8-5-2016

Classroom Communities of Practice

Angela Marie Muse
University of Missouri-St. Louis, angiemariemuse@gmail.com

Classroom Communities of Practice

by

Angela Muse

B.S.Ed, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1996

M.A. in English, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2001

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

University of Missouri-St. Louis

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Practice

August, 2016

Advisory Committee

Nancy Singer, Ph.D. (Chair)

Ralph Cordova, Ph.D.

E. Wendy Saul, Ph.D.

Alina Slapac, Ed.D.

Abstract

Are classrooms preparing students with the literacy skills they need for school, work, and life? When students don't meet expectations, educators tend to seek answers in innovative programs or research-based practices that promise success.   The practices teachers use, however, are neither selected nor enacted in a vacuum.   To fully understand what is happening in a classroom, one needs to consider not only the instructional practices teachers use but also the context in which teachers select and enact these practices and the effect these practices have on our students. The impetus for this study came from a broader desire to dig deeper into practices that create successful writing communities in secondary classrooms. A teacher's discourses about writing and about her students plays a crucial role in the development of student practices in a classroom community of practice. This study used discourse analysis and interactional ethnography to focus on teachers' talk and classroom interactions about writing in a large, suburban middle school. The researcher found clear connections between a teachers' discourses and the practices that are integral to the classroom writing communities. This study has implications not only for teachers but also for administrators, professional development leaders, or teacher educators. Change in a classroom is not simply a matter of mandating certain programs or practices. A teacher's experiences, beliefs, and values must be addressed in reflective practice, professional development, and teacher preparation because teacher discourses shape student practices.

Keywords: writing, instruction, community of practice, discourse, interactional ethnography, classroom writing community

Table of Contents

Classroom Communities of Practice

Dissertation Research Study

Article Submission

Communities of Practice in the Classroom

Angela Muse

Communities of Practice

December 2016

700 Samoa Drive

St. Louis, Missouri 63126

Phone: (314) 853-3814

Email: angiemariemuse@gmail.com

Fax: (314) 953-7513

Angela Muse is an instructional coach in St. Louis, Missouri.

Article word count (excluding title page, reference page, and optional excerpt): 2, 378

Communities of Practice in the Classroom

Imagine that you are tasked with helping your teachers implement a key instructional strategy—a strategy that is sure to change the world if implemented with fidelity. You design a workshop that is so amazing that if they gave a medal for such a thing, you would surely win it. When you visit the classrooms to see the glorious fruits of your labor, you barely recognize what you taught. Teachers aren't using the strategy the way you taught them. One teacher isn't even using the strategies, and says, believe it or not, "I tried that, and it didn't work." Didn't work? You return to your office, defeated, and think, "I've got to design a better workshop."

This scenario parodies the typical mistakes of my early work as an instructional coach. If only I could whisper this dire warning in the ear of my former self: You are looking at the wrong things.   As a new coach, I observed classrooms and focused on the strategies or activities that teachers used, and when I saw effective practices in one classroom, I wanted to help other teachers replicate those practices. Picking up a strategy from one classroom and plunking it down in another didn't always work out, and I began to wonder why.

Looking at Classrooms Differently

After reading the work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991; Wenger, 1999), I came to realize that classrooms are complex communities of practice, and I needed to examine teaching and learning through this lens. I began to search for studies that looked at the daily life of classrooms, examining the practices that develop as teachers and students come together to do the work of the classroom.

The idea of communities of practice in the classroom was made visible for me by researchers from the University of California at Santa Barbara (Castanheira, Crawford, Dixon, & Green, 2001) who described two classroom experiences for one Australian grade 11 student. The following passage describes his math classroom. After a period of independent work time, the teacher approached the student to discuss his progress. The teacher posed a question and the student posed a question in response. After a bit of work on the concept at hand, there was an exchange of feedback where the student assessed his own progress and the teacher gave affirmative feedback before the student returned to his work. In this classroom, students learn by using a more knowledgeable other to jointly construct understanding. The work is not about finding an answer or completing a task. In addition, the teacher's validation of the student's responses helps the student see himself "as a mathematics student, as a successful problem solver, and as a worthy, valued, and appropriate conversation partner" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 367).

This student's English class is a starkly different community of practice, characterized by limited interaction and sharply defined roles. In one class period, the student took a quiz in silence. The teacher sat at her desk. When finished, the student sat quietly and waited. When told, the student opened up a workbook to get the correct answers and proceeded to correct his own work. The teacher's "talk and actions were focused on managing the flow of activity and not the academic content" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 367). Students took up the roles afforded them, becoming test-takers, answer checkers, and grade recorders.

Communities of practice develop in all of our classrooms, whether we are conscious about this development or not. Seeing the above classrooms through the eyes

of the researchers taught me to ask new questions about what I was seeing: What roles are taken up by students and teachers? What knowledge is privileged? What practices are acceptable to the group? These represented just a few of the questions that I wanted to ask when looking at the ways of saying, doing, and being in the daily life of a classroom.

Examining Our Communities of Practice

Guided by these questions, I began to look not for what teachers "should" be doing, but for what was actually happening in the everyday work of each classroom. I was very grateful for one teacher, whom I'll call Mrs. O'Bryan, who asked for support with her writing instruction and welcomed me in to observe her community of practice.

I worked with Mrs. O'Bryan to plan a small unit to introduce her students to argument writing. During this teacher's lesson on using evidence to support a claim, she asked her students to help her write a general rule that would justify how a piece of evidence supported their claim. The class spent 25 minutes wordsmithing this sentence to make sure that it accurately described the situation at hand. Below is a brief portion of this wordsmithing, showing a back-and-forth discussion of potential words:

Student 1:   Safety emergency

Teacher: *(Elongates the word as she thinks about it.)* Sa:::fety emergency

Student 2:   A horrible *[inaudible]*

Teacher: *(Words spoken rapidly.)* Ew. Horrible's real high*. That makes me nervous.

Student 1:   Cause if it's something that traumatizes you that means that you will call for help and it could be—it could be a situation from a medical emergency or if like someone got in a fight-- *(interrupted)*

Teacher: *(Emphasizes word.)* True

In previous lessons on the accuracy and connotation of words, Mrs. O'Bryan used the terms high intensity and low intensity to help students understand shades of meaning.

I thought about Mrs. O'Bryan's class as a community of practice, reflecting on the ways of saying, doing, and being in this small slice of classroom life. What roles were taken up by students and teacher? Students were working together with the teacher to construct knowledge so students were collaborators and idea generators. This collaboration, however, was not an equal partnership; the teacher was the ultimate authority on student suggestions, weighing in on each word or thought after it was given. Also, what practices were acceptable in this collaboration? I considered the way that students were participating in the learning. The communication was clearly two-way: one student spoke to the teacher and the teacher spoke back to that student. Student-to-student discussion on this topic was not the norm. Finally, what knowledge was privileged? The teacher's decision to spend 25 minutes on wordsmithing (a detour from the written lesson plan) was critical in shaping the values of this community. The students were consistently engaged in offering suggestions for words and justifying their choices. Value in this classroom, then, was given to the words used in writing.

Mrs. O'Bryan gave me the opportunity to see classrooms differently. An instructional technique or learning activity must be seen in context, through a lens that

examines all the ways of saying, doing, and being in a classroom. The argument lesson in Mrs. O'Bryan's room would not look the same in another teacher's classroom because certain kinds of work and talk have become the norm in Mrs. O'Bryan's classroom community. While all members of a classroom community contribute to the development of the practices in that community, I was particularly interested in the teacher's role in shaping the community of practice

Discourses in Communities of Practice

James Gee's (2014) work with discourse analysis gave me a lens through which to view this dynamic. All communication is colored by who we are, what we say, and the context in which we say it. In addition, we design our communication not only with words, but also with actions, gestures, clothes, body language, objects, and more. Gee's (2014) theory of discourse looks at communication through the lens of identity. Who we are–what we believe, what we value, how we see ourselves in the world—fuels our communication. In ways we often don't notice, teacher's words and actions play a big role in shaping academic practices and student identity. As a result of this lens, my questions became, "What discourses—about writing, about learning, about students—surface in teachers' communication, and how do these discourses shape student practices in the classroom?

While various discourses are surfaced every day in the classroom, I wanted to dig deeper into the teachers' discourses about writing, learning, and their students by giving them an opportunity to talk. In particular, I was curious about the identities teachers took up surrounding their work as writers and teachers of writing, the attitudes teacher's held

about their students' abilities, the experiences that influenced their thinking, and the value

they placed on various aspects of writing and instruction.

Surfacing Teachers' Discourses

I was, again, grateful for a teacher, whom I'll call Mrs. Roberts, who welcomed

me into her classroom, and spoke fluently about her experiences, beliefs, and values as a

writer and a teacher. At several points in our discussion, she expressed frustration with

assignments that meant very little to her as a student. "You know in school it was

always, read this little story and answer these questions. Go get it checked off, and on

and on and on." She also spoke about key moments—turning points for her as a

student—where the assignment or text carried meaning.   In most of the conversations

I've had with Mrs. Roberts about her instruction, she was adamant that the work students

do and the books they read should be relevant to their lives. Most of the writing students

do in Mrs. Roberts's class is authentic—whether they are developing "class work

resumes" and interviewing classmates for collaborative writing teams or they are creating

fiction that arises from the stories of their own lives.

I was fortunate enough to follow up our conversation with a visit to her classroom

where Mrs. Roberts's discourse on the relevance of student work clearly aligned with the

work her students were doing. In the weeks prior to my visit, students had piloted two

digital writing programs, and they were in the process of writing a critical review of each

program. The reviews would be sent to school personnel who could potentially purchase

these programs. Today, students were collaboratively constructing feedback for a student

model.

Student 1: I think her transitions could be much better.

Student 2: Between paragraphs or sentences?

Student 3: Um paragraphs. They had no meaning to, like, there was no crossover to them. They went to different subjects and they—you couldn't understand why she wrote it like that. She could have been like, "As well as." Something like that.

Student 2: So she needs, um, more transition words?

(While student 2 records their feedback in a chart that the group designed, other group members return their eyes to the student model and consider more feedback. Periodically during this revision activity, the teacher makes announcements concerning the organization of the feedback. She also stops by each group to discuss a problematic feature of the student model. For the most part, however, the thinking of our group is student initiated.)

Student 2: Okay so after this one I think we have enough for cons. We can go to pros.

Okay. Sydney would you like to start off with the pros?

Student 4: Yeah. A pro was that she was very detailed when she was talking about

[program #2] and what she didn't like about it and what the problem was with it.

In this classroom, it is clear that norms for collaborative discussion have been established: One person records the feedback, regularly seeking clarification of the group's ideas. This recorder also moves students on to the next topic when she is ready. A more subtle norm is the expectation that everyone gives input, and, when one student hangs back a bit too long, she is drawn into the discussion by a teammate. Finally, we

see students contemplating other's feedback and building upon it. After observing

writing groups like this in Mrs. Roberts's class, I returned to the notes from our

discussion. Throughout those notes, there were countless references to the importance of

collaboration and organizing collective work. It was clear to me that Mrs. Roberts's

discourses about collaboration and organization shape the way her students engage in the

productive practices of a writing group.

In a similar way, conversations I had with Mrs. O'Bryan--the teacher who spend a

chunk of her argument lesson on word choice—showed that the practices enacted in the

classroom aligned with deeply held beliefs about word choice and the roles of teachers

and students. For any coach or administrator who is tasked with moving Mrs. Roberts or

Mrs. O'Bryan in a different instructional direction, the approach cannot be as simple as

giving them a new curriculum and a few workshop sessions. What they say and what

they do is tied to who they are (what they've experienced, who they've engaged with,

what they value, etc.).

Supporting Classroom Communities of Practice

I've come to realize that helping teachers change practice necessitates attention to

teachers' discourses. Do you want your traditional math teachers to implement problem-

based learning? If so, you may want to listen to their discourse about who holds

knowledge in a math classroom, about their students' abilities, about process vs. product,

and about curriculum coverage. If we want a classroom community of practice where

students are empowered as math thinkers willing to persevere in solving relevant

problems, then we must attend to teacher discourses that fuel the daily work of the

classroom. Simply put, listening to teachers' discourses on the content they teach, their

students' abilities, their role as a teacher, the purpose of their students' work, and more can give coaches, administrators, or anyone charged with supporting teachers a starting point for leading change.

 If we want our students to engage in effective communities of practice, we must consider the role of the teachers in shaping these communities. Teacher discourse shapes student practices. To speak plainly, what teachers say, what teachers do, and who teacher are shape their interactions with students. These interactions shape what students say, what students do, and how students see themselves. A community of practice, effective or not, develops from these interactions. If those of us who are charged with supporting teachers are committed to providing high quality professional development, then a piece of this support must include focused attention on teacher discourses and the affect they have on student practices in the classroom.

References

Castanheira, M., Crawford, T., Dixon, C., & Green, J. (2001). Interactional ethnography: an

approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics &*

Education, 11(4), 353-400.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method* (Fourth ed.). New

York: Routledge.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.

Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (1999). *Commuities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge,

Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

Classroom Writing Communities

Dissertation Research

Proposal

Classroom Writing Communities: How Discourse Shapes Practice

Angela Muse
M.A, English, University of Missouri-Saint Louis, 2001
B.S.Ed., Secondary English Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1996

A Dissertation Proposal Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri-
St. Louis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Education Doctorate in Educational Practice with an emphasis in Language, Literacy, and
Culture

November 2015

Advisory Committee

Nancy Singer, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Ralph Cordova, Ph.D.

E. Wendy Saul, Ph.D.

Alina Slapac, Ed.D.

Classroom Writing Communities: How Discourse Shapes Practice

Introduction

For 12 of my 15 years of teaching in a middle school classroom, I used a writing workshop approach to help my students improve their writing. While I never studied this practice formally, I feel confident that my early years using this model were miserable failures. Eventually, I used writing workshop with success, helping students become more engaged, confident, and capable writers. I have a strong suspicion that the elements of a writing workshop didn't change over those 12 years. I changed. I engaged with new texts, new situations, and new people. What I knew, what I believed, and what I valued evolved. Those changes fueled a refinement of my practice, and the culture of my classroom changed.

Problem of Practice

Throughout my educational career, both as a teacher and in my current role as an instructional coach, I've seen many initiatives, programs, and instructional techniques come and go. For some teachers, the latest practice works well. For others, the practice fails, and they are ready to explore new techniques. What is the difference between these classrooms? How can teacher-student writing conferences, for instance, work so well in one class and prove disastrous in another? I have long wondered about the context surrounding a practice such as one-on-one conferencing with students.   How much does the context in which a teacher envisions and enacts this instructional practice influence student participation in that practice?

Consider teacher A, who acts on her beliefs that teachers know good writing and that a teacher's job is to inform students about good writing. Would her use of

conferencing differ from teacher B, who acts on her belief that students know good

writing, and a teacher's job is to help students refine and articulate what they already

know? Would this basic stance on who holds knowledge in the classroom play out in

other practices? Would differing stances contribute to differing classroom cultures in

which students took up different writing practices, depending upon the classroom

culture? Who holds knowledge is only one stance that can shape a teacher's practice. In

any given slice of classroom life, could we see various stances at play?

Imagine two classrooms. Both decide to teach students about using strong leads

in their writing. In fact, they use the same mini-lesson and deliver it with similar skill.

Then, it is time for students to write, to use the skill they just learned. In one class, the

teacher displays a prompt on the board and asks her students to write to that prompt. She

will collect their pieces by the end of the week and score them on the skill they just

learned. The students put pen to paper and begin to write. The teacher returns to her

desk. "If you need any help while you are writing, raise your hand. Remember, writing

time is quiet time. We need to let people think." Students quietly engage in the writing

task for the rest of the period. When students need help, they raise their hands and are

allowed to sit next to the teacher's desk and get feedback. The teacher gives advice or

asks questions to get students to think through the issues with their paper. Students who

seek help are satisfied with the teacher support and continue writing.

