Audience and Authority in the Professional Writing of Teacher-Authors

Anne Elrod Whitney
Pennsylvania State University

Christine Dawson
Michigan State University

Katie Anderson
KIPP Austin Public Schools

Suyoung Kang, Elsie Olan Rios, Nicole Olcese, and Michael Ridgeman
Pennsylvania State University

This article discusses the ways issues of audience and authority are encountered and addressed by classroom teachers who write journal articles for publication. Drawing on an interview study of K-12 classroom teachers who have published articles in NCTE's journals Language Arts, Voices from the Middle, and English Journal, we show that teachers developed and deployed strikingly different conceptions of audience at different points in their composing process. Before and after writing, they acknowledged the wide and mixed readership of those journals, including university-based scholars; however, while drafting their articles they thought about a much more limited group of "teachers like them." In doing so, these teacher-authors found a concrete way to navigate the contested place of classroom teachers in wider education discourses. We highlight two major implications of this work. First, it complicates the standard advice to writers to "know your audience," showing instead how considerations of audience are closely linked to questions of one's status relative to members of that audience. Second, our work might complicate understandings of legitimate peripheral participation and how members of communities of practice are positioned relative to one another vis-à-vis authority: teacher-authors manipulated notions of authority, temporarily redefining some readers as more central and others as more peripheral, in ways that shifted according to the authority stances those definitions allowed them to take in composing.

Introduction

At an afternoon meeting of a professional writing group for K–12 teachers in our local area, a group of teachers sat around a table sharing ideas and partial drafts of articles for publication. Responding to a call for manuscripts, they worked to develop drafts of articles that described promising slices of their classroom practice or examined problematic teaching situations they had encountered. The teachers around the table differed in terms of degrees held, years of experience in teaching,

prior experience with writing, and familiarity with professional journals, yet they described some shared challenges in developing their articles. They wondered aloud whether they had "enough" evidence, referring to the anecdotes and artifacts from their classrooms that they were analyzing in the drafts. Some worried that they needed more citations or even statistics from some large-scale study in order to make the observations they wished to make. They talked about the appropriate register for addressing the readers of a journal, wondering if it should be like speaking to colleagues in a faculty meeting or writing to a professor in a graduate course. They sometimes wondered whether they might "get in trouble" with their building and district administrators if they expressed criticisms of curricula in place in their school or, more subtly, if they described teaching approaches that differed from the district curriculum guide.

This snapshot illustrates a set of issues that teacher-authors must contend with to successfully produce an article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. They reflect the complex analysis and decision-making involved in a writer's process; at the same time, they also offer insight into the genre(s) of the peer-reviewed "practitioner article" about teaching and the discourse communities that shape and use those genres. When a "peer-reviewed," "practitioner-oriented" journal includes on its review board more university-based than classroom-based reviewers, the very notion of "peer" becomes complicated in ways that teacher-authors must respond to as they write.

The purpose of this article is to examine the issues of audience and authority that arise when classroom teachers write about their teaching for publication in peer-reviewed journals, both at the level of an individual writer's process and at the level of practice in a professional community, through the genres arising from and employed in that community. Using data from an interview study of classroom teachers who have published in NCTE's journals *Language Arts*, *Voices from the Middle*, and *English Journal*, we show how teacher-authors engage matters of audience as they write for publication, with particular attention to how those processes invoke or alter teachers' beliefs about their own status and authority to contribute to the collective knowledge base of their professional community.

Background

Professional Learning through Writing

The way professional writing can promote significant learning experiences for teacher-authors is well documented. In addition, a solid body of research explores how teachers draw upon their own writing experiences as they teach, extending studies of the National Writing Project and other writing-based professional development (Lieberman & Wood, 2003; Perl & Wilson, 1986; Street & Stang, 2009; Sunstein, 1994) that have highlighted the recursive relationship between writing, teacher learning, and the teaching of writing.

Further, Wood and Lieberman (2000) have identified three principles—authorship, authority, and authorizing—that guide the approach to writing at work in National Writing Project professional development, principles that we find in play in professional writing in the current study as well. Wood and Lieberman include in the concept of "authorship" a sense that writers are creators who generate, develop, and claim ownership of ideas. When teachers position themselves as authors, they are then in a position to claim "authority." That is, they "recognize the insights and understandings they have built over time" and "come to see that authority need not always come from outside" (Wood & Lieberman, 2000, p. 266). Finally, the NWP network "authorizes" teachers to move forward in developing and sharing knowledge, lending the credibility of the network and its reputation to the actions of any one teacher within it. The present study is not a study of the NWP or of teacher writing in any single organizational context. Some participants in this study have written on their own; others have written within NWP contexts or in the contexts of university courses, teacher research groups, or local collaborations in a school building or district. Yet, as we will see, teacher-authors in this study did report knowledge and composing practices that made it possible to see themselves as authors and claim the authority necessary to produce articles that were then authorized by NCTE via publication in its peer-reviewed journals.

