writers in the literacy classroom? | 2 practising teachers: elementary. | Classroom observation, written texts, video stimulated review, interviews (teachers and students), teacher journals.<br><br>4 weeks. | Institutional, interpersonal factors and intrapersonal factors fluidly shaped the teachers' identities as teacher-writers and writer-teachers.<br><br>These positions were often in conflict and were the subject of sustained identity work, such that the writing classroom appeared to be a site of struggle for the practitioners as they performed and enacted shifting identities.<br><br>The teachers' relational identities, influenced by interaction with children, other adults and the wider institutional context, were also shaped by their engagement or disengagement in their own compositions produced spontaneously in class.<br><br>Additional intrapersonal factors included the degree of personal authenticity and authorial agency they exercised as writers at any moment. |
| Cremin and Baker (2014), UK | How did a teacher who sought to model being a writer (during demonstration writing and writing alongside pupils), engage in constructing, reproducing and maintaining different discourses through multimodal interactions? | 1 practising teacher: elementary. | Classroom observation, written texts, video stimulated review, interviews (teachers and students), teacher journal.<br><br>4 weeks. | The teacher's multimodal behaviour indexed different discourses which in turn drove her practice and therefore made available and constrained possible identity positions.<br><br>She negotiated and re-negotiated two primary identity positions: teacher-writer and writer-teacher which worked with and against each other at different moments in the interaction.<br><br>There was on-going conflict between the teacher's intended |

| | | | | discourse positions/identities. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The shifting multimodal discourse dynamic in both demonstration and writing alongside contexts was a site of on-going conflict between her intended discourse positions/ identities and the recognition and acceptance of these attempts by the pupils. |
| Daisey (2009), USA | What were the past writing experiences of respondents who reported enjoying writing (HWE-High Writing Enjoyment) throughout their lives compared to those who reported Low Writing Enjoyment (LWE) | 124 pre-service teachers: middle and high. | Surveys: pre, mid, post, and follow-up. | HWE respondents had positive writing experiences in schooling; teachers who enjoyed writing and encouraged them. LWE respondents reported negative school experiences and were apprehensive about writing. |
| | What were the groups' current attitudes and beliefs about writing? | | | HWE respondents thought of themselves as writers, wrote a lot and received encouragement. LWE respondents were less likely to think of themselves as writers. |
| | Did the groups change their attitudes and beliefs during a literacy course? | | | All respondents reported an increased sense of ownership of writing during the course. |
| | What predictions did the groups make about integrating writing | | | More LWE than HWE respondents predicted they would seek to be |