Across the hall, after students experience the lesson, they are told to resume work

on whatever piece of writing they've been working on. The teacher reminds students

that strong leads are another tool in their writer's toolbox, and, when portfolios are due,

she will look for evidence of strong leads. She encourages them to take a look at their

leads today and revise. "Keep in mind: your writing group knows your piece better than I do at this point, so, if you need feedback on your revised leads, go to your writing group first." She also reminds them that, as usual, she will visit each writing group before the deadline to have a conversation. When the instructions are over, some students use a partner to discuss a paper idea, some begin writing, some look back at the sample leads in their notebook, and some turn to a partner to get advice how to revise a lead on a previous paper.

In the broadest sense, these teachers and students are doing the same thing: Teachers use a mini-lesson to introduce a new technique; students write, incorporating the technique; students write and get feedback on their writing. These two classes, however, are different. Different teacher practices and different student practices create two different writing communities. How are these classroom writing communities developed? In particular, what is a teacher's role in this development?

Research Question

These questions, born out of my experiences as a teacher and as an instructional coach in a middle school, inspired the direction of my research. Two major shifts in my understanding refined the research question that will guide my dissertation work. James Paul Gee's (2014) big D Discourse helped me to conceptualize a teacher's work in the classroom as a process of "enacting and recognizing socially significant identities" (p. 25). Discourse theory "is about recognition of 'kinds of people' in performances in context" (p. 25). If I explore a teacher's Discourses on writing, I can look at many facets of a teacher's identity (words, thoughts, deeds, feelings, and values) and how they affect

or are affected by "other people, things, technologies…at certain times and places" (Gee, 1994, p. 36).

The work of discourse in a classroom is not linear, and my thinking on this was influenced by the ideas of Etienne Wenger (1999). Wenger's communities of practice conceptualized the processes by which people engaged in a common enterprise make meaning and engage in practices that define the community. A teacher and her students, when engaged in the work of a writing classroom, are enacting practices that result from members negotiating meanings, being affected by and in turn affecting way the members of the class do the everyday business of the writing classroom (Wenger, 1999). This shift in my thinking led me away from seeing classroom community as one piece of a causal chain that led to student writing practices and toward the understanding that the classroom community was the ecosystem I was studying. This study of classroom communities would allow me to answer my refined research question: How does a teacher's Discourses on writing shape the writing practices of students in a classroom community?

Potential Impact of Research

Both the methodology and the future results of this study will have implications for teachers as well as instructional coaches or others who are focused on helping teachers grow. Teachers want to improve their practice so that all students learn and grow. Reflective practice should engage teachers in an examination of their own Discourses on writing. What long-running, socially-situated conversation on writing is the teacher a part of? What are the complex network of practices that define the teacher's classroom? The methodology of this study (which will be detailed later in this proposal)

could be replicated in action research conducted by a teacher so that he or she can get a clearer picture of what is happening in their classroom and make informed decisions about their teaching.   Teachers also want to know instructional practices that elicit specific student practices. What can I do to help my students to get meaningful writing support from peers? What can I do to help students use an appropriate, effective voice in their writing? This study will detail a wide range of teacher and student practices about which teachers can draw conclusions as to their effect on student writers.   Instructional coaches and professional developers can also benefit from this study as they are uniquely positioned to help teachers engage in reflective practice and introduce instructional strategies that may help student writers. Coaches can also engage in the research methodologies in order to examine teacher Discourses, student practices, and the classroom community as a whole. Being mindful of a teacher's Discourses in a particular area like writing, seeing the complexity in a teacher's practice, will help coaches meet teachers where they are and help on a path of professional development that meets their needs.

In order to reach both teachers and coaches in a medium that is relevant and accessible, I will create a website (detailed in the final part of this proposal) that will allow teachers and coaches to access not only the method and findings of my research but also steps for conducting action research.   The site will feature instructional strategies that teachers can implement, related reading for teachers to explore, and ways for teachers to connect with other teachers in reflective practice and idea sharing. Instructional coaches can also access this resource and use pieces to guide professional development. This web resource, fueled by my dissertation research, will allow teachers

and coaches to examine classroom practice and make strategic changes that will help

students grow as writers.

Literature Review

Theoretical Backdrop from a Sociocultural Tradition

The ideas of Bakhtin (1986, p. 25), Vygotsky (1986), Wertsch (1991), and various

other theorists who posit a social construction of learning and the primacy of language in

socialization form a backdrop that sets the stage for viewing classroom practice. One can

trace the threads of sociocultural theory throughout the separate research studies in this

literature review, underscoring the power of the ideas inherent in sociocultural theory and

helping us see the complexity and rich possibilities in classroom writing communities.

What a teacher says (both verbally and non-verbally) is filled with meaning, often

in ways the teacher isn't aware of.   Bakhtin (1981) posits that our words are not ours

alone. Instead they are saturated with heteroglossia, other people's words and

expressions. Our messages are polyphonic because they incorporate many voices,

including the styles, references, and assumptions of those who spoke those words to us.

Our words, received from others in the past, go out to others as well, creating a chain of

utterances throughout time. Bakhtin (1981) says, "Language is not a neutral medium that

passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is

populated –overpopulated– with the intentions of others" (p. 294).

 Additionally, the work of Freire (1970) and Bakhtin (1981) theorize that every act and

every utterance is colored by context. What a teacher says, then, is ripe for study. A

teacher's words carry the influence of her experiences, which, in turn, influence her

students.   Because a person can share unintended or unrealized messages, it is important

for teachers to think about what they say when reflecting on their practice.

Vygotsky (1986), Bakhtin (1986) and Wertsch(1991) all posit that language gives

rise to mental functioning.   According to Wertsch's (1991) recapitulation of Vygotsky's

work, classroom discourse leads to concept development (131). Vygotsky's (1986)

theories of concept development says we come to know deeply, and think in sophisticated

ways, through repeated and varied interactions surrounding a concept. Human

development happens through action in context (Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1991). What

happens in our classrooms on a daily basis, not only what people say but also how people

interact, must be examined to determine if we are providing the best education for

students.

What a teacher says or does in the classroom, how the teacher engages students in

saying and doing is a complex phenomenon that happens daily. Freire urges teachers to

be aware of their important role in the classroom as it can be used to either oppress or

promote social justice. A teacher's beliefs and values, according to Freire (1970), will

lend itself to one of two types of practices: one grounded in a banking model and one

grounded in a problem-posing model.   In the banking model, a student is a bank account,

waiting to be filled with the knowledge that only the teacher possesses. It is the duty of

the teacher, who understands her informed position as superior, to give that knowledge to

students, who are inferior without it.   The problem is that this teacher-held knowledge

isn't reality, but an illusion that the teacher has bought into.   In problem-posing

education, the teacher helps students gain their own understanding by posing problems

through which students engage with the world around them. In order to teach in the

problem-posing model, teachers need to be willing to rethink their way of life and to examine their own role. In addition, teachers need to examine their beliefs about their students. "One cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people" (Freire, 1970, p. 84). What do teachers know and believe about their students' funds of knowledge? Freire (1970) says, "Those who authentically commit themselves to the people must re-examine themselves constantly" (p. 60). So a teacher's practice is born of knowledge, beliefs, and values, all of which must be considered when reflecting in order to gain a full picture of the interactions in the classroom.

Discourse: Language in Interaction in Context

Because this study is going to examine classroom interaction, particularly messages sent and received in the classroom, a theory of discourse must guide this research. James Gee's (2014) theory of discourse provide the lens through which this study views discourse. Gee says that discourse is "language in interaction in context" (2014, p. 25). He goes on to unpack this idea, developing a concept called big "D" Discourse. He begins clarifying the word language. Language is not only speaking and doing, it is also being, taking on a socially significant identity. Discourse is a long-running conversation, formed through various interactions in history. "So when two people interact, so too do two (or more) Discourses" (2014, p. 25). Discourse theory, then, is about seeing the interaction between people as they enact and react to social significant identities. This is precisely what this study seeks to do. When teachers are saying, doing, and being in their classrooms, what Discourses about writing, teaching,

and students are being communicated. How do students reject, take-up, or transform

these Discourses?

Socially significant identities, along with related ways of speaking, doing, and

being, are at the heart of Gee's Discourse theory. Various studies have undertaken

identity formation for students and teachers. These studies underscore the importance of

identity in the classroom and its relationship to teaching and learning.

Teacher Identity Formation. Many researcher have focused on how teachers

construct identities around their practice. Smagorinsky, Cook, and Moore (2004) looked

into teacher identity formation with student teachers. These researchers highlighted one

case of a teacher whose university methods program urged her to implement

constructivist practices while her mentor teacher urged her to mimic the traditional

approaches currently being practiced in the classroom. Because human development (in

this case, the teacher's formation of teaching identities) happens through action in context

(Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1991), the tensions between these two world contributed to

her identity as a teacher. Even as she made accommodations, taking up the practices of

her mentor teacher, she worried about the teacher she was becoming, stating that she was

afraid to go over the mentor teacher's side. The researchers followed up with this student

teacher during her first year in her own classroom at a different school where the teacher

demonstrated both constructivist and traditional practices of her own choosing. New

tensions surrounding her practices and those her mentor suggested she try served to

further shape her identities at this new school, though this time the tensions were more

productive.

Tensions, as Smagorinsky et al. (2004) conclude, serve to forged teacher identity. This idea is echoed in the Day, Kington, Sobart, and Sammons study (2006) which concluded that teacher identities are formed by the tensions between structures of their job and their ability to take action. In addition, these researchers emphasize that a teacher's identities shift because they formed in context and the context in which teachers work shifts as changes occur in the home, the workplace, or other life worlds they inhabit.

Juzwik and Ives (2010) look at teacher identity as it is formed dialogically in situ, in the daily interactions with their students. These researchers examined a teacher's narrative as it was told in a classroom in preparation for student writing. Their narrative discourse analysis showed how the teacher co-constructed her identities with her students. Juzwik and Ives (2010), Smagorinsky et al. (2004), and Day et al. (2006) are but three slices of research in teacher identity. What about the impact of a teacher's identities on the students they teach?

Student Identity Formation. There is compelling research that makes visible the correlation between a teacher's Discourses and a student's identity formation.   Hall, Johnson, Juzwik, Wortham, and Mosley (2010) present three separate studies that explore identity development of both teacher and literacy learners. These researchers, like Juzwik and Ives (2010), examine identity formation in situ, as teachers guide students in literacy learning.   One of their studies allowed us to see a teacher whose identity in her classroom, characterized as wolf-like, was constructed as she told a personal narrative to her class.

Another study allowed us to see how a teacher's characterization of literacy shapes the way students see literacy and themselves. When a teacher describes behaviors of good readers and bad readers, she is prescribing narrow roles for students to take up, roles that might not fit with their literacy experiences, but which they must take on to fit within the culture created. Students' identities, therefore, are shaped by the stances the teacher has taken on literacy.

Fernsten (2005) also looks at student identities as they are shaped not only by teacher stances but also by social structures inherent in writing. This researcher interviewed college writing students, asking them questions about who they are as writers. Fernsten concluded that student identities as writers are shaped in part by ideologies embedded in the classroom and of power structures inherent in writing. Like Hall et al., Fernsten draws powerful connections between teacher and student identities. On the peripheries of all of this identity research described thus far are pedagogical decision-making and how teacher identities or stances might play into how a teacher enacts certain practices in her class.

Shifts in Teacher Identity Impact Instruction.   Dix and Cawkwell (2011) conducted a study of teacher self-efficacy and writing identity. The general finding indicated that shifts in pedagogy occurred after a shift in teacher identity. The researchers conducted a 2-year longitudinal action research study. This multi-site, multi-teacher project spanned elementary and secondary classrooms. Teachers participated in training from their local National Writing Project site and implemented pedagogical changes in order to establish a workshop model in their classrooms. Researchers followed them on their journey, gathering data from teachers in the form of

questionnaires, focus group responses, surveys, interviews, and reflective journals. To

examine students in the study, the researchers gathered writing samples, survey

responses, observation notes, and interviews. For one publication, Dix and Cawkwell

(2011) focused on one teacher and her six-year-old students.

   The researchers (Dix & Cawkwell, 2011) drew conclusions about both the

teachers and the students. By participating in a writing workshop set up by the National

Writing Project site and reflecting on her progress, the teacher developed a writing

identity and a self-efficacy for teaching writing in her classroom (Dix & Cawkwell,

2011). The researchers also noted that the realization of a writing identity corresponded

to shifts in pedagogy. The teacher in this study included more peer review in her lessons,

and student writing and engagement improved.

   Kohnen's (2013) work with teachers who were incorporating writing into science

class also demonstrates a case of a teacher's shift in identity preceding a change in

instruction. In this study, a science teacher, used to being what is commonly referred to

as a sage on the stage, welcomed a science journalist into her room in order to help

students take on the role of investigative writers. This project required students to direct

their own learning and this only became possible when the teacher shifted her stance.

The teacher made the shift from sage on the stage to fellow writer and lead learner in the

process of writing science articles. She assisted rather than directed and wrote articles

with the students. These practices weren't happening in her classroom when she believed

she had to be the one to deliver knowledge to her students.

   Timperley and Parr (2009) provide another interesting study linking teacher

stance to pedagogy. Their work involved the communication of lesson aims to students

and the impact on student learning. When lesson aims and mastery criteria were clearly articulated by the teacher, students were able to identify deeper features of writing as the lesson aims. If activities and mastery criteria didn't align with the lesson aims (or lesson aims were not clearly articulated), students identified surface features (such as becoming a good writer) as the lesson aims rather than those articulated by the teacher.   Good instruction, with activities and performance expectations in alignment with well-articulated lesson aims, make writing features explicit for students. Although Timperley and Parr weren't primarily focused on teacher stance, questions about teacher stance on writing can follow: What happens then, when a teacher does not fully understand the lesson aims enough to either clearly explain them or align instruction? What if lesson aims are mandated by a district but a teacher does not value them? It is precisely situations like these that piqued my interest as a researcher.

Communities of Practice

The aforementioned studies involving Discourse illuminate the complexities of communication as well as the social significance of communication in the classroom. One person's saying, doing, and being are never done in isolation. Wenger's (1999) work on communities of practice helps us see the shaping of Discourses in a classroom.

According to Wenger (1999), communities of practice are everywhere, and they often go unnoticed because they are so commonplace in our lives. As formal as a chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and as informal as a group of retired men who gather to play chess in Washington Square Park, communities of practice are developed when people are mutually engaged in a joint enterprise where a common repertoire is used (Wenger, 1999).   The practices of a community are tied to meaning-

making. Members of a community of practice negotiate meaning as they participate in

the community.   These practices are a source of coherence for the community, and these

practices are, essentially, a reflection of learning. Communities of practice are not rigid.

While practices do create a boundary that separate members from non-members, the

boundaries are porous; new members come in. The boundaries of the community, the

practices that define them, are also flexible. They can change over time because just as a

community shapes the members, they members shape the community.

The classroom is a perfect place to view a community of practice. As teachers

and students come together, they engage in practices that allow for a negotiation of

meaning. As teachers and students repeatedly engage in practices specific to that

classroom, they develop a common repertoire, both spoken and unspoken, of procedures

and skills. To recall concepts from Discourse theory, their ways of saying, doing, and

being are mutually shaped in the classroom.

Ethnographic Studies of Classroom Communities

Because this study will examine the complexities of Discourse in communities of

practice, a look at ethnographic studies in educational settings provides examples of these

complexities as well as models for methodology.

Social Construction of Knowledge. Interactional ethnographers from the

University of California at Santa Barbara (Castanheira, Crawford, Dixon, & Green, 2001)

show us specific examples of how knowledge is socially constructed in a classroom

community. The foundation of their work is this belief: "What counts as literacy in any

group is visible in the actions members take, what they orient to, what they hold each

other accountable for what they accept or reject as preferred responses of others, and how they engage with, interpret and construct text" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 354).

The focus of the Castanheira et al. study was one Australian, Grade 11 student's experiences across 5 classes through which understanding of literate practices were constructed and reconstructed by teachers and students.   The researchers used artifacts (various texts including videos, workbook pages, and student generated texts) collected by researchers. Their interactional ethnographic exploration would focus on the following:

- The requirements (implicit and explicit) for participation in the literacy events

- Literacy demands entailed by membership in each of the subject-area classes

- The opportunities given to members

- What members did to learn

- Consequence for not taking or having the opportunities to learn

By analyzing the data, researchers were able to see how both teachers and students shaped the literate actions in the classroom.