Authority in the Professional Communities of Teachers

Teachers who write for publication do so in the context of a set of power differentials between university-based researchers and practitioners as well as between teachers and others who participate in educational discourse such as administrators, policymakers, and parents. These differentials are both products of history and tangible features of the rhetorical situation in which teacher-authors find themselves as they write. Shannon (1990) has shown how voices of teachers, once prominent or even dominant in the generation of knowledge about teaching, have been marginalized via shifting conceptions of knowledge generation and whose business it is to generate educational knowledge—and as it turns out, it is often business's business, quite literally. That is, one way of reading the situation of teachers as authorities on teaching is to recognize that teachers are in competition with (and often overpowered by) commercial and political actors interested in moving educational decision-making out of individual classrooms with individual teachers and into more centralized hands. Giroux (2004) has called this "the proletarianization of teacher work" (p. 206). Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999, 1990), among others, have detailed the problems that arise for the entire field of education when the voices of teachers are not integrated into, or taken seriously within, educational discourse; one thing we find in our research is that those problems are also internalized by individual teachers in ways that complicate, and are revealed in, their writing efforts. As DeBlase (2007) points out, "a political and educational climate that conspires

to silence and dismiss teachers' voices" results in "a closed conversation instead of an open and active dialogue around theoretical inquiry, research, and pedagogy" (2007, p. 118–119). Thus, when teachers set out to write for publication, they enter a contested space in which their right to participate is far from settled. As Ivanic (1994) has pointed out, "Writers are positioned . . . not only through what they have said but also through the discourses they have participated in to say it" (Ivanic, 1994, pp. 5–6), and thus social discourses that disempower and de-professionalize teachers can create problems in writing as writers struggle with being positioned in ways they would not have fashioned for themselves.

However, the challenges in teachers' writing are not only issues of the place of teachers in the larger educational sphere. Even when conceived as a friendly group of fellow teachers, the audience for teachers' writing presents problems of authority within communities of practice. Lave and Wenger (1991) have described situated learning through "legitimate peripheral participation" in communities of practice. Legitimacy and authority develop as participants become more deeply involved in the activities of the community of practice. Situated learning is not solely a matter of learning to do certain activities; it is a matter of *becoming* within the sets of relationships and situations of which those activities are a part:

> Activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relationships in which they have meaning . . . The person is defined by as well as defines these relations. Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53)

Boundaries of communities are not static, and communities of practice do not have "centers" acting as targets toward which all learners try to move, nor is there some level of participation one might deem "complete participation" and then use to identify goals for others (p. 36–37). Instead, "peripheral participation means being located in the social world" and must be considered along with all the factors influencing relationships in that world including history of participation, politics, and authority that may flow from status within an institution (p. 36). Thus peripherality involves potential for empowerment, disempowerment, and/or articulation between related communities of practice (p. 36). At issue for teacher-authors are the following questions: (a) how does a teacher-author see his or her own peripherality within the community within which he or she writes, and what decisions in composing follow from that? and (b) how, within communities of practice for professional writing, do participants perceive themselves and one another as qualified or authorized and thus positioned appropriately to speak to others in an authoritative way? Within the community of practice of, for example, readers of *English Journal*, which participants are perceived as peripheral and which are central? When envisioning "the field" as the audience for a piece

of writing, how does a teacher-author claim expertise, placing herself within her conception of the community such that she can speak authoritatively? Sometimes this is a question of de-centering non-classroom-based researchers within one's conception of the community, thus creating space for oneself as an author whose peripheral position is one of potential rather than one of exclusion. Other times it is not about distinctions between institutional roles and notions of expertise but a matter of not wanting to break a taboo of telling any other teacher what to do. If authority develops by consensus in communities of practice, how do members identify themselves as more peripheral or more central, and how does this influence the rhetorical choices they make as they compose writing for an audience of that community? How do teachers enter communities of practice and author identities and agency within the "figured worlds" of those communities (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998)?

All of these questions also activate questions about journal article genres, the forces that shape those genres and the stances they make available (and preclude). Stock (1993, 2001, 2005) has written provocatively about genres for teacher research, demonstrating how teachers' scholarship is developed and disseminated in the anecdote and the workshop. She finds those genres both characteristic and productive of professional communities "constructed of and connected through sustained conversations," citing as examples those found in the National Writing Project, Bread Loaf School of English, Philadelphia Teachers Learning Cooperative, and any of a number of other networks in which teachers inquire together through public, critical examination of their work (Stock, 2005, p. 118).

NCTE's journals represent examples of genres of teacher scholarship in that they can be read as print versions of the professional conversations NCTE (as a teacher network) fosters, but they also carry the particular histories and characteristics of the genres of peer-reviewed journals and journal articles. While *English Journal* was founded in the first year after the founding of NCTE and has always published articles written primarily by teachers, it is also true that "journal" and "journal article" are the dominant genres of university-based researchers. *English Journal* and the other NCTE "practitioner journals" have published many articles written by people outside K–12 classrooms (such as university professors) about people within them (such as teachers and students) (Whitney, 2009b). It does not make sense to characterize the worlds of K–12 education and peer-reviewed research as separate or to claim that university-based scholars are somehow no longer teachers, yet we also know that these worlds are sometimes experienced as starkly different, perhaps especially by those who find themselves walking in both. Fleischer, for example, has described the situation of having "one foot in each world," as a teacher-researcher who also engages the world of "Big R research," and the ways of both seeing and writing that accompany those footholds (Fleischer, 1995, p. 26). While her discussion focuses primarily on processes of conducting

teacher research rather than specifically on preparing an article for publication, her concerns echo those of the participants in this study who found themselves (to use Fleischer's metaphor) shifting their weight from foot to foot at different moments in the process of composing.