| | | | | positive role models; both groups planned to decrease students' writing apprehension. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dix and Cawkwell (2011), New Zealand | What is the impact of sustained involvement in writing workshop experiences on the professional identities of participating teachers?<br><br>Is there an impact upon pedagogical practice?<br><br>Is there evidence of transformational learning with reference to teaching writing? | 1 practising teacher: elementary; (selected as case study from larger sample of 12 elementary and high school teachers). | Surveys; questionnaires, focus group interviews, individual interviews, journals.<br><br>Two 6-day writing workshops/<br><br>meetings within a two year national writing project. | The workshop process and personal writing experiences impacted on the teacher's professional and personal identity as a writer; it enhanced her self-efficacy.<br><br>She perceived peer responses in the workshop 'community' enabled her to present and compare her writing with others, and value critical feedback, empowering her self-belief as a writer and deepening her understanding of the writing process.<br><br>She incorporated these experiences into her classroom practice, transforming and reshaping her pedagogy; modelling how to respond to each other's texts and challenging students to consider others' suggestions and revise their writing. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Draper, Barksdale-Ladd and Radencich (2000), USA | What factors have influenced the development of beliefs about reading/writing and current reading/writing habits in pre-service elementary teachers?<br><br>How do students' histories of reading and writing relate to present attitudes and habits?<br><br>How do students relate their own histories, attitudes and habits to their plans for teaching reading and writing in the classroom? | 107 pre-service teachers: elementary. | Survey; semi structured interviews (sub-sample of 24). | Family practices and specific teachers were perceived to be influential in shaping their current habits and beliefs about reading/writing.<br><br>Differences were noted between writing histories of writers and those who deemed themselves to be non-writers. The latter recalled copying, the former creative writing. Non-writers described their early writing experiences as negative and most continued to experience writing in this way.<br><br>The pre-service teachers were unaware of the breadth of their current writing practices and defined themselves as writers/non-writers based on narrow academic perceptions of writing.<br><br>All wished to foster children's pleasure in writing. Most did not perceive themselves to be role models as writers. |
| Gallavan, Bowles and Young (2007), USA | What is the nature of pre-service teachers' beliefs about writing and the writing process? | 112 pre-service teachers: early childhood, elementary, middle and high. | Survey, undertaken during the last year of their course. | The majority disliked writing: they perceived they received inadequate instruction and feedback; even many of those who received high grades considered themselves to be poor writers.<br><br>The majority (85%) valued writing and the writing process highly for themselves. They did not always make clear connections between their assignments, themselves and life.<br><br>Nearly all (94%) valued writing and writing process for their preK-12 students. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | They reported uncertainty about how to teach writing effectively and were unaware of the benefits writing can contribute to learning and living. |
| Gannon and Davies (2007), Australia | Why did the pre-service teachers' choose to teach English?<br><br>What is the nature of the practicing teachers/poets memories of writing? | 48 pre-service teachers: high school; practicing teachers who are published writers (10). | Surveys (48); sub-group (10) collective biographies, interviews. | Predominantly a love of reading, not writing, had drawn pre-service teachers to teach English.<br><br>The memories of the practicing teacher/poets were characterised by a love of the word, by their affective engagement as readers and writers, by particular teachers' texts and tasks and by their chosen immersion in writing. |
| Gardner (2014), UK | What views did pre-service teachers have of themselves as writers at the start of their course?<br><br>What did they learn about compositional processes as a result of being positioned as writers in writing workshops? | 115 first year pre-service teachers: elementary. | Questionnaires; interviews; focus group (10); writing sketchbooks and logs.<br><br>3 months after starting the course, the pre-service teachers undertook 5 writing workshops. | 49.5% of the pre-service teachers reported at the outset that they never gained pleasure from writing, 1. 8% reported writing frequently for pleasure, the remainder that they occasionally did so. The majority were either negative about writing or indifferent to it.<br><br>Following the workshops, 76% perceived being positioned as writers would positively influence their teaching of writing.<br><br>As a result of the workshops, the pre-service teachers highlighted increased awareness of the affective dimension of writing, the influence of life experience on the content of writing and the role of a writer's self-esteem. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Locke and Kato (2012), New Zealand | What pedagogical strategies have the potential to enhance the motivation and writing/composing performance of students of participating teachers, and which of these can be attributable to changes in classroom practice prompted by engagement in the writing workshop experience? | 1 practising teacher: high; her class of 9-10 students. | Teacher's reflective journal; pre- and post-intervention student questionnaire; pre- and post-intervention writing assessments; student evaluations.<br><br>5-week classroom intervention following teacher's attendance at 6-day writing workshop (part of two year project on teachers as writers writing). | The intervention 'switched on' a group of reasonably able but unmotivated students to writing poetry.<br><br>Students expressed somewhat more positive attitudes to writing at school and considerably greater enjoyment of writing in their own time. They were less likely to avoid writing and experienced an improved sense of competence in relation to their peers. They reported an increase in writing frequency and were more likely to choose literary genres as their favourite.<br><br>More students improved their overall writing scores following the intervention than reduced them, and there was some increase in the range of poetic devices used. |
| McCarthey, Woodard and Kang (2014), USA | What discourses do teachers employ in instructional approaches and beliefs about writing?<br><br>What factors influence teachers' discourses about writing? | 20 practising teachers: elementary; sub-sample of 3 cases. | Classroom observations; observations of professional development sessions; interviews (teachers and professional development | Most teachers' beliefs and practices reflected a combination of Ivanič's discourses. They were usually influenced by district-adopted curricula and professional development courses.<br><br>The three cases illustrated teachers' hybrid discourses and the ways in which they negotiated and resolved (or not) the tensions among them in their teaching. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | How do writing teachers negotiate tensions among their various discourses? | | providers); analysis of districts' writing curricula materials & procedures.<br><br><br>1 year. | One teacher adopted a narrow skills approach which did not reflect her beliefs about writing as communication. Another borrowed from several discourses without resolving potential contradictions. A third was able to create a coherent and enhanced version of the district curriculum drawing on different discourses.<br><br><br>These differences reflected personal writing experiences and professional development. |
| McKinney and Giorgis (2009), USA | In what ways do literacy specialists construct their identities as writers and as teachers of writing?<br><br><br>In what ways do literacy specialists' identities as writers interconnect with their identities and performances as teachers of writing and/or as supporting the teaching of writing? | 11 practising teachers from 6 schools: elementary and high; sub-sample of 4 cases. | Autobiographies, interviews, writing plans, field notes, classroom observations, photographs.<br><br><br>2 years ('Teaching Writing in the Primary Grades' course + follow-up interviews one year later). | Literacy specialists narrated a variety of writer-identities that had been constructed over time in response to life and school experience and interactions with others.<br><br><br>Their identities as writers and teachers of writing worked in complicated and sometimes contradictory ways to define how they negotiated their roles and supported the teaching of writing.<br><br><br>Participants' school experiences impacted on their identities as writers and teachers of writing.<br><br><br>Issues of power, control, and status also informed the different ways in which participants positioned themselves as writers, teachers and literacy specialists. |
| Morgan (2010), USA | What understandings and perceptions do pre-service teachers have about writing and | 42 pre-service teachers: elementary. | Reflective essays, interviews, weekly responses to | Almost 60% of the pre-service teachers did not feel confident as writers at the start of the course. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | themselves as writers prior to engaging in a semester long writing course? | | questions, teachers' writing; course evaluations. | They often identified specific interactions with teachers or grades as contributing to their sense of self as writer. |
| | What ideas and experiences do pre-service teachers identify as salient from a course on process writing? | | 16 weeks (Writing Methods course). | Many reported not writing outside class; few currently enjoyed writing. |
| | How do pre-service teachers articulate and demonstrate their growth in understanding about themselves as writers and for teaching writers at the end of the semester? | | | They identified four important learning experiences from the course: reading like a writer; having similar writing experiences as their future students; writing regularly and choosing the topic; designing writing mini-lessons.