In the math classroom, after a period of independent work time, the teacher approached the student to discuss the student's progress. The teacher posed a question and the student posed a question in response. After a bit of work on the concept at hand, there was an exchange of feedback where the student self-assessed his own progress by posing a question via facial expressions, and the teacher gave affirmative feedback before the student returned to his work. This interplay of discussion and work is an example of

how teachers and students can come together to shape what is literate practice in their

group. In the case of this math class, the researchers concluded that "one practice [the

student] learned was that it was possible to work collaboratively with someone who had

more knowledge to construct a joint understanding, not merely an answer" (Castanheira

et al., 2001, p. 366). In addition, because the teacher validated the student's responses in

the exchange, we see an additional dimension to the formation of literacy in this math

class: identity formation. The authors state that to be literate in this math class, you need

to form an identity "as a mathematics student, as a successful problem solver, and as a

worthy, valued, and appropriate conversation partner" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 367).

The practices in the English class paint a picture of limited interaction and

sharply defined roles. The students took a quiz in silence. The teacher sat at her desk.

When finished, the student sat quietly and waited. When told, the students opened up a

workbook to get the correct answers and proceeded to correct their own work. In

describing the very little interaction that characterized literacy in this classroom,

Castanheira et al. note: "In no instance did we observe her talking about or providing

information that went beyond the workbook, or that addressed the content of general

English. Her talk and actions were focused on managing the flow of activity and not the

academic content" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 376). Students took up the roles afforded

them, becoming test-takers, answer checkers, and grade recorders. Students didn't initiate

questions or discussions. The researchers conclude: These actions suggest that she

privileged the workbook as the authority, placing responsibility on the students for

obtaining the content *from* the text" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 376).

The authors take the stance that knowledge is socially constructed.   When they apply this epistemological perspective to literacy, they construct the following definition: "Literacy is a socially constructed phenomenon that is situationally defined and redefined within and across differing social groups" (Castanheira et al., 2001, p. 354). Like Wertsch's (1991) view of language as a mediating tool for thought and action, Castanheira et al. concludes that literacy is both a "product of, and a cultural tool for, a social group" (p. 356). As a group develops, their literate practices develop. These practices evolve to serve the needs of the individual members and the group as a whole. While members of the group are given chances to participate in a range of these practices, it is possible that members of a group can be denied the opportunities to fully participate, resulting in, for that person, a limited repertoire of literacy skills within the group.

Social Positions in Communities of Practice. Raymond Brown (2007) conducted a study that illuminated the interplay of student participation, social positions or identities in the classroom, and discourse in a community of practice. Positioning his work on foundational theories from Lave and Wenger (1991), Brown examined the construction of social positions through a classroom discourse technique called Collective Argumentation. This technique mirrored the discursive practices of mathematicians, calling for small groups of students to represent varied representations of mathematical problems then share, compare, and evaluate these representations. The researcher focused on his own class of 26 students in a year-long study of a math class operating as a community of practice. He used student journals to examine "talk about" a community of math practice and classroom presentations to examine "talk within" a community of math practice. This particular article, focused primarily on one student named Cath.

Students who participated in the mathematical community of practice developed a social position in the classroom that was characterized by confidence, interdependent thinking, and critical thinking. Cath's reflections, for instance, indicated a role shift from passive dependence on others to interdependence—being a part of the process of building upon one another's ideas. Cath's reflections also showed that she began to assess others' ideas and their communication processes. This student's understanding of how to "do math" eventually shifted from finding the correct answer to engaging in innovative thinking and use of evidence to support thinking. As Cath's work as a mathematician was evolving so, too, was her use of the language of the mathematical community in the classroom. She and her work partner Tracey ultimately developed one voice, utterances intermingling as they explained their work. Cath and Tracey became proficient in using the language of the community to represent their mathematical thinking.

Brown's work is clearly situated in the sociocultural tradition. As in Lave's apprenticeship model (1996), students who are immersed in authentic context appropriate an identity that they strive to embody. This study, then, has implications for instructional practice. Instructional practices that allows students to do authentic work in a discipline will help students develop an identity that enhances achievement in that discipline. Additionally, the interdependent thinking in communities of practice demonstrates Vygotsky's (1986) theories of concept development. We come to know deeply, and think in sophisticated ways, through repeated and varied interactions surrounding a concept—exactly what Brown's students were doing when they were creating, sharing, and critiquing representations of problems.

Brown's (2007) work has significant implications for the construction of classroom culture. Instructional practices that engage students in collaborative methods inherent in a discipline create a community of practice—a classroom culture that relies on authentic acts of thinking and communicating. Also, instructional practices that allows students to do authentic work in a discipline will help students develop an identity that enhances achievement in that discipline.

Participatory Roles in Communities of Practice. Students' participation in the practices of a community is essential for the development of that community. Student participation, according to a study by Minna Kovalainen and Kristiina Kumpulainen (Kovalainen & Kumpulainen, 2007) is socially constructed, and participation can be analyzed to more clearly see how students and teachers take up various roles in the community. The researchers clearly situate their work in the sociolinguistic and sociocultural perspectives, viewing the classroom as a culture in which norms, values, rules, and relationships are socially constructed.

Kovalainen and Kumpulainen (2007) investigated a 3rd grade classroom of mainstream students in a class that emphasized the practices of a community of dialogic inquirers. Key practices in this classroom included whole group discussions and small group activities. These practices were used in three subjects: math, science, and philosophy.   The researchers used discourse analysis on transcribed video recordings of whole-classroom interactions, paying particular attention to student participation.

Kovalainen and Kumpulainen (2007) found that four diverse modes of participation were identified, and these modes were characterized by the form, amount, function, and direction of the interaction. For each discussion, students were

characterized as one of the following modes: vocal participant, responsive participant,

bilateral participant, and silent participant. Whether a student tended to take a passive

role in the bulk of the discussion and respond only to one other person (bilateral

participant) or a student tended to vocalize thoughts throughout the discussion and direct

them to the large group of students (vocal participants), all roles were important to the

community of discourse. Across multiple instances of discussion, researchers noted that

students tended to stay with the same participation mode. The teacher had an interesting

role in the construction of participation modes. The teacher's participation in the

discussion varied depending upon the student participant. With vocal participants, for

instance, teachers often stepped back and allowed for horizontal flow of discussion. With

silent participants, teachers prompted discussion.

    The very basis of their research is sociocultural: classroom interactions signal

what counts as learning, participating, and communicating. These interactions are

socially constructed, discourse being the primary tool for constructing the classroom

culture. Meaning-making, as echoed again and again in the works of sociocultural

theorists like Vygotsky (1986), Bakhtin (1986), Wertsch (1991), is not a solo-activity.

Another key idea in this study concerns the sociocultural ideas that the flow of meaning

is not linear and one-directional. Roles in the classroom culture are both a product of the

community and a tool to shape the community. This is reminiscent of the ideas in Bakhtin

(1986) and Wertsch (1991). We shape and are shaped by the language in our community.

    So what does this tell us for instructional practice? When students are allowed to

engage in dialogic inquiry, they shape participatory roles at the same time that these roles

shape their thinking and shape the community. If both teachers and students are critically

aware of the various discursive roles, a refinement of practice is possible.   If a teacher's

role in the dialogic community is responsive to the student's mode of participation, the

communication process is honed, becoming more meaningful and productive.

Additionally, a teacher can scaffold support for students so that each student has

experience is various modes, gaining a wider repertoire of communication skills. The

Kovalainen and Kumpulainen study, then, has rich implications for classroom practice.

Construction and Negotiation of Literate Practices. The Moje, Willis, and

Fassin study (Moje, Willes, & Fassio, 2001) concerning the Writers Workshop model

illuminates the construction and negotiation of literacy practices in a writing classroom.

This group of researchers grounds their work in the Scribner and Cole (1981) perspective

on literacy. Literacy is "a set of socially organized practices which make use of a symbol

system and a technology for producing and disseminating it" (2001, p. 194) . Moje et al.

give a nod to the Discourse group (1994) when they explain their stance on literacy

practice: "In literacy events people draw on particular social practices that carry certain

meanings and serve particular social purposes" (Moje et al., 2001, p. 194).

For this study, Moje et al. worked with a group of seventh grade students in a

Writers Workshop, carefully observing student and teacher practices within this

classroom community. Her research methods were grounded in several theories. First,

the symbolic interactionist theory claims that individuals define situations and negotiate

meanings based on their interpretations of symbols while engaged in interaction with

other human beings (Moje et al., 2001, p. 195). Additionally, the researchers took the

cultural studies perspective as they sought not to discover truth but to discover links

between everyday practice and the construction of communities. Finally, to analyze the

data, they used critical discourse analysis to uncover unexamined assumptions embedded in practice and the constant comparative method, or inductive analysis, to let themes emerge from the data.

Moje et al. (2001) discovered that through mini-lessons and repeated use of the steps of the writing process, students began to use the language and steps of writers. "Doing writing" for these students, in fact, became a matter of doing these steps instead of a matter of communicating ideas, representing meaning, or entertaining others. When asked about the work of a writing class, students often defined the writing process in relationship to past classes. Students saw the workshop approach as just another kind of classroom literacy. Most interesting was a disconnection between writing in and out of the classroom. Students saw workshop writing as separate from their real world writing—mostly because the teachers unknowingly promoted certain types of writing (memoir and fiction, in particular). Schools, as an institution, promote certain parameters on writing topics and students tended to avoid real world topics that seemed taboo in school. Another contributing factor was possibly the teacher's selection of models that stuck to safe topics.

The researchers note that after they saw the patterns illustrated above, they made adjustments, publicly encouraging students to tell the real stories of their lives, making sharing optional, and making assessment conducive to prolific writing (Moje et al., 2001). These changes demonstrate how teachers can shift their practices to help shape the environment. The practices done every day, the ones discussed and assessed, are the ones that people will internalize. It is also important to note that an emphasis on expressive pedagogy doesn't mean that students will automatically connect home with

school. Students bring with them what they think counts as literacy just as teachers may find themselves unwittingly focusing on a narrow range of practices. The classroom practices in which students engage should not be a narrow slice of the literacy pie. Students need to be exposed to a variety of texts.

This literature review shows us that what teachers do in the classroom is of utmost importance and most certainly worthy of study. The key area for study is the Discourse that teachers bring with them and the Discourses that are shaped as teachers and students engage in a community of practice. This community of practice needs to be seen through an ethnographic lens as the everyday discourse, actions, and interactions of a classroom are rich with information that can help us see how students learn so that we can, ultimately, help all teachers and students improve their practice.

Classroom Writing Communities Study

How, then, does a teacher's Discourse on writing shape the writing practices of students in a classroom community? The Classroom Writing Communities study, based on theories of sociocultural learning, Discourse, and communities of practice, will use both ethnography and discourse analysis to examine the dynamics of instruction and learning in a middle school classroom focused on writing instruction.

Setting

This Classroom Writing Communities study will take place in a middle school situated in the suburbs of a large Midwestern city. The school typically enrolls around 750 students, with 45 percent qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch and 85 percent classifying as minority. On state tests, this school regularly performs below state averages. Improvements from year to year are generally slight. Currently this building is

focusing on cultural competence training, a district-mandated initiative, and using the data team process in professional learning communities (PLCs) to inform practice. In addition to these initiatives, the school is implementing a one-to-one technology initiative. Because this study's participants will be selected from English Language Arts (ELA) teachers, it is important to note that all ELA teachers are using a brand new curriculum and materials during the 2015-16 school year. All students will be sorted into ELA classes designated as Tier 1, 2, or 3 based primarily on a standardized reading assessment.

Participants

The primary participants in the Writing Communities Study will include classroom teachers and one class of each teacher's students. Volunteers for the teacher participant role will be solicited using a letter inviting them to study the teaching of writing in their own classroom in collaboration with the researcher who is an instructional coach in the building. Because writing instruction is not a focus of tier 3 classrooms, the invitation will be sent to teachers of tier 2 and tier 1 classes.   Three to four teachers will be selected from volunteers based on expressed commitment to the study.   If more than 4 teachers volunteer, I will be sure to select participants so that I have both tier 2 and tier 1 classes represented.   For student participants, I will seek both parental consent and student assent (Appendix B & C). Adult participants in the study will also be asked to sign general consent letters as per IRB procedures (Appendix D).

While my role as researcher can be summarized as an insider collaborating with other insiders, my position in this study is complex. I am currently an instructional coach in this building, and I previously taught in this building for four years. For some

teachers, our working relationship began in another building where I was not only a teacher but also a department chair who evaluated teachers in the English department. My roles as a coach and a department chair may be considered an outsider role for some people. I acknowledge a difference in perceived power and realize that it may be a limitation in that teachers may be ambiguous about sharing challenges they experience. However, throughout my career, I have worked consciously to develop trusting and supportive relationships. As a coach, many teachers confide in me. For these reasons, I identify primarily with the role of an insider in this study.

Time Frame

The Classroom Writing Communities study will take place in fall semester of the 2015-16 school year. Classroom observational data will be collected on two to three days per each unit of study, for up to three units. The researcher will spend from 6-13 hours in each teacher's classroom. The specific number of days and units will be determined in collaboration with the teacher participant. Collaborative reflections on data will occur throughout the semester using audiotape, videotape and field note data. (See Appendix A for tentative timeline for data collection.)

Data Collection and Analysis

The study aims to understand and make visible implicit elements in a situated context that shape learning outcomes in subtle, as well as overt, ways. Specifically, this study aims to show how a teacher's Discourse (words, actions, identities) about writing shape student writing practices though interactions in a community of practice. Various forms of observational data, inquiry data, and artifact data will be collected (Hendricks, 2013). Data analysis will, at times, draw on ethnography, content analysis, critical discourse, and multimodal analysis. (See Appendix E for proposed data chart.)

My approach to collecting observational data is generally ethnographic. The qualitative analysis of narrative data will describe the lived experiences of the teacher and students in this writing classroom. Ethnography seeks to describe the culture of a particular group (Frank, 1999). It is important to have an ethnographic lens when observing the classroom so that an observer can get an insider view into teaching and learning. According to Frank (1999), an ethnographic lens "enables an observer to understand how members of a class (or other group) view and interpret activities, who can participate, when, where, in what ways, under what conditions, for what purposes, or even with what outcomes" (p. x). I will use several types of data to create a thick description of this classroom over four months of intensive scrutiny. First, field notes will be used to describe enacted teacher practices, classroom culture, and student and teacher behaviors. In order to describe the enacted practices, classroom culture, and student behaviors in relation to physical spaces, I will draw a classroom map that includes labeled physical spaces and patterns of movement. In addition, I will use photos to document the physical spaces and resources in the room. An underlying assumption of classroom maps and photos is that a teacher's philosophy of teaching and learning can be seen in the physical spaces of the classroom (Frank, 1999). Video recordings of teacher instruction will also be collected. These recording will include teacher instructions and may also include other interaction between participants such group work or conferences. In order to fully articulate the lived experience, I will use a multimodal analysis of portions of the video data to describe the nonverbal as well as verbal interactions that create a culture in this classroom.   My rationale for using a multimodal approach is based in the work of multi-literacy scholars like Carey Jewitt (2008) who claims that

"how knowledge is represented, as well as the mode and media chosen, is a crucial aspect

of knowledge construction, making the form of representation integral to meaning and

learning more generally" (p. 241).   For this study, then, I want to examine not only a

teacher's message but how it is presented in a variety of modalities. All of this

observational classroom data will be shared with each teacher in the study and we will

discuss at least weekly what patterns or insights we are gleaning from the data. This may

involve a before, during or after school connection in person or a running dialogue

online.

　　　Because Bakhtin (1981) says every utterance is laced with a rich history of

meaning, it is important to attend closely to the verbal and nonverbal messages in the

classroom. Specifically, I will use audio recordings of classroom practice to analyze the

oral interactions in the classroom. Using discourse analysis, I will look for potential

ways that discourse shapes culture and reveals the power relationships in the room.