Audience and Authority in Writing Processes

Taken at the level of one writer writing, authority issues in composing processes are also strongly tied to sense of the audience(s) for the written work. Dating at least from Walter Ong's (1975) assertion that "the writer's audience is always a fiction," we have in composition an understanding that "audience" is a construction of the writer's making. Long (1980) further elaborates that conceptualizing audience as constructed moves the writer out of a detective role (guessing what an audience is like and would want to know based on whatever limited information is available about them) and instead into a creator role (Long, 1980, pp. 225–226). This role shift for the writer relative to his or her audience is in fact a shift of authorship, a shift toward authority. That is, in composing, one construes (with or without conscious intention) the idea of audience, conjuring an audience into being for the purpose of focusing the author as he or she writes. This image of audience cannot map directly onto the real assemblage of future readers; its purpose instead is to offer leverage to the author as he or she develops the content of the text. As Berkenkotter (1981) found in an early empirical effort to understand audience-making, writers across disciplines shaped "a rich representation of the audience" and "created individual rhetorical contexts or scenarios" within which to compose (Berkenkotter, 1981, p. 395). Thus active analysis and manipulation of audience choices and the consequences of those choices are one set of means by which authors *become* authors—that is, take agentic stances with respect both to audience and to content.

Building on these foundations, as well as on research and theory from both rhetoric and from cognitive studies of writing, Ede (1984) and Kroll (1984), in turn, both offered attempts to parse out for teachers of composition the various ways of conceiving audience and the implications these conceptions might have for teaching. Yet there are differentials in power (real or perceived) between the writer, his or her intended audience, and other authors, from whose fictionalized audiences (Ong, 1975) a writer might draw in fictionalizing his or her own. As Ede and Lunsford (1996) point out, these earlier discussions of audience, while important in their attention to the constructedness of audience (what Ede and Lunsford call "audience as invoked"), ignore or underestimate the potential effects of such differences in power.

Such differences in power, real or perceived, make composing a professional article difficult for many teachers, perhaps especially over the last few years when we commonly read dismissive, deauthorizing comments about teachers in mass

media and policy discussions. As Elbow explains (1987), some audiences are "inhibiting" in that their presence in the moment of composing limits the ability of writers to work out for themselves what the ideas are and what stances the writer may take on them. It is in part in response to imagined/constructed audiences of readers that ideas are composed, but it is also true that some imagined audiences provide more helpful (imagined) responses than others.

Considering the process of becoming an article author as a process of (legitimate peripheral, or central) participation in the community of the field of language arts education, as represented in the genre of the NCTE practitioner journal, composing for an audience of the field certainly invokes power issues. Becoming "expert enough" to share one's ideas in an article is not simply a matter of being a good enough teacher or a good enough writer but also a matter of claiming authority within that community. To "participate" as a teacher-author involves not only seeing who is part of the community ("knowing one's audience" in the most conventional sense), but also knowing how to navigate the power dynamics of such scenes and to manipulate those dynamics, working on who the teacher-author is within the community as well as how he or she is perceived.

In the situation of a teacher composing an article for a professional journal with a readership of both teachers and others who are outside the classroom, we see a site of intersection between, on the one hand, the now well-known tensions in the field about what and whose ideas count and, on the other hand, the ways in which questions of authority crop up in composing processes, especially as those processes relate to audience. In this article, we share results from a study of teacher-authors working in K–12 classrooms who have published articles in peer-reviewed language arts journals. While the backgrounds, situations, and motivations of these teachers varied widely as they approached the task of writing an article, their experiences share a common set of concerns about audience, their perceptions of "the field," and their right to claim membership in that community.

Research Questions

The data we discuss here were collected in the context of a larger study addressing questions of when and why teachers take up writing for publication, the processes they engage in doing so, the resources they draw upon, and the outcomes they report of having written and published. In the analyses we report here, however, we focused specifically on a linked set of research questions:

1. How did published teacher-authors conceive the audience for their work?
2. How did their ideas about audience influence them as they composed an article?
3. How, if at all, did teacher-authors engage questions of authority as they developed articles for publication?

Methods

Given these questions and the theoretical considerations that informed them, we designed an interview study in which teacher-authors who had published in major language arts journals reflected on and discussed their activities in writing for publication. While writers' self-reports offered in interviews are an indirect method of learning about writers' concrete practices when compared to process tracing methods, interviews offer insight into "people's understanding of the meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences and self-understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspective on their lived world" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 116). As such they offer access not only to behavior (in this case, composing behavior) but also to the subjective meanings that contextualize that behavior (Mishler, 1986; Seidman, 2006).

Context

The study focused on