They articulated or demonstrated growth in three areas: increased confidence and sense of self as writer; understanding that writing takes work; development of voice. |
| Norman and Spencer (2005), USA | What are pre-service teachers' perceptions of themselves as writers?

How do people and experiences shape pre-service teachers' views of writing instruction and learning to write? | 59 pre-service teachers: elementary. | Autobiographies.

Assignments during 1 semester language arts methods course. | More participants viewed themselves positively as writers (58%) than negatively (33%).

The majority (63%) expressed a preference for personal-creative forms of writing; only 13% preferred analytic/expository writing. Many claimed to engage in personal/creative writing as part of their daily lives.

90% acknowledged the impact, both positive and negative, that influential people, particularly teachers, had had on their self-perceptions as writers. They distinguished between classroom environments which encouraged writing and environments which |

| | | | | provided writing instruction. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 63% described writing ability as an inherent talent or gift; 36% viewed writing ability as malleable, something that can be improved with teaching and hard work. |
| Street (2003), USA | What attitudes did pre-service teachers hold regarding writing and the teaching of writing when they entered their final semester of pre-service professional education?<br><br>What were the major influences on these attitudes?<br><br>What was the relationship between the participants' writing attitudes and the teaching process they actually employed during student teaching? | 5 pre-service teachers: middle. | Questionnaires, interviews (student teachers, their university supervisor, cooperating teachers, and course instructor); journals, field notes, classroom observations;<br><br>1 semester. | Participants' attitudes to writing ranged from positive to poor. Only 2 perceived themselves as writers.<br><br>All had experienced critical teachers whom they deemed detrimental to their development as writers. However the confident writers also recalled supportive home and school experiences where they felt nurtured as writers.<br><br>There was an apparent relationship between participants' beliefs, attitudes, and experiences, and their classroom practice.<br><br>The two teachers who saw themselves as writers offered a great deal to students that the others did not and were able to provide students with a passion for writing.<br><br>All participants valued the support and validation the course provided. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Whitney (2008), USA | What do teachers mean when they say that participation in an NWP Summer Institute 'changed their life'?<br><br>What does it mean to "transform" in a professional development setting, and what might researchers and professional development providers gain from an understanding of teacher transformation as a kind of teacher learning?<br><br>And how, if at all, does the writing that teachers engage in at the Summer Institute matter for transformation? | 7 practising teachers: elementary – high. | Interviews, observations, text analysis, field notes;<br><br>18 months (NWP Summer Institute + follow-up one year later) | For 5 of the 7 teachers, participation in the Summer Institute was a 'transforming experience'. They reframed their view of themselves as writers, their sense of agency and authority, and their faith in their own professional judgement.<br><br>Writing, and particularly sharing and receiving feedback on writing, appeared to be central to these teachers' learning experience and their gains in confidence.<br><br>The difference between the teachers who reported change and those who did not was in their participation in writing-related activities.<br><br>The findings highlighted the connection between transformational professional development experiences and sustained collaborative work within a community of professionals. |
| Whitney (2009), USA | The complexity with which norms of "personal writing" or "professional writing" interact in the real experience of a teacher/writer who has been invited to do both during an NWP summer institute. | 1 practising teacher: elementary. | Interviews; teacher writing samples. | Over the course of the NWP programme, the participant teacher reframed her conception of herself as a writer, as a teacher of writing and as a professional.<br><br>As a writer, she began to reconcile what she initially perceived as dichotomous categories of "personal" and "professional" writing and considered the possibility of calling herself "a writer" for the first time. |