Discourse analysis is a critical tool for examining a classroom community for "dialogue

and participation are at the heart of a community of practice" (Rogers & Mosley Wetzel,

2014, p. 8). Teacher talk, both in the planning and enacting stages of instruction, should

be analyzed closely for language is not neutral. It is replete with meaning (Rogers &

Mosley Wetzel, 2014). Gee (2014) says that in discourse, people are saying, doing, and

being something. Van Dijk (2001) says that critical discourse analysis not only describes

discourse structures, but also tries to explain them in terms of social interaction and social

structure. "CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate,

reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society" (Van Dijk, 2001, p.

353).

Inquiry data will also prove important information in surfacing thoughts of the teachers and their students. Through interviews and conferences with the teachers, I hope to surface knowledge, beliefs, and values that shape instruction. Specifically, I will use a semi-structured interview before I begin work with the teacher to collect initial baseline thinking. This interview will allow each teacher to reflect on her training and personal history with writing as well as her work as a writing teacher. (See Appendix F for sample interview protocol.) I will use another interview at the end of the semester. This interview will, again, allow the teacher to reflect on her work as a writing teacher, answering some of the same questions from the first survey. These post-interview questions will allow me to see any shifts in thinking or practice. Additional questions will allow her to reflect on the collaborative process we engaged in. Another source of inquiry data will be conferences with the teacher. These meetings will provide the opportunity for collaborative planning and reflection on the observation and artifact data. The frequency of these conferences will be decided collaboratively and will be subject to change depending upon the ongoing analysis of the data. Conferences will focus on student survey data, planning, classroom observation data, and scoring student work. A content analysis of the audio tapes of both the conferences and the interviews, coding the transcripts and letting themes emerge, will be used to surface the teacher's knowledge, beliefs, and values.

Because this study seeks to examine students' confidence and engagement with writing,   I will use an attitudinal survey for students. Part of the survey will use a four point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree) with statements relating to student confidence not only in their own writing ability but also in their ability

to help others. Likert items will also refer to levels of interest in and engagement with writing. Open-ended questions will elicit not only students' opinions about what works and doesn't work to help them improve their writing, but also students' descriptions of the class environment.   This survey will be given at the beginning and end of the semester in order to see any changes in attitude or links to attitude and performance. This survey will also provide information about classroom culture. (See Appendix G for sample survey questions.) Artifacts, in addition to observation and inquiry data, will prove important in answering the research questions that drive this study. Student writing samples will be used to assess the quality of student writing. Specifically, the teachers and I will collect student writing samples at the beginning of the semester. This writing will act as a pretest for writing quality. From this pretest, we will select six students per teacher from a range of scores (two high, two medium, two low) who we will follow more intensively. We will collect writing samples from these six students on the three writing units/tasks for which observational data is collected. A comparison of scores on the assessments will help us determine if students are growing in their writing.   For each writing sample we analyze, each teacher and I will score separately then compare scores, discussing any discrepancies. Other artifacts may also prove useful in triangulating data, such as the teacher's unit or lesson plan or the assessment and scoring guide; these can document intended practice and describe expected student performance, both of which may be linked to a teacher's knowledge, beliefs, and values.

        This study employs observational, inquiry, and artifact data in order to aid deep and collaborative reflection. The mixture of methods in this study will support

understandings by both the teachers and me in order to gain a clearer picture of this writing classroom.

Validity/Trustworthiness

I will take several steps to make sure that the data collected and analyzed will accurately measure what it is intended to measure. First, and most important, I will use multiple data sources and perspectives. For instance, I will record the teacher's classroom practice in field notes as well as in audio and video formats. Classroom practice will also be reflected in audio-taped conferences. In addition, I will collect data across several different days for several different writing units/tasks. This persistent and prolonged observation increases process validity (Hendricks, 2013). The varied data collections methods will lend themselves to thick description. The ethnographic stance behind the data collection and analysis necessitates deep description which will increase the consistency validity (Hendricks, 2013).

My data collection process will result in a clear audit trail with accurate recordings for analysis. Audio, video, and photographs of the class session, for instance, can back up field notes. Clearly organizing this information also will be important. These practices will not only help me navigate my data but also will allow others to inspect my process. Because the participating teachers will be using the data for reflection, accuracy and clarity are even more crucial. These accurate and detailed practices will increase process validity.

Collaboration will increase neutrality/confirmability validity (Hendricks, 2013). Collaboration with the participating teachers will occur both in conferences, when we collaboratively analyze data. When collaboratively scoring work, we will use calibration

methods to increase inter-rater reliability. Collaboration will also happen between the

researcher and university colleagues. The Language, Literacy, and Culture learning

community has been a part of the thinking and planning up to this point. They will

continue to review and advise as the study commences. All of this collaboration

increases not only process validity and neutrality/confirmability validity but also dialogic

validity or democratic validity (Hendricks, 2013). Great care has been and will be taken

to make sure that the data and resulting findings will be valid.

Anticipated Challenges

I anticipate one major challenge in this study: time for collaborative reflection on

data. The district and school, as described in the context above, will move forward with

several initiatives that will require the teacher's time. The time that the typical teacher

has to reflect and plan is often limited by mandatory meetings, paperwork, and

preparatory tasks.   A few proactive steps, however, may minimize the impact of these

challenges. First, the invitation for participation will fully disclose the extent of meeting

and reflection, including a timeline of events (Appendix A) that will help teachers to

make an informed decision about commitment. Additionally, getting meeting dates on

the calendar as soon as possible will help us follow through on meetings even during the

busiest times of the semester. Reminders about these meetings and regular contact with

the teachers will keep the work of this study at the forefront of the teacher's thinking.

Finally, this reflective work can mesh with school and district expectations for this

teacher, essentially allowing participation in this study to count for other requirements the

teachers have.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this study. The small sample size and relatively homogenous composition of tracked classrooms is not ideal. While the purpose of this study is to fully understand a specific classroom, consumers of the research findings might find it hard to transfer understanding from this tracked setting to their own settings. My positionality in this study could also be a limitation. My role as an instructional coach, former colleague, and former evaluator for some could create power dynamics that might impact collaboration and reflection. A teacher who sees me in a power position may want to say "the right thing" and resist full or honest reflection. I have worked as an instructional coach in this building for a year, and I have used the practices of Jim Knight's (2007) Instructional Coaching model to build a partnership built on trust and mutual respect. It cannot be assumed, however, that one year in this role has negated past relationships. It will be important for me to continue to build a true partnership in this collaborative study and be acutely aware of cues that indicate otherwise.

Classroom Writing Communities Website

In order to share the results of this study, I will create a multi-use website designed to help teachers create classroom writing communities that help students improve writing practices. While the primary audience will be classroom teachers, instructional coaches and professional developers could also use the site to help teachers grow.

Content

The website will offer content in three primary areas: instructional practices, steps for reflective practice, and research. The content for this website will not only stem from

the Classroom Writing Communities research study but also from other research and highly regarded practitioners.

Instructional Practice. The content related to instructional practices will fall into three areas: Spaces that support writers, structures that support writers, and lessons that support writers. Spaces that support writers will give teachers ideas for using walls as a textual resource, uses stations or centers to engage students, and using alternative space (spaces outside the classroom) to promote writing. Structures that support writers will share information about using instructional strategies like workshops, writing groups, on-line supports, and generative processes to improve writing. Lessons that support writers will also be available. Mini-lessons on a wide variety of topics will help teachers teach important practices that students need to employ.

Reflective Practice. The content related to reflective practice will help teachers engage in action research that will help them see some of the complexities of Discourse and communities of practice. These resources will include reflection exercises that will help teachers reflect on aspects of their own practice such identity, discourse, and decision-making. In addition, teachers will have opportunities to reflect on aspects of their classroom community of practice, including student identity, hidden rules, power positions, and student participation. This reflection will be promoted through work such as reading, journaling, on-line discussions, recording and analyzing instruction, surveys for students, and descriptive note-taking.

Research. Through the Classroom Writing Communities website, teachers will have access to the methodology and results of the Classroom Writing Communities study. They will also be able to get access to or references to not only the research that fueled this study but also other research regarding writing instruction.

Sharing

In order to promote use of the website, I will begin with the teachers and coaches in the school district in which I am an instructional coach. I will first ask for time at our district-wide coaches' meeting to share the resources with coaches, suggesting that they lead interested participants though the reflection activities and share resources with teachers. I will share a link to the site with all ELA teachers in the district, send follow-up emails featuring content on the website. From these users, I will seek feedback and revise the website. To broaden the promotion, I will contact teacher educators who are responsible for writing methods classes at universities in the St. Louis area, giving an overview of the site. If the website is favorably received, I will consider additional steps for sharing the resource.

Conclusion

Ultimately, this study seeks to reveal complex dynamics in the writing classroom. As a result, the participating teachers can make informed decisions about instruction. In addition, I hope to gain a better understanding of how classroom writing communities are formed so that I can help teachers, in the future, examine the context of their practices. Through the participant teachers' interactions with colleagues, his or her reflective practice and any resulting changes in instruction will influence other teachers. In addition, my coaching interactions with other teachers will be colored by my finding from this study. Finally, through possible future iterations of this study, the Classroom

Writing Communities studies can have an impact beyond the immediate scope of this

research.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans. M. Holquist
    Ed.). Austin, TX: Universtiy of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans. C. Emerson &
    M. Holquist Eds.). Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Brown, R. (2007). Exploring the social positions that students construct within a classroom
    community of practice. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*(3-4), 116-128.

Castanheira, M., Crawford, T., Dixon, C., & Green, J. (2001). Interactional ethnography: an
    approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics &
    Education, 11*(4), 353-400.

Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional selves of
    teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(4),
    601-616.

Dix, S., & Cawkwell, G. (2011). The influence of peer group response: Building a teacher and
    student expertise in the writing classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique,
    10*(4), 41-57.

Fernsten, L. (2005). Discourse and difference. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 9*(4),
    371-387.

Frank, C. (1999). *Ethnogaphic eyes: A teacher's guide to classroom observation*. Portsmouth,
    New Hamphire: Heinemann.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Gee, J. P. (1994). Discourses: Reflections on m.a.k. halliday's "toward a language-based theory
    of learning". *Linguistics & Education, 6*(1), 33-40.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method* (Fourth ed.). New

    York: Routledge.

Hall, L. A., Johnson, A. S., Juzwik, M. M., Wortham, S. E. F., & Mosley, M. (2010). Teacher

    identity in the context of literacy teaching: Three explorations of classroom positioning

    and interaction in secondary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2010), 234-

    243.

Hendricks, C. (2013). *Improving schools through action research: A reflective practice*

    approach. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in*

    Education, 32, 241-267. doi: 10.2307/20185117

Juzwik, M. M., & Ives, D. (2010). Small stories as resources for performing teacher identity:

    Identity-in-interaction in an urban language arts classroom. *Narrative Inquiry, 20*(1), 37-

    61. doi: 10.1075/ni.20.1.03juz

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kohnen, A. M. (2013). "I wouldn't have said it that way": Mediating professional editorial

    comments in a secondary school science classroom. *Linguistics and Education: An*

    International Research Journal, 24(2), 75-85.

Kovalainen, M., & Kumpulainen, K. (2007). The social construction of participation in an

    elementary classroom community. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*,

    141-158.

Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture & Activity, 3*(3), 149-164.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.

    Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Moje, E., Willes, D., & Fassio, K. (2001). Constructing and negotiating literacy in a writer's

    workshop: Literacy teaching and learning in seventh grade. In E. B. Moje & O. B. D. G

(Eds.), *Constructions of Literacy* (pp. 193-212). Mahway, New Jersey: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates.

Rogers, R., & Mosley Wetzel, M. (2014). *Designing critical literacy education through critical discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Moore, C. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accomodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(1), 8-24.

Timperley, H. S., & Parr, J. M. (2009). What is this lesson about? Instructional processes and student understandings in writing classrooms. *Curriculum Journal, 20*(1), 43-60.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wenger, E. (1999). *Commuities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Appendix A

Tentative Timeline of Study

CWC--Timeline

Period Highlight: 1   Plan   Actual

ACTIVITY	PLAN START	PLAN DURATION	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL DURATION
Teacher Interview Pre	1	1		
Student Survey Pre	1	1		
Conference--St Surv Pre	2	1		
Conference--Unit Planning	2	1		
Conference--Assmt Planning	2	1		
Student Writing Pre	3	1		
Conference--Collab Scoring	4	1		
Observation Set 1	5	2		
Conference--Collab Scoring	7	1		
Conference--Obs Data	8	1		
Observation Set 2	9	2		
Conference--Collab Scoring	11	1		
Conference--Obs Data	12	1		
Student Survey Post	13	1		
Conference--St Surv Post	14	1		
Teacher Interview Post	15	1		

Week: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Appendix B

Parent Consent Form

Division of College of Education

One University Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
E-mail: selingera@umsl.edu

Informed Consent for Child Participation in Research Activities

Classroom Writing Communities

Participant _____   HSC Approval Number
_____

Principal Investigator: Angela Muse   PI's Phone Number: 314.853.3814

1. Your child is invited to participate in a research study conducted by Angela Muse, doctoral student at the University of Missouri-St. Louis under the supervision of Dr. Nancy Singer. The purpose of this research is to examine the activities and the environment in your child's English language arts class. A primary goal of this research is to help classroom teachers reflect on their practice in order to make instructional decisions that will help students become powerful writers.

2. This research will involve up to six English Language Arts (ELA) teachers and up to 150 students (one class of approximately 25 students for each participating teacher) for approximately 15 weeks during the 2015-16 school year.

3. Your child's participation will involve:
   a. Observations by the principal investigator during approximately 6 class periods during which teacher and student words and actions will be documented. This documentation will include video or audio tape of class activities.
   b. A survey that allow students to share their feelings about writing and ELA class.
   c. Writing assignments (up to 3 or 4) that will be scored collaboratively between the teacher and the investigator.
   d. The writing assignments will be a part of the regular curriculum for the class. Also, the surveys will be conducted during ELA class. Your child will not have a time commitment outside of the normal school day.

4. There are no anticipated risks to your child associated with this research.

5. There are no direct benefits for your child's participation in this study. However, your child may find being in this study teaches them something about how they learn.

6. Your child's participation is voluntary and you may choose not to let your child participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent for your child's participation at any time. Your child may choose not to answer any questions that he or she does not want to answer. You and your child will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to let your child participate or to withdraw your child.

7. If your child doesn't participate in this study, he or she will still participate in class activities and writing assignments as they are a part of the school curriculum. Your child's work, however, will not be used in the study, and I will not use video or audio tape of your child. Also, your child will not have to take the surveys. While other students are taking the surveys, your child will read his or her SSR (Silent Sustained Reading) book.

8. We will do everything we can to protect your child's privacy. By agreeing to let your child participate, you understand and agree that your child's data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your child's name will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your child's data.

9. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may contact the following individuals:
    >Angela Muse (Principal Investigator)—314-853-3814 or selingera@umsl.edu
    >Dr. Nancy Singer—314-516-5517 or singerna@umsl.edu
    You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration, at 516-5897.

I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I consent to my participation in the research described above.

_____   _____
Parent's/Guardian's Signature   Date   Parent's/Guardian's Printed Name

_____
Child's Printed Name

Appendix C

Student Assent Form

Division of College of Education

One University Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
E-mail: selingera@umsl.edu

Assent to Participate in Research Activities (Minors)

Classroom Writing Communities

1. My name is Angie Muse

2. I am asking you to take part in a research study because your teacher and I are trying to learn more about how we can help students become powerful writers. First, we want to look carefully at the activities you do in your English language arts (ELA) class. We also want to think about the class environment and how you feel in this class.   By the end of the study, we want to find out what kind of ELA class is best for you.

3. If you agree to be in this study, the following things will happen:
    - I will come into your ELA class a few times and write down what the teacher and students do. I may even record part of the class so your teacher and I can go back and watch the activities.
    - Your teacher and I will ask you to fill out a survey at the beginning and end of this study so you can tell us your feelings about writing in your ELA class.
    - Your teacher and I may look at your writing to see how you are improving.

4. Being in this study should not harm you in any way.

5. You might find being in this study teaches you something about how you learn. Also, if you participate in this study, your teacher can change her instruction so that it works better for you.

6. If you don't want to be in this study, you don't have to participate. Remember, being in this study is up to you, and no one will be upset if you don't want to participate or if you change your mind later and want to stop. If you change your mind, please tell me.

7. You can ask any questions that you have about the study. If you have a question later that you didn't think of now, you can come see me in room 228.

8. Signing your name at the bottom means that you agree to be in this study. You will be given a copy of this form after you have signed it.

_____

_____

Participant's Signature   Date   Participant's Printed Name

_____   _____

Participant's Age   Grade in School

Appendix D

Teacher Consent Form

Division of College of Education

One University Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
E-mail: selingera@umsl.edu

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Classroom Writing Communities

Participant _____   HSC Approval
Number_____

Principal Investigator: **Angela Muse**   PI's Phone Number: **314-853-3814**

1. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Angela Muse, doctoral student at the University of Missouri-St. Louis under the supervision of Dr. Nancy Singer. The purpose of this research is to 1) describe Discourses (talk, practices, and identities) involved with writing instruction and 2) reflect on possible connections between Discourses and class culture.

2. This research will involve up to six teachers and up to 150 students (one class of approximately 25 students for each participating teacher) for approximately 15 weeks during the 2014-15 school year.

3. Your participation will involve:
    a. Up to two interviews, one at the beginning of the study and one at the end of data collection.
    b. Facilitating one student survey. (Non-participating students will engage in Silent Sustained Reading while participating students are taking the survey.)
    c. Up to six classroom observations (conducted by the investigator) spread across up to 3 writing units and scheduled collaboratively with the investigator. These observations will be audio or video recorded.
    d. Assigning and assessing student writing tasks collaboratively with the investigator. (These writing tasks will be a part of the routine classroom instruction. They will not be additional activities for the research.)
    e. Teaching writing lessons and facilitating student writing activities which will be observed and audio or video-taped. (These writing tasks will be a part of the routine classroom instruction. They will not be additional activities for the research.)
    f. Reflecting on instruction in 30-minute, weekly meetings with the principal investigator. These audio-recorded meetings will involve, but may not be limited to, the following:
        i. Writing instruction

      ii.   Assessment of student writing
     iii.   Student survey data
     iv.   Classroom observation data

4. There are no anticipated risks associated with this research.

5. Possible benefits for the teacher include 1) instruction and assessment support, 2) collaborative professional reflection, and 3) fulfillment of various required practices and performance targets in the Hazelwood Teacher Evaluation Program.

6. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.

7. By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

8. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may contact the following individuals:
     Angela Muse (Principal Investigator)—314-853-3814 or selingera@umsl.edu
     Dr. Nancy Singer—314-516-5517 or singerna@umsl.edu
   You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration, at 516-5897.

I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I consent to my participation in the research described above.

_____   _____
Participant's Signature   Date   Participant's Printed Name

_____   _____
Signature of Investigator or Designee   Date   Investigator/Designee Printed Name

Appendix E

Data Collection and Analysis

Type of Data	Data Source	Purpose	Analysis
Observational Data			
Field Notes	Observational notes of teacher practices and student behaviors	To describe enacted teacher practices To describe classroom culture To describe student behaviors	Ethnographic approach
Map	Map of room that includes labeled physical spaces Maps of room that include teacher and student movement	To describe enacted teacher practice, classroom culture, and student behaviors in relation to physical spaces in the room	Ethnographic approach
Photos	Digital pictures of physical spaces and resources in the classroom	To describe enacted practices and classroom culture in relation to physical spaces in the room	Ethnographic approach
Video	Digital video of teacher instructing or facilitating student work Digital video of students working, alone or in groups	To describe verbal and non-verbal messages that contribute to classroom culture	Ethnographic approach Multimodal analysis
Audio	Digital audio of teacher instructing or facilitating student work Digital audio of student small group work	To describe oral interactions in the classroom that contribute to classroom culture	Discourse analysis

Inquiry Data			
Survey	Student attitudinal survey (pre and post instruction)	To surface aspects of students' confidence and engagement with writing To describe classroom culture	Discourse analysis Grounded theory
Interview	Teacher semi-structured interview (pre and post collaboration)	To surface knowledge, beliefs, and values	Discourse analysis
Conference	Conferences with teacher • Student survey reflection/data analysis after pre and post • Collaborative planning of writing unit(s) • Analysis of/reflection on observational data • Collaborative scoring	To surface knowledge, beliefs, and values	Content analysis Discourse analysis
Artifact Data			
Lesson plans	Writing unit/lesson plans	To document instructional intentions	Discourse Analysis
Assessment & scoring guide	Writing assessments & scoring guides	To document instructional intentions To document expectations for student performance	Content analysis
Student writing	Writing Samples: Pre-assessment writing 　　Teacher selects samples (two high, two medium, two low) from pre-assessment Summative writing pieces 　　Same students from pre-assessment selection	To analyze writing proficiency	Scoring guide

Appendix F

Sample Semi-structured Interview Questions

1) Describe any experiences you've had with writing, outside of your teaching

2) Describe your experiences with teaching writing.

3) What are your strengths as a writing teacher?

4) What do you want to work on as a writing teacher?

5) What is important for middle school students to learn, with respect to writing? Include why you think those things are important.

6) Describe your students' writing. If you don't have information about your current group of students, describe the writing from past students.

Appendix G

Sample Survey Question

Directions: After reading each statement, circle your level of agreement.

1. I like to write.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. I put a lot of effort into writing.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. My writing has strengths.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. My teacher helps me make my writing better.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5.   Other students help me make my writing better.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6.   I can help other students improve their writing.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Directions: Answer the following prompts with as much detail as you can.

7. Explain what helps you get better at writing.

8. Explain what makes it hard for you to get better at writing.

9. Describe the ELA class environment during writing activities.

10. Describe how you feel in ELA class during writing activities.

Classroom Writing Communities

Initial Research Study

Culminating Project

"I'm Afraid My Own Beliefs Kind of Affect It":

How One Teacher's Stances are Reflected in Her Instructional Practice

Angela Muse

University of Missouri, Saint Louis

Abstract

Are classrooms preparing students with the literacy skills they need for school, work, and life? When students don't meet expectations, educators tend to seek answers in innovative programs or research-based practices that promise success. The practices teachers use, however, are neither selected nor enacted in a vacuum. To fully understand what is happening in a classroom, one needs to consider not only the instructional practices teachers use but also the context in which teachers select and enact these practices and the effect these practices have on our students. The impetus for this study came from a broader desire to dig deeper into practices that create successful writing communities in secondary classrooms. A teacher's pedagogical decision-making is crucial in developing a classroom writing community. How is this decision-making influenced by a teacher's stance on writing, instructions, and her students? This study used discourse analysis to focus on one teacher's talk and classroom interactions about writing and in a large, suburban, middle school. The teacher's talk and interactions reflected stances on herself as writer and teacher, on writing and teaching writing, and on her students as writers. The researcher found clear connections between a teacher's discourse and her practice, indicating that instructional decision-making is influenced by stance. This study has implications not only for teachers but also for administrators, professional development leaders, or teacher educators. Change in a classroom is not simply a matter of mandating certain programs or practices. A teacher's stance must be addressed in reflective practice, professional development, and teacher preparation because stance informs practice.

Keywords: writing, instruction, stance, identity, decision-making

"I'm Afraid My Own Beliefs Kind of Affect It":

How One Teacher's Stances are Reflected in Her Instructional Practice

Introduction

Classrooms are complex communities. To make informed decisions in our

classrooms, we need to get a clear picture of what is happening. We need to consider not

only the instructional practices we select but also the context in which we enact these

practices and the effect these practices have on our students. The impetus for this study

came from a broader desire to dig deeper into practices that create successful writing

communities in secondary classrooms. How does a teacher's stance influence his or her

practice? How does his or her practice influence classroom culture? How does classroom

culture influence student achievement? This particular study will focus on how teacher

stances might influences practice.

A teacher's pedagogical decision-making is crucial in developing a classroom

writing community. What should I teach? How should I teach it? These are the obvious

questions that shape a teacher's practice. Other question may insert themselves into this

decision-making, often at a subconscious level: Why should I teach this? Do I care about

this? Am I good at this? Can I teach this? Do I really know how to teach this? Can my

students do this? How a teacher answers these questions shapes what she teaches and

how she teaches it. In a writing classroom, the teacher's stances toward writing,

instruction, and his or her students as writers lays a foundation for this decision-making.

If we want to understand why teachers do what they do in the classroom or help teachers

change their practice, we must know where they stand on writing, writing instruction, and

their students' abilities.

How do we come to know the identities, understandings, and values a teacher

has? We let them talk. This study engaged one teacher in reflection on her practice. I

used discourse analysis to describe, interpret, and explain the complexities of this

teacher's stances about writers and writing. In particular, this study seeks to answer the

following research questions:

- How does a teacher's talk and classroom interactions reflect stances she has

  constructed for herself as a writer and a teacher of writing?

- How are teacher stances reflected in practice?

A review of the literature will show that this study is situated within a large body of

empirical research that arises from a rich theoretical background.

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

The idea that a teacher's knowledge, beliefs, and values can impact the

development of these communities can be seen in the work of Paulo Freire and Mikhail

Bakhtin. The work of Freire (1970) and Bakhtin (1981) theorize that every act and every

utterance is colored by context.

What a teacher says (both verbally and non-verbally) is filled with meaning, some

on levels the teacher isn't aware of.   Bakhtin (1981) posits that our words are not ours

alone. Instead they are saturated with heteroglossia, other people's words and

expressions. Our messages are polyphonic because they incorporate many voices,

including styles, references, and assumption of those who spoke those words to us.   Our words, received from others in the past, go out to others as well, creating a chain of utterances throughout time. Bakhtin (1981) says, "Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated –overpopulated– with the intentions of others" (p. 294). Teachers, then, can share unintended or unrealized messages in their communication with others. It becomes important, then, to think about what we say when reflecting on our practice.

It is also important to think about what we believe about ourselves and our students. A teacher's beliefs and values, according to Freire (1970), will lend itself to one of two types of practices: One grounded in a banking model and one grounded in a problem-posing model.   In the banking model, a student is a bank account, waiting to be filled with the knowledge that only the teacher possesses. It is the duty of the teacher, who understands her informed position as superior, to give that knowledge to students, who are inferior without it.   The problem is that this teacher-held knowledge isn't reality, but an illusion that the teacher has bought into.   In problem-posing education, the teacher helps student gain their own understanding by posing problems through which students engage with the world around them. In order to teach in the problem-posing model, teachers need to be willing to rethink their way of life and to examine their own role. In addition, teachers need to examine their beliefs about their students. "One cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people" (Freire, 1970, p. 84). What do teachers know and believe about their students' funds of knowledge?   Freire (1970) says, "Those who authentically commit themselves to the people must re-examine themselves

constantly" (p. 60). So a teacher's practice is born of knowledge, beliefs, and values, all

of which must be considered when reflecting in order to gain a full picture of the

interactions in the classroom.

Discourse analysis is a critical tool for examining a classroom community for

"dialogue and participation are at the heart of a community of practice" (Rogers &

Mosley Wetzel, 2014, p. 8). Teacher talk, both in the planning and enacting stages of

instruction, should be analyzed closely for language is not neutral. It is replete with

meaning (Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014). Gee (2014) says that in discourse, people are

saying, doing, and being something. Discourse analysis then is a tool that can help us dig

deeply into a teacher's talk in order to determine the meanings about identity, beliefs and

values about writing, and beliefs and values about students.

Related Research

A lot of empirical research has been done on writing instruction. A great deal of

this research focuses on the effectiveness of particular practices.   Read Hillocks's (1986)

classic meta-analysis on writing or a more recent meta-analysis from Graham and Perrin

(2007) to see that much research focuses on whether or not a specific practice is effective.

Because theory tells us that actions are socially situated, my interest is not in the practice

itself but in how a teacher selects and enacts that practice. Because the research

questions for this study concern teacher stances on writing and teaching writing, I will

share literature on teacher and student   formation in literacy classrooms. In addition,

because this study will look at pedagogical decision-making, I will share research on the

connections between stances and practice.

Teacher Identity Formation. Many researcher have focused on how teachers construct identities around their practice. Smagorinky, Cook, and Moore (2004) looked into teacher identity formation with student teachers. These researchers highlighted one case of a teacher whose university methods program urged her to implement constructivist practices while her mentor teacher urged her to mimic the traditional approaches currently being practiced in the classroom. Because human development (in this case, the teacher's formation of teaching identities) happens through action in context (Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1991), the tensions between these two world contributed to her identity as a teacher. Even as she made accommodations, taking up the practices of her mentor teacher she worried about the teacher she was becoming, stating that she was afraid to go over the mentor teacher's side. The researchers followed up with this student teacher during her first year in her own classroom at a different school where the teacher demonstrated both constructivist and traditional practices of her own choosing. New tensions surrounding her practices and those her mentor suggested she try served to further shape her identities at this new school, thought this time the tensions were more productive.

Tensions, as Smagorinsky et al. (2004) conclude, serve to forged teacher identity. This idea is echoed in the Day, Kington, Sobart, and Sammons study (2006) which concluded that teacher identities are formed by the tensions between structures of their job and their ability to take action. In addition, these researchers emphasize that a teacher's identities shift because they formed in context and the context in which teachers work shifts as changes occur in the home, the workplace, or other life worlds they inhabit.

Juzwik and Ives (2010) look at teacher identity as it is formed dialogically in situ, in the daily interactions with their students. These researchers examined a teacher's narrative as it was told in a classroom in preparation for student writing. Their narrative discourse analysis showed how the teacher co-constructed her identities with her students. Juzwik and Ives (2010), Smagorinsky et al. (2004), and Day et al. (2006) are but three slices of research in teacher identity. What about the impact of a teacher's identities on the students they teach?

Student Identity Formation. There is compelling research that makes visible the correlation between a teacher's stances and a student's identity formation. Hall, Johnson, Juzwik, Wortham, and Mosley (2010) present three separate studies that explore identity development of both teachers and literacy learners. These researchers, like Juzwik and Ives (2010) , examine identity formation in situ, as teachers guide students in literacy learning. One of their studies allowed us to see one teacher whose identity as wolf-like in her classroom was constructed as she told a personal narrative to her class. Another study allowed us to see how a teacher's characterization of literacy shapes the way students see literacy and themselves. When a teacher describes behaviors of good readers and bad readers, she is prescribing narrow roles for students to take up, roles that might not fit with their literacy experiences but which they must take on to fit within the culture created. Students' identities, therefore, are shaped by the stances the teacher has taken on literacy.

Fernsten (2005) also looks at student identities as they are shaped not only by teacher stances but also by social structures inherent in writing. This researcher interviewed college writing students, asking them questions about who they are as

writers. Fernsten concluded that student identities as writers are shaped in part by ideologies embedded in the classroom and of power structures inherent in writing. Like Hall et al., Fernsten draws powerful connections between teacher and student identities. On the peripheries of all of this identity research described thus far are pedagogical decision-making and how teacher identities or stances might play into how a teacher enacts certain practices in her class.

Teacher Stances and Pedagogy. Not as widely represented in the literature is an examination of how the choices teachers make when choosing and enacting practices might arise from their stances. Dix and Cawkwell (2011) conducted a study of teacher self-efficacy and writing identity. The general finding indicated that shifts in pedagogy occurred after a shift in teacher identity. Highlighted in this study was the case of an elementary school teacher. By participating in writing workshops with other teachers and reflecting on her writing process, the teacher developed a writing identity and self-efficacy for teaching writing. In her classroom, the teacher included more peer review in her classroom, mirroring the workshop model in which she participated.

Kohnen (2013) work with teachers who were incorporating writing into science class demonstrates a case of a teacher's shift in identity preceding a change in instruction. In this study, a science teacher, used to being what is commonly referred to as a sage on the stage, welcomed a science journalist into her room in order to help students take on the role of investigative writers. This project required students to direct their own learning and this only became possible when the teacher shifted her stance. She made the shift from sage on the stage to fellow writer and lead learner in the process of writing science articles. She assisted rather than directed and wrote articles with the students.

These practices weren't happening in her classroom when she believed she had to be the one to deliver knowledge to her students.

Timperley and Parr (2009) provide another interesting study linking teacher stance to pedagogy. Their work involved the communication of lesson aims to students and the impact on student learning. When lesson aims and mastery criteria were clearly articulated by the teacher, students were able to identify deeper features of writing as the lesson aims. If activities and mastery criteria didn't align with the lesson aims (or lesson aims were not clearly articulated), students identified surface features (such as becoming a good writer) as the lesson aims rather than those articulated by the teacher. Good instruction, with activities and performance expectations in alignment with well-articulated lesson aims, make writing features explicit for students. Although Timperley and Parr weren't primarily focused on teacher stance, questions about teacher stance on writing can follow: What happens then, when a teacher does not fully understand the lesson aims enough to either clearly explain them or align instruction? What if lesson aims are mandated by a district but a teacher does not value them? It is precisely situations like these that peaked my interest as a researcher.

Research Design and Methodology

This case study focuses on the discourse of a middle school teacher who was interested in studying her practice in the area of writing instruction. Case studies deal with bounded systems, presenting an in-depth description and analysis of one unit of study (Merriam, 2009). In this case, the unit of study is one teacher, with one class of students, teaching one lesson from a unit on argumentative writing.

Context

Dana, the pseudonym we will use for this study, is a Caucasian, middle-aged, female teacher who has been teaching for more than fifteen years. For all but the first three years of her career, this teacher has been working in a large school district situated in the suburbs of a large Midwestern city. For the last eight years, Dana has worked at a middle school where the majority of the students are African-American and from families that are often labeled as lower-middle and middle class. The school typically enrolls between 750 and 800 students. In the 2014-15 school year, forty-nine percent qualified for free or reduced lunch and eighty percent were classified as African-American students.

On state tests, this school (like the other middle schools in the district) regularly performs below state averages. Improvements from year to year, when they happen, are generally slight. Increasing student achievement, then, is a priority for not only this school but also this district. Currently this building is focusing the following district-mandated practices to increase student achievement: 1) increasing rigor and relevance of student work, 2) using classroom formative and summative assessments to increase learning, and 3) using the data team process in professional learning communities (PLCs) to inform practice. In addition to these initiatives, an extensive teacher evaluation system was in its first year of implementation in the 2014-15 school year. Also, it is important to note, this particular school began to use homogeneous grouping based on level of instructional support needed for math and English language arts (ELA) classes in the 2014-15 school year. All students have been designated as Tier 1, 2, or 3 in math and ELA based upon a triangulation of assessments and documented instructional needs. Dana teaches two Tier 2 classes and one Tier 1 class.

Writing hasn't been an instructional focus at the district level for the last eight years. Before that, the district demonstrated a commitment to improving student writing through required common formative writing assessments for all content areas; established professional development time for collaborative scoring of student work; and summer training opportunities for ELA teachers. During that time in the district, Dana became familiar with the Six Traits model of writing, supported students in using a writing process, regularly assigned and assessed the district prompts, and scored student writing according to a district-wide, six-trait scoring guide. Since the district shifted focus away from writing, Dana hasn't often asked her students to do formal writing assignments. She has most frequently assigned five paragraph essays to teach her students about essay structure. She has stated that while she has *assigned* writing in the past, she hasn't really *taught* writing.

For the three years prior to this study, Dana had been working on a district curriculum writing committee. She became familiar with the Common Core Standards for writing and came to the decision that she needed to focus on teaching writing. She made a commitment to herself to teach more writing, but she wasn't satisfied with her attempts to do so. A part of her frustration is her uncertainty about what to teach and how to teach it. In addition, Dana is not confident in her own writing abilities. Teaching students to improve their writing was frustrating. It was at this point that Dana came to me, her building's instructional coach, to seek support. I invited Dana to be a part of this study after she expressed interest in working with me on a implementing a writing unit.

It is important to examine my role as the researcher in this study. Like Dana, I am a Caucasian, middle-age female. Before my work as an instructional coach, I taught middle school ELA. My role in the study has elements of both an insider and an outsider. Because I work in the school in which I am doing research, I am an insider. Because I haven't spent a lot of time in Dana's classroom this year, I am an outsider. My relationship with Dana is of critical importance to this analysis of context. I have worked in the same school as Dana for her entire career in the district. I have served as her teaching colleague, her department chair, her team leader, and her coach. While Dana and I have a social relationship as well as a collegial relationship, it is significant that a majority of our working relationship has put me in positions of authority. While I have worked hard to develop my role as coaching partner, separate from the evaluative aspects of administration, it is still a role which, for some, has connotations of both an insider and an outsider.

The Data Sources

The primary data source for this research was a semi-structured interview (See Appendix B.) This audio-taped interview allowed Dana to talk in response to questions pertaining to her experiences with writing and teaching writing. This interview allowed the teacher to explore not only her experiences and skills with writing but also her students'. The questions, given to Dana ahead of time, were designed to help her explore her stances on writing and writers. Questions related to her identity as a writer, her identity as a teacher of writing, her beliefs about writing, and her beliefs about her students. The interview took place Learning Lounge, a place in the school that teachers use to work collaboratively with peers, have committee meetings, or meet with the

instructional coach.   This was, again, a decision made by the teacher.   Immediately

following the interview, I typed up notes about the interview. I created a summary of the

interview sections that detailed what Dana wanted to focus on instructionally and gave

them to her at the start of the our first planning conference.

Planning conferences between teacher and researcher, conducted at least once a

week, were audio taped for potential transcription. I took notes during these conferences

and created summary notes afterward. These discussions centered on instructional

purposes, goals, content issues, assessment, and instructional strategies.

Another significant source of data was classroom observation. A video recording

of the Dana's instruction during one lesson in her writing unit allowed me to examine her

practice and consider how her talk and interaction reveals any stances she's created for

herself, any beliefs and values she holds about writing or her students. This particular

lesson, situated at the beginning of a unit on argumentative writing, focused on creating a

fact-based argument using evidence from a fictional murder scene. Specifically, students

were constructing warrant or rules that would connect evidence from the murder scene to

a claim about the murder.

Analytic Procedures

To analyze these data, I drew on critical approaches to discourse analysis

including critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2014; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014),

narrative analysis (Bruner, 1987; Johnstone, 2001; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014), and

multimodal discourse analysis (Jewitt, 2008; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014). My

analysis occurred across a number of stages, which I describe here.

The first stage of data analysis involved the creation of a transcript. The first draft was written to capture words, pitch drops and turn-taking. On a second playing of the audio recording, the flow of conversation was one focus. Notations were made for overlapping speech, contiguous utterances, interruptions, and self-corrections. In addition, notations were made denoting both brief pauses (.5 sec) as well as longer ones. The third playing of the transcript afforded a look at subtle features that convey meaning: word elongation, emphasis, inhalations or exhalation, notably varied volume, and marked increases or decreases in speed. After representing the dialogue with the three passes through the audio, the transcript was segmented. Turn-taking was still the primary structure, but within each turn discourse was segmented into short clauses.

Critical Discourse Analysis. The second stage of data analysis involved the use of Critical Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2014; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014) Critically oriented forms of discourse analysis allow us to understand the relationship between semiotic resources and social interaction (Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014). Our framework for analyzing this interaction utilized Fairclough's three orders of discourse: genre, discourse, and style (2011; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014).   Using Dana's interview, I examined the ways of interacting (genre). What structures were utilized? Who introduced topics? Where were instances of cohesion or disruption? Were there repetitions or false starts and stops that need to be examined. These are just a few of the aspects of genre that were explored.   Using the same passages from the interview, I examined the ways of representing (discourse). What information was at the forefront of conversation? What information got little or no attention? Examining the discourse allowed me to see the macro-narratives or cultural models about writing that Dana has

taken up.   Finally, the interview transcript was analyzed for ways of being (style). How did Dana orient herself in this discourse? Considering such linguistic features as voice, mood, tense, appraisals, and affinity statement, I was able to the identity work being done through this interview.

The orders of discourse were not examined one at a time for the entire length of the transcript. Instead I examined sections that revolved around themes that emerged from the first few readings of the transcript: Dana as a writer, Dana as a writing teacher, Dana's knowledge or beliefs about writing, and knowledge or beliefs about her students. Each line in the thematically significant portions of the transcript was considered for all three orders of discourse as they are so closely linked together.

In analyzing the text in this way, it became clear that the thematic chunks were no clearly delineated. Phrases about Dana as a writer showed up in the middle of sections about Dana as a teacher. In order to draw conclusions about the data, I needed to isolate the utterances thematically. The result was clusters of statements surrounding the themes listed above. In looking at individual lines for thematic clusters, I noticed new themes that emerged. Most significant was a large cluster of pedagogical questions or statements of ambiguity about instruction practice.

Narrative Analysis. The third stage of data analysis utilized a structural narrative analysis (Johnstone, 2001; Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014) of portions of the transcript. Approaches to narrative analysis focus on people using narratives to "represent their goals, stances, and ideas a(nd, in turn, construct the world" (Rogers & Mosley Wetzel, 2014).   Jerome Bruner (1987) writes about the connections between our lives and narrative. He says the ways we tell about our lives change the way we live our lives.

In the context of my study, I wondered how Dana was telling about her life as a writer and a teacher of writing, including stories about her students as writers. How might these stories influence her future actions?

Using a structural narrative analysis, I first identified narratives in Dana's interview. Then, I segmented the narratives into stanzas. For the purposes of this study, a narrative was a larger idea cluster within which one or more micro-narratives (or stanzas) were situated. For instance, one narrative in Dana's interview concerned her experiences with writing. That narrative was broken into two three stanzas or small idea clusters around 1) Dana's K-12 writing experiences, 2) One experiences with writing PD, and 3) her stance on difference types of writing. See Appendix E for a table displaying the interview represented in narratives and stanzas. Each stanza was then analyzed for elements of a personal experience narrative: orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution, and coda. This study utilized the explanation of narrative structure outlined in Rogers & Mosley Wetzel (2014) as well as Johnstone (2001).

After segmenting the transcript, I looked within and across those narratives for similarities, differences, and shifts. I first focused on portions of the transcript concerning Dana's experiences with writing. I knew this portion of the transcript was key to the identity she was creating for herself as a writer and I wanted to see this portion of discourse through both a critical discourse lens as well as a structural narrative lens. I identified each line of each stanza according to the elements of the personal experience narrative listed above. In addition to looking closely at her experiences with writing, I looked at the narrative told across the stanzas about the different types of writing she taught.   Looking at a stanza structurally gave me a chance to notice, for example, that

the interviewer helped to construct both the orientation and the coda. Similarly, I was

able to note that the lack of developed narrative structure in the stanzas like I Did

Gateway (narrative 1, stanza 2).   See Appendix F for a structural analysis of a portion of

Dana's interview.

　　　　After analyzing the structure of each stanza, I looked across stanzas in order to

identify similarities or differences. I was able to see, for instance, that the co-

construction of narrative happened across numerous stanzas in very much the same way.

In addition, I was able to compare the lack of narrative development in a stanza like I Did

Gateway, which summarizes the Dana's PD experiences with writing, and contrast it to a

stanzas like Expectations for Memoir (narrative 6 stanza 4), which details the teacher's

experiences with teaching memoirs. This structural narrative analysis, both within and

across narratives and stanzas allowed me to examine the stances and beliefs Dana holds

about writing, teaching, and her students.

　　　　Multimodal Discourse Analysis. The final stage of discourse analysis utilized a

multimodal approach to exam data from a short video clip of Dana's instruction. During

the lesson I observed on writing fact-based arguments, Dana and her students spent about

25 minutes co-constructing a sentence that would serve as a rule.   As I watched the

video-taped lesson, I noted stances on writing and writers that emerged from Dana's

discourse.   A 45 second excerpt was chosen for transcription and analysis because it

echoed stances that previously emerged in Dana's interview.   A multimodal perspective

on this instructional interaction allowed me to see Dana's construction of stance in a new

way. People have vast semiotic resources with which they make meaning. The spoken

word is only one part of a communicative act. People draw on a variety of additional

modes to compose a message. Tone, gesture, gaze, and movement are modes that also

configure meaning (Jewitt, 2008). I had these modes in mind as I prepared the

multimodal transcript. See Appendix G for a portion of this multimodal transcript. In

addition to the transcript, I also described and photographed the room, including the

artifact (an ongoing draft of a class-constructed sentence) used in the lesson, desk

configuration, posters, and various other artifacts and resources around the classroom.

Informed by the work of Rogers and Mosley Wetzel (2014), I analyzed this

transcript in terms of the genre, discourse, and style of Dana's communicative acts within

and across clauses. I wanted to consider each clause for its function in the interaction

between this teacher and her students (genre).   I also wanted to look at each clause for

the themes or topics taken up in this interaction (discourse). Finally, I wanted to look

closely at the language to determine how Dana positioned herself in the discourse. After

a close look at each clause in the interaction, I took a step back and looked at patterns

across the interaction. My first step was looking at the turn-taking structure and lexical

count. How many turns were taken by the teacher and how many by the students? How

many words did the teacher speak as compared to the students? How long did her turns

take in the overall conversation? How were varied modes of meaning making (dialogue,

glance, gesture, etc.) used to structure this interaction? I sought this data to support

findings on whose voices were valued in this lesson. My second step was looking for

lexical items or topics that showed how Dana represented writing and writers. Is writing

seen as a skill or a process? How are specific aspects of writing characterized? How is

the work they are doing in the lesson situated within a bigger picture of writing? My

final step was looking for patterns in how she situated herself in this interaction. How did

she position herself with the students? How did position her students? How did she

express her relationship to the writing topics presented? This multimodal analysis

articulated the rich panorama of discourse that Dana uses to construct her stances on

writing and writers. Alongside the Critical Discourse Analysis and Structural Narrative

Analysis of the interview, the Multimodal Discourse Analysis of the video-taped

instruction allowed me to see Dana's stances through her talk and her interaction with

students.

Researcher Roles

As explained in the context section above, my roles as researcher and building

coach, as well as my lengthy relationship with the participant, are important to this study.

How Dana and I approached our work together and represented ourselves in this

collaboration must be considered. I was primarily concerned about minimizing coercion.

In particular, I wanted the primary instructional decision-maker to be Dana. I practiced

an instructional coaching method that involves a partnership approach in which the coach

seeks to guide as opposed to direct a teacher's reflection and planning (Knight, 2007).

During the interview itself, I repeated her ideas to check that my received meaning

matched her intended meaning. A summary from each conference was given to Dana via

email to make sure that the salient points were captured as she intended. This summary

was also repeated at the beginning of the subsequent conference. This member checking

was one way that I ensured validity and minimized the potentially coercive nature of our

relative positions.

Findings

A multi-layered discourse analysis allowed me to examine closely the various stances that Dana constructed around writing and writers. To share the results of this study, I've organized the findings according to stances. Using each stance as a lens through which I share the analysis allowed me to layer together the results of the three methods of discourse analysis described above.

Before this study began Dana came to me and asked me to work with her on writing instruction. She said that she didn't ask her students to do much extended writing this year. When she did, she didn't really teach writing; she just assigned it.   Dana often said that she disliked teaching writing, but she was earnest in her desire to improve her practice. After investigating the stances detailed below, it was clear that Dana has many stances on writing and teaching writing that inform her decision-making. As a writer, she defines her strengths clearly, but discourse about her weaknesses abound.   As a teacher, she identifies more as a reading teacher than a writing teacher.   A lot of doubt surrounds her practice, though some clearly defined values around developing ideas, organizing ideas, and using standard language conventions emerge.

Dana's Stances

Teacher as writer. The first lens through which the participant's discourse was examined was teacher as writer. Does the teacher see herself as a writer?   How have her experiences shaped her as a writer? How does she characterize her skills as a writer? The first question of the interview asked the teacher to describe her experiences with writing. Outside of teaching, what experiences in her education or in her personal life has she had with writing?

Dana's reply is a narrative about her experiences with writing that can be divided into three stanzas: Typical School Experiences (a brief summary of the types of papers she wrote in school), I Did Gateway (a brief reference to a writing PD session), and I Don't Mind Expository (a stanza that details her likes and dislikes of certain types of writing). Stanzas in this narrative ranged from 5-12 lines each.   The lines on the stanza where she recalls a writing PD experiences is only one line less that the stanza where she summarized her K-college experiences as a writer. Both were shorter than the final stanza were Dana explains how she likes—and it good at—expository writing as opposed to what she dislikes and does poorly.

The participant's summation of her school-based writing experiences was a fairly brief summary of the types of papers she had written:

1   Um:: Just the typical school experiences through elementary, high school.
2   They were mostly just research papers and: response based papers
3   not very narrative slash creative.
4   College was pretty much the same,
5   it was just paper after paper, research, expository.
6   After that there was none. ·
7   I · I did not write **anything**..

No mention was made of sharing writing with an audience or the emotional connections that could follow (fear, excitement, pride, etc.). No mention was made of the teachers involved in these experiences or the ideas explored in the writings. The word "just," used three times in this short excerpt qualifies these experiences, indicating Dana's perception that her writing experiences were limited.

With some prompting, Dana elaborated on her experiences by explaining likes and dislikes and strengths and weaknesses of various types of writing.

21   I don't mind expository

22   in fact I like that.
23   It's very straight forward and blunt ·
24   the creative parts ·
25   couldn't stand it. Hated it · struggled everything ·
26   coming up with the words.
27   All my words sounded elementary.
28   Very: basic level ·
29   there's no: higher order thinking or higher word choice er: · >anything whatsoever in my writing.<
30   I like the very black and white and straight forward ·
31   I can pull it from a book and interpret it.

The only affinity statements she made in regard to writing or her writing skills were the two mildly appreciative phrases about expository writing and the following lines that end her self-assessment: "I like the very black and white and straight forward/I can pull it from a book and interpret it" (lines 30-31). The bulk of her self-assessment detailed perceived qualities of substandard performance (lines 24-29). She explains how she "struggled" coming up with words, words that she described as "elementary" and "basic." The types of writing associated with her negative self-assessment is infused with emotion. She "couldn't stand" creative writing. In fact, she "hated it." This description is in sharp contrast with the mildly appreciative phrases previously mentioned. The teacher rarely lingered on what she likes or what she does well. Here, at the beginning of her interview, Dana begins construction of an identity. As a writer, she struggles. In other parts of the interview, Dana echoes the identity of a struggling writer. "So I think my inability at times comes through in my teaching / because if I really don't know how to write it well / how can I teach them how to write it well?" (lines 42-43) "Later, when she was talking about a unit on memoir writing that she had previously taught, Dana explained that she was looking for an expression of commitment in her students' writing. While she was reflecting on their progress with this, she

characterized her own writing in the following way: "U:m so:me I felt like it was me writing it because it was so dry" (line 478).

Dana takes a clear stance as a writer: She struggles as a writer and has a narrow comfort zone. How do these stance impact her decision-making as a teacher? In planning conferences with Dana, she selected argument writing for her next unit, staying within her comfort zone. When detailing the learning goals for this unit, she listed the skills she listed as strengths in this interview: Making claims and supporting claims with evidence.

Beliefs about writing. A second lens through which Dana's Discourse was beliefs about writing. A look across narratives and stanzas in the interview shows that Dana often frames writing in terms of types, modes, or genres. When she speaks of her lack of confidence as a teacher of writing in one of the stanzas, she frames her abilities in terms of types of writing. When she talks about her strengths as a writing teacher in another stanza, she again frames her reflection in terms of types. Additionally, the longest narrative in the interview is, by far, the one about the different types of writing she has taught. It is clear that writing, for Dana, revolves around types of writing.

It is during the elaboration on her experiences with writing that the teacher set up a dichotomy between narrative/creative writing (association made by the participant) and expository writing. This duality was echoed throughout the interview. It was interesting that when she described her stance toward the two forms, she used very different ways to describe them. For expository writing, she expressed affinity in a mild way, saying that she "doesn't mind it" and that she "likes" it. In expressing her problematic relationship with creative writing, she uses stronger statements like couldn't stand it, hated, and

struggled. Emotions are more strongly linked to the negative aspects of her writing performance.

Expository, informative, and argumentative writing, which Dana states are all closely related, are all characterized as simple: "State your stance, back it up with facts." In fact, in several places, when she refers to this type of writing, she refers to the structural elements. Structural elements of writing is a privileged topic for Dana. She mentioned it in several places in her interview, and she listed structural elements in her plan. Not only does she consider "the perfect five paragraph essay" as one of her strengths, she talks about teaching expository in the following way: "And, expository, piece of cake/ No big deal/ I can teach topic sentence/ now stick to topic/ give the great details/ and that's it" (lines 47-52).

Contradictions can be found in her characterization of writing. "I like the very black and white and straight forward/I can pull it from a book and interpret it" (lines 30-31). It is interesting to note, however, that a bit of contradiction was detected in these two lines. She said she likes the black and white/straightforward aspects of writing, yet when she went on to give an example, she spoke of interpretation—which is necessary when there is ambiguity. Did this teacher not see that interpretation is far from black and white? Alternately, did this teacher mislabel what she does well? The subsequent data didn't offer conclusive answers. Also contradictory is what Dana considers important in writing. In her interview, Dana speaks about what she considers important for students to know. She mentions in at least five stanzas that language conventions (spelling, grammar, etc.) are very important to her. She also discusses structural aspects of writing

in various places in her interview. Significant time in class, however, was devoted

wordsmithing one sentence, constructing the wording to perfectly represent the ideas.

This portion of the tape used for multimodal analysis was situated within this

sentence crafting session. Within the 45 second clip, word choice is a privileged topic.

Student suggest wording and the teacher gives feedback on these suggestions. The

teacher wonders aloud if the words emergency "really engulf" the situation. When

horrible is suggested, she rejects this quickly: "Ew. Horrible's real high. Makes Me

Nervous." Using gestures on both of these examples, Dana tries to convey through words

and non-verbal signs that the given examples just aren't adequate. In a planning

conference following this class session, I asked the teacher what was meant by high. She

explained that this is the terminology they've been using to indicate more intense words.

(Furious, for example, would be a more intense word than mad.) This idea of words have

high/low value was also seen in the interview where Dana speaks about her own use of

words, describing her skills as "very low level" and quite "elementary."

Teacher of writing. The third lens through which this transcript was examined

involves the participant as a teacher of writing. Does the participant see herself as a

successful writing teacher? What impact does she have?

Sometimes the statements were strong declaration of weakness, calling her

writing instruction "low-level" for instance. Other times, statements subtly suggested

weakness: "Which I guess isn't—that isn't I guess not that bad."   When compared to

the statements of strengths as a teacher ("formula writing is my strength") the negative

statements outnumbered the positive by more than two to one.

At one point in the interview, after Dana had been explaining areas of teaching writing she was unsure of, I prompted her to explain strengths she had as a writing teacher. After laugher, pauses, and repetitions, she stated (without explanation) that expository formula writing is her strength. This very short section, when compared to longer stanzas about Dana's strengths in in other aspects of teacher, like analyzing text and building relationships, is telling. Her identity as a writer mirrors her identity as a writing teacher: she claims limited strengths.

In addition to looking collectively at the teacher's perceived instructional strengths and weaknesses, this study looked at the number of statements of ambiguity about practice. In one particular narrative where stanzas detail the instructional areas on which Dana wants to focus, there was a telling structure that didn't fit the aforementioned typical narrative structure. Instead there is a series of questions (conflicts), each followed by explication (evaluation). In these sections, resolutions are typically not made. This string of questions leaves practice up in the air. Questions about what to do. Statements of uncertainty. These genres of discourse outweighed the negative self-assessment of practice. While pedagogical questioning (i.e. "How do you use model texts") isn't a negative self-assessment of practice, when combine with the self-deprecating comments, a lack of confidence is clear.

After noting the lack of confidence as a writing teacher expressed in the interview, it is interesting to see how Dana's stance as a writing teacher is constructed in the classroom. When genre was analyzed across the 45 video clip, is was interesting to note whose voices were valued. The teacher's voice was valued, but only slightly more than students. The teacher, for instance, too six out of 11 turns, spoke 25 out of 45 seconds, and

spoke 62 of the 107 audible words. (More student words were probably spoke, but student voices during a 4 second time frame were inaudible.) It seems that the teacher is willing to hear student voices as they are co-constructing a sentence together. Also supporting this conclusion is the teachers use of the words "we" and "let's think," which indicates a collective responsibility for this composition.

Student voices, however, are not the ones who are ultimately respected. It is Dana, after every suggested wording option, who judges the merit of that wording.

Student: Safety emergency

Teacher: Sa::fety emergency

Student: A horrible (other students inaudible)

Teacher: Ew. Horrible's real high. That makes me nervous

Student: Cause if it's something that traumatizes you that means that you will call for help and it could be—it could be a situation from a medical emergency or if like someone got in a fight=

Teacher: <u>True</u>

The turn-taking structure in the above transcript reinforces the idea that the qualified person to respond to a student is a teacher (as opposed to another student). It is also interesting to note teacher orientation during this exchange. The teacher stands just inside the first row of students or in front of the classroom. She is fairly stationary in her position at the head of the class.

Because this study is ultimately looking for links between a teacher's stance as a writer and teacher and her instructional practice, the various links that this teacher made between her stance and her practice were important to note. "I struggle because of

knowing how to write myself/how to teach the kids how to write/So: I think my inability

at times comes through in my teaching/because if I really don't know how to write it

well/how can I teach them how to write it well." More often than not, Dana's stance as a

writing teacher is fraught with self-doubt and questioning. How does a teacher who

expresses lack of confidence in writing and teaching writing move forward with teaching

it in a classroom space where she is the arbiter of correctness, the person with all the

answers?

Dana's Decision-Making

Dana's stances are evident in the decisions she made in her classroom. From the

posters on her wall to the ways she responds to students during a lesson, her stances are

visible in her practice.

Setting Level Decisions. Signs, posters, data charts, and bookshelves fill the

walls around Dana's classroom: posters about attitude, signs about behavior expectations,

charts about assessment results. Two posters are displayed on a brightly colored bulletin

board, taking center stage on the back wall of Dana's classroom. When she decorated her

room at the beginning of the year, these two posters were prominently displayed above

shelves filled to overflowing with novels making up her classroom library. These posters

are posters. One details various organization patterns in writing. The other poster is

really a set of small related posters, each defining a part of speech. Emerging from

Dana's discourse was a clear value for language conventions and organization. Here,

there is a connection between stance and her instructional decisions.

Curriculum Level Decisions. When Dana approached me for help with writing, I

asked her to talk about what she wanted to do. Was there a certain process, a set of skills,

or a mode of writing that on which she needed to focus? From the very beginning she

identified either informational writing or argumentative writing as a focus. She quickly

settled on argumentative for several reasons. First, she knew it was a part of her new

standards for teaching.   Second, she felt she had mostly covered informational writing

earlier in the year when she taught how to write constructed response answers. Finally,

she felt like argumentative writing and informational writing were pretty much the same

thing: supporting ideas with evidence. This reasoning is very much in line with the

stances Dana constructed when discussing writing. She was comfortable with

informational writing, which was closely linked to argumentative and she felt it was

something she should be doing.

Unit Level Decisions. When Dana discussed what she wanted to teach in this

argument unit, she settled on three key areas of focus: idea development, structure, and

language conventions. Each of these three characteristics often surfaced in Dana's

discourse about writing and teaching writing. It is important to note, however, that each

of these things, while valued and even considered personal writing strengths, were not

identified as teaching strengths. Dana was confident in teaching idea development and

structure, but she was not confidence with grammar instruction. This was an area she

needed to work on. During our planning conversations, Dana also wanted to build in

time for giving students adequate feedback, build in opportunities for choice in writing

topic, and build in supports for the writing process. These three practices were identified

as areas she needed to improve upon in writing.

Lesson Level Decisions. During Dana's lesson on writing a rule to accompany

evidence, she chose to co-construct this rule with her students, taking suggestions for

wording from students. She spend 25 minutes word-smithing this sentence with her

students. Words, as Dana indicated in her interview, are indicators of writing quality.

Good writers use good words, and Dana uses value-laden language when referring to

word and word choice. Words are referred to as high level or low level. Sometimes this

indicates writing quality and sometimes this indicates shades of meaning. Either way,

words are valued in Dana's discourse and pedagogy. Also interesting to how she chose

to respond to student suggestion for wording. She set up an student suggestion/teacher

feedback loop. A student gave a suggestion and she made a judgement on that word.

Throughout Dana's discourse on writing, she talked about right and wrong, correct and

incorrect. She also talked about wanted to give students feedback that will help them

correct their work or help them say the right things. In this discourse, Dana was typically

the person who held this knowledge and she positioned herself as the giver of this

knowledge to her students. This stance is represented in her decision to set up the

feedback loop represented in the lesson detailed above.

Conclusion

This study aligns with the identity research that describe how teachers' stances

make their way into the classrooms (Fernsten, 2005; Hall et al., 2010; Juzwik & Ives,

2010) and impact practice (Dixon, Frank, & Green, 1999; Kohnen, 2013; Timperley &

Parr, 2009). This study extends this research by taking a fine-grain look at the stances

that are woven throughout pedagogical decision-making. It is clear that Dana's unique

stance readies her for practice in ways that are specific to her. What if, however, her

understanding of writing--what is important to teach middle school writers, for instance)

doesn't align with her schools expectations for writing? What if her beliefs about her

own writing limitations help her create a sympathetic perspective of struggling students? If a teacher's knowledge, beliefs, and values inform practice, why then are we not focusing on these things in our professional development and support programs?   More common is the focus on the practices themselves.

As a coach, discourse analysis helped me to see the complexities, inconsistencies and tensions that exist in a teacher's understandings and beliefs about writing practices. This methodology also afforded me the opportunity to see how a teacher's identity as a writer and a teacher of writing play a role in her work.   Discourse analysis offered me a window to see this particular teacher's needs.   Now, when I coach Dana, I know her strengths. Practices grounded in her strengths are a good starting point for her professional development. I know, too, that she has a keen desire to grow in certain practices she values but feels unsure about, and these would be key areas to help her stretch. In addition, I know misunderstanding about writing that need to addressed, insecurities that need to supported, and confidences that need to be highlighted.   If school leaders or professional developers want teachers to teach certain range of writing skills and exposes writers to a variety of practices, shouldn't our teachers feel comfortable with these skills and practices? Shouldn't we attend more closely to their perceived skills and experiences with writing? How does a teacher who expresses lack of confidence in writing and teaching writing move forward with teaching it in a classroom space where she is the arbiter of correctness, the person with all the answers?

Discourse Analysis clearly offers insight into stances that inform practice. Engaging teachers in a study of their own talk or classroom interaction may help teachers identify lines of thinking about writing that are preventing them from enacting desired

practices. Engaging teachers in this kind of action research may also help them identify

stances about themselves or about students that could result in oppressive practice.

Perhaps engaging teachers in reflective practices that focus on the genesis of the

decision-making in the classroom is too complex or not clearly understood. We cannot

afford, however, to focus our resources on encouraging best practices when underlying

knowledge, beliefs, or values may not support their implementation.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans. M.

   Holquist Ed.). Austin, TX: Universtiy of Texas Press.

Bruner, J. (1987). Life as narrative. *social research, 54*(1), 11-32.

Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional

   selves of teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research

   Journal, 32*(4), 601-616.

Dix, S., & Cawkwell, G. (2011). The influence of peer group response: Building a

   teacher and student expertise in the writing classroom. *English Teaching:

   Practice and Critique, 10*(4), 41-57.

Dixon, C. N., Frank, C. R., & Green, J. L. (1999). Classrooms as cultures: Understanding

   the constructed nature of life in classrooms. *Primary Voices K-6, 7*(3), 4-8.

Fairclough, N. (2011). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In R.

Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed.,

pp. 119-126). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fernsten, L. (2005). Discourse and difference. *International Journal of Inclusive

Education, 9*(4), 371-387.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method* (Fourth ed.).

New York: Routledge.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent

students. *Journal of Education Psychology, 99*(3), 445-476.

Hall, L. A., Johnson, A. S., Juzwik, M. M., Wortham, S. E. F., & Mosley, M. (2010).

Teacher identity in the context of literacy teaching: Three explorations of

classroom positioning and interaction in secondary schools. *Teaching and

Teacher Education, 26*(2010), 234-243.

Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*

Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in

Education, 32*, 241-267. doi: 10.2307/20185117

Johnstone, B. (2001). Discourse analysis and narrative. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H.

E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 635-649). Malden,

Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Juzwik, M. M., & Ives, D. (2010). Small stories as resources for performing teacher

identity: Identity-in-interaction in an urban language arts classroom. *Narrative

Inquiry, 20*(1), 37-61. doi: 10.1075/ni.20.1.03juz

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving

instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kohnen, A. M. (2013). "I wouldn't have said it that way": Mediating professional

editorial comments in a secondary school science classroom. *Linguistics and

Education: An International Research Journal, 24*(2), 75-85.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative Research Design*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Rogers, R., & Mosley Wetzel, M. (2014). *Designing critical literacy education through

critical discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Moore, C. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach:

Accomodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher

Education, 55*(1), 8-24.

Timperley, H. S., & Parr, J. M. (2009). What is this lesson about? Instructional processes

and student understandings in writing classrooms. *Curriculum Journal, 20*(1), 43-

60.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin Ed.). Cambridge,

Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Appendix A: Transcription Symbols

Transcription Key:

=	Contiguous utterances
[ ]	Overlapping utterances/simultaneous utterances
/	One second pause
·	Pause, less than one second.
.	Drop in pitch
?	Marked raise in pitch
¿	Slight raise in pitch
--	Self-interruption or correction
:	Elongation of syllable
bold	Emphasis
°	Spoken at lower volume
((-	Marked inhalation
hh))	Marked exhalation
((hh))	Other characteristics of speech delivery
(( ))	Faster than speaker's normal speech
> <	Slower than speaker's normal speech
< >	

Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Semi-structured Interview Questions

7) Describe any experiences you've had with writing, outside of your teaching

8) Describe your experiences with teaching writing.

9) What are your strengths as a writing teacher?

10) What do you want to work on as a writing teacher?

11) What is important for middle school students to learn, with respect to writing?

    Include why you think those things are important.

12) Describe your students' writing. If you don't have information about your current

    group of students, describe the writing from past students.

Appendix C: Partial CDA Analyzed Transcript

CLASSROOM WRITING COMMUNITIES Semi-structured Interview 1 Analyzed Transcript 1/26/15 DB: Participant, Classroom Teacher AM: Researcher, Instructional Coach			
		GENRE	**DISCOURSE**	**STYLE**

		GENRE	DISCOURSE	STYLE
AM:	17 Talk to me 18 about any of those things that you just mentioned. 19 Uh: maybe how you liked it · 20 what you felt about it · um			
DB:	21 I don't mind expository 22 in fact I like that. 23 It's very straight forward and blunt · 24 the creative parts · 25 couldn't stand it. Hated it · struggled everything · 26 coming up with the words. 27 All my words sounded elementary. 28 Very: basic level · 29 there's no: higher order thinking or higher word choice er: · >anything whatsoever in my writing.< 30 I like the very black and white and straight forward · 31 I can pull it from a book and interpret it.	22. "In fact" indicates extended affirmation of previous statement (that she doesn't mind expository) 25. Repetition/listing--multiple ways of explaining dislike/struggle with writing	21. Writing genre 22. Writing preferences 25-26. Writing dislikes and struggles 24. Sets creative parts of writing in opposition to expository 24-25. Hates creative writing. Creative writing not straight forward and blunt 25-28. Negative self-assessment of writing skill. 25-26. Struggled everything. Coming up with the words→idea that writing is a struggle to think of what to say 27. Complex wording = intelligence; simple wording = elementary 30-31. Interpretation is black and white and straight-forward	21. Don't mind—not full praise 22. affinity with expos genre opposition/struggle 24-25. short phrases, no subject 29. Quick phrase--anything whatsoever—emphasis on lack of skill in writing 30-31. affinitiy toward "black and white and straight forward" writing 32. Her skills as writer: "I can pull it form a book and interpret it."
AM	32 Mmhmm			
DB:	33 That's: about it. ((laugh))			

Appendix D: Thematically Grouped Transcript Excerpts

Participant Identity as a Writer: Experiences, Strengths, Weakness, Likes, Dislikes		
Line	Statement	Analysis
4	Um:: Just the typical school experiences through elementary, high school.	• There are "typical" school-based writing in K-12 • "just" devalues her experiences
5	They were mostly just research papers and: response based papers	• Experiences reduced to paper types • "mostly just" devalue her experience • generalized or non-descript nouns w/ verbs of being
6	not very narrative slash creative.	• Experiences reduced to paper types • "narrative slash creative" sets up a link between the two Writing genre--Creativity=narrative • "not very narrative slash creative" creates dichotomy between narrative/creative and research/response
7	College was pretty much the same,	• Compares college to K-12 experiences • Experience weren't varied
8	it was just paper after paper, research, expository.	• Experiences reduced to paper types • "paper after paper"—suggests repetitive work
9	After that there was none. ·	• Passive voice
10	I · I did not write **anything**.	• Switch to active verb—owning the absence of writing (as opposed to owning the other writing she did) • Emphasis on anything, negative assessment of lack of writing
15	they required it for us to come into the district.	• Experience in writing PD was a job requirement
21	I don't mind expository	• Don't mind—not full praise • Writing preferences
22	in fact I like that.	• "In fact" indicates extended affirmation of previous statement (that she doesn't mind expository) • affinity with expos genre • Writing preferences
24	the creative parts ·	• Sets creative parts of writing in opposition to expository • short phrases, no subject
25	couldn't stand it. Hated it · struggled everything ·	• Writing dislikes and struggles • opposition/struggle • Repetition/listing--multiple ways of explaining dislike/struggle with writing • short phrases, no subject • Writing is a struggle
26	coming up with the words.	• short phrases, no subject • Writing is a struggle ("coming up with the words")
27	All my words sounded elementary.	• Negative self-assessment of writing skill. • Complex wording = intelligence; simple wording = elementary

28	Very: basic level ·	• Negative self-assessment of writing skill.
29	there's no: higher order thinking or higher word choice er: · >anything whatsoever in my writing.<	• Negative self-assessment of writing skill. • Quick phrase--anything whatsoever—emphasis on lack of skill in writing
30	I like the very black and white and straight forward ·	• affinitiy toward "black and white and straight forward" writing
31	I can pull it from a book and interpret it.	• Her skills as writer: "I can pull it form a book and interpret it." • Interpretation is black and white and straight-forward
40	I struggle because of knowing how to write myself ·	• Lack of writing ability
42	So: I think my inability at times comes through in my teaching	• Lack of writing ability
43	because if I really don't know how to write it well	• Lack of writing abiliy
318	Because you think about it mine's not there	• "Mine" refers to confidence as a writer. • Lack of confidence in writing skills
339	I **never** have used a graphic organizer in my writing.	• Explains her own process • Emphasis on never. • Doesn't use graphic organizers
340	I just sit down and start writing. So:: /	• Explains her own process • "just" qualifies her process

Participant Identity as Teacher of Writing: Strengths
Now, constructed response · breeze.
Again, expository, piece of cake, no big deal ·
I can teach topic sentence
I get--I expository I can teach them topic sentence.
I can teach the:m · okay your supporting details ·
formulaic · I guess or formula writing is my strength.
But u:m yeah digging into the writing--the reading part of it¿
That's my strength.
but I think that it's-- i have uh · it · it · I guess an **acceptance** for the kids?
So nobody: I think that's my strength where they don't feel like they:: don't fit in my room.

Participant Identity as a Teacher of Writing: Weaknesses			
Line	Overtly Stated Weakness	Line	Obliquely Stated Weaknesses
40	I struggle because of knowing how to write myself ·	45	U:m I limit it and almost don't teach it.
41	how to teach the kids how to write.	90	U::m. /////// That's it.
42	So: I think my inability at times comes through in my teaching	91	That is honestly it.
43	because if I really don't know how to write it well	102	I would prefer to deal with books and reading materials
44	how can I teach them how to write it well.	103	and / step away from writing altogether.
52	but anything beyond that / very low level.	110	So sometimes I get snookered into believing there's a real vibe
286	I'm afraid m:y own beliefs or my own practices kind of effect it [what she considers important].	113	And I give 'em a lot of chances
302	I struggle with that.	114	whether that's a right or wrong thing
318	Because you think about it mine's [her confidence] not there	115	but I try to do it for a relationship
319	and I'm a teacher	120	So: at least I hope. I mean that's **my**: impression ((laugh)) whether or not they think that is a whole 'nother story [((laugh))]
350	I don't do that [publishing student writing] either.	274	I've ki:nd of got it
354	I don't even **know** the sites out [there.]	383	and I'm finding I I've had to kind of I guess lower **myself** so to speak if you call it that
		584	Which I guess isn't--That isn't I guess not that bad¿

Pedagogical Question or Statements of Ambiguity about Practice	
54	How to break it do:wn.
55	How t-- How **do:** you teach somebody to write.
58	how can you actually guide them to comin' up with their own thinkin'.
61	(-hhh) How do you teach them to think for themselves and their writing ·
67	You know · or is this even the uh the right way to go.
68	Do I just skip over this point?
69	Is this point critical.
75	How do you incorporate that into your writing¿ Or **teaching** of writing.
76	You know · or do you go through and just red mark everything¿
78	How do you lead your students to start to know that.
80	And what are good mini lessons
81	instead of full-fledged boring worksheet / =
131	How do you go step by step with teachin' them okay,
135	(-hh) Where do you start.
136	How do you break it into **small** chu:nks
146	can I get to em in enough time so that
158	How do you teach other kids to be good peer revisers.
163	But how do you teach another child (0.5) to help another child revise well.
165	then what's the right question.
167	And really is it necessary to have a question.
169	So and then with that you know how do you deal with oh well this paper's great.
192	You know? When do you draw that stuff in. U:m /////
193	And does spelling °**matter**? /////
194	I go back and forth with that one=
208	Yea—How--where do you where do you really focus.v
262	O::h. How do you use model texts¿
272	And really how do you use those mentor texts.
275	bu::t I'm not sure how to tie it
321	That probably back--how do you deal with a kid who just says well I can't **write**.
322	I--I--I don't know what to **do**.
342	Well maybe learning how to:: generate some ideas but
345	I don't know.
349	I guess publishing and
444	Maybe **willingness**
447	Maybe.
483	but I don't even know how to teach a child what is effective dialogue in something like that.

Appendix E: **Overview of Narratives and Stanzas**

Narrative 1: Experiences with Writing
Stanza 1: Typical School Experiences
Stanza 2: I did Gateway
Stanza 3: I don't mind expository
Narrative 2: Teaching Writing
Stanza 1: Low Confidence in Teaching Writing
Stanza 2: How Do You Teach Someone How to Write?
Stanza 3: How Do You Incorporate Grammar?
Stanza 4: Formula Writing is My Strength
Stanza 5: Digging into Reading is My Strength
Stanza 6: The Vibes With the Kids
Narrative 3: Focus Areas for Improving Instruction
Stanza 1: How Do You Go Step by Step?
Stanza 2: Probably the Writing Process
Stanza 3: How do You Teach Peer Review?
Stanza 4: Do You Try to Push for More?
Stanza 5: Let's Draw in the Grammar
Stanza 6: Pros and Cons of Spelling
Stanza 7: The Real World is Formal Language
Stanza 8: Recapping Focus Areas
Stanza 9: How Do You Use Model Texts?
Narrative 4: What Do Mddle School Writers Need to Know?
Stanza 1: My Own Beliefs or my Own Practices Kind of Effect It
Stanza 2: These Kids Have Got to Learn Grammar
Stanza 3: Gotta Build Their Confidence
Stanza 4: Learning How to Generate Some Ideas
Stanza 5: Publishing is Probably a Good Confidence Builder
Narrative 5: Students' Strengths and Weaknesses
Stanza 1: How Many Sentences is That?
Stanza 2: I've Had to Lower Myself
Stanza 3: Good Support
Stanza 4: I Don't Know that I Can See What is Strong
Stanza 5: Grammar is Definitely not a Strong One
Sanza 6: Maybe Willingness
Narrative 6: Types of Writing Taught in Class
Stanza 1: I did a Menoir
Stanza 2: Just the Constructed Reponse
Stanza 3: Very Basic Reponses to Text
Stanza 4: Expectations for Memoir
Stanza 5: Expectations for Constructed Response
Stanza 6: I Remember us Talking a out Evidence and Support
Stanza 7: The Ideal 5 Paragraph Essay
Stanza 8: I've Done Poetry
Stanza 9: I Want to Teach Research

Appendix F: Portion of Structurally Analyzed Transcript

SPEAKER		TRANSCRIPT	NARRATIVE STRUCTURE	ANALYTIC NOTES
Narrative 1: Experiences with Writing				
Stanza 1: Typical School Experiences				
AM:	1	Alright so start off talking to me	Orientation	• Interviewer collaborates with speaker to orient the narrative. How does AM's orientation compare across stanza's?
	2	about experiences that you've ha:d writing.	Orientation	
	3	Um outside your teaching. From way back in school all the way to adulthood, experiences with writing.	Orientation	
DB:	4	Um:: Just the typical school experiences through elementary, high school.	Orientation/Complication	• Ln 3 gives leading lines. Does this help or hinder?
	5	They were mostly just research papers and: response based papers	Evaluation	• Ln 5-6: "mostly just" and "not very" are cues that speaker is evaluating her K-12 experiences as limited.
	6	not very narrative slash creative.	Evaluation	
	7	College was pretty much the same,	Complication	• Ln 7-8: "pretty much the same" and "paper after paper" attaches same evaluative experiences on college.
	8	it was just paper after paper, research, expository.	Evaluation	
	9	After that there was none. ·	Complication	
	10	I · I did not write **anything**.	Resolution	• Summarizes many years of experience in a short stanza.
				• Characterizes experiences according to types of writing
Stanza 2: I did Gateway				
AM:	11	Did you ev-- What about any PD experiences with writing?	Orientation	• She doesn't say whether she like it or doesn't like it.
DB:	12	Oo! I did Gateway /	Orientation/Complication	• A lot of explanation on whether or not she did this experience
	13	before I was hired.	Complication	
	14	And that was:::	Complication	
		right--Gateway Writing Project ·	Complication	• Coda here is similar to coda in stanza 1. Experiences cut off with a phrase that makes the lack of anything that follows definite
		I **did** ·	Complication	
	15	they required it for	Evaluation	
		us to come into the district.	Evaluation	
		And then: trying to think · any other /	Coda	
	16	no other PDs.	Coda	
Stanza 3: I don't mind expository				
AM:	17	Talk to me	Orientation	• Orientation again led my A.M.
	18	about any of those things that you just mentioned.	Orientation	

	19	Uh: maybe how you liked it ·	Orientation	• Ln 19-20, gives leading examples like in 1st stanza.
	20	what you felt about it · um	Orientation	• There is a lot of orientation. Why all the buildup?
DB:	21	I don't mind expository	Orientation	• Orientation and resolution – strengths as bookends to weaknesses.
	22	in fact I like that.	Orientation	•
	23	It's very straight forward and blunt ·	Orientation	
	24	the creative parts ·	Orientation	
	25	couldn't stand it. Hated it · struggled everything ·	Complication	
	26	coming up with the words.	Complication	
	27	All my words sounded elementary.	Evaluation	
	28	Very: basic level ·	Evaluation	
	29	there's no: higher order thinking or higher word choice er: · >anything whatsoever in my writing.<	Evaluation	
	30	I like the very black and white and straight forward ·	Resolution	
	31	I can pull it from a book and interpret it.	Resolution	