| | | | | As a teacher she resolved the conflicting priorities of fostering student enjoyment of writing and helping them to write in the structured way expected on standardized tests. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| | | | | As a professional she came to regard herself as competent to balance competing demands. |
| Whyte, Lazarte, Thompson, Ellis, Muse & Talbot (2007), USA | Whether, and to what extent, National Writing Project and comparison teachers' writing outside of school was associated with middle and high school students' achievement in writing. | 35 practising teachers from 17 schools and 551 of their students: middle and high. | Early- and late-course student writing samples; teacher survey. 1 school year. | NWP teachers reported writing more frequently outside school than comparison teachers did. The extent of teachers' reported writing lives was associated with their students' achievement in writing. Students' late-course mean writing scores were higher than early-course scores across all participating teachers' classes. The NWP teachers who reported more extensive writing lives had students whose achievement increased significantly, whereas comparison teachers and NWP teachers who wrote less did not. There were significant differences in these students' scores for quality of ideas, voice, sentence fluency and word choice. |
| Woodard (2013), USA | What tensions exist between teachers' writing and | 2 practising teachers: middle school | Teacher interviews; classroom & out-of-school | There was a disconnect between the writing purposes both teachers prioritised for their students and for themselves: whilst both wrote for varied purposes/audiences outside school, they |

| | instructional practices? | and college. | observations; field notes and artefacts.<br><br>1 – 2 months. | tended to teach to more limited curricula or state standards.<br><br>Their identities as writers and teachers of writing were mismatched: one was a confident writer but felt less secure about her teaching; the other a confident teacher but hesitant about identifying as a writer since she saw writers as published professionals.<br><br>Both teachers framed writing authority in complicated ways, advising students that expertise was not synonymous with authority, but not applying this advice to themselves |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Woodard (2015), USA | The relationship between teachers' writing and their teaching of writing. | 2 practising teachers: middle and high. | Teacher interviews; classroom & out-of-school observations; textual artefacts.<br><br>1 month – 1 semester. | Both teacher-writers appropriated and repurposed language and textual practices across contexts, illustrating 'some of the everyday ways that teachers' writing *can* inform their instruction'.<br><br>Their participation in creative writing and networked writing respectively informed the ways they talked about, practised and taught writing.<br><br>Their different writing experiences and communities of practice informed the different writing values and practices they brought to the classroom.<br><br>The study highlighted the dialogic interplay between teachers' writing and teaching practices, and their personal and professional identities. |

| Yeo (2007), Canada | How do teachers conceptualise composition and literacy, and how are those conceptualisations socially and historically situated? | 12 practising teachers from one school: elementary; | Semi-structured interviews; 4 lunch hour 'literacy café meetings. | Teachers in this school were more dedicated readers than writers.<br><br>Most saw reading as the central tenet of literacy and emphasised reading over composition in the classroom.<br><br>Only 2 teachers considered themselves writers as well as readers, and approached the teaching of literacy differently, using text to explore the author's craft for example.<br><br>Most teachers did not use digital media in their own lives and new literacies were not viewed as highly relevant to their teaching.<br><br>There were connections between teachers' literacy histories and their conceptualisations of composition and literacy, which carried forward into their classroom practice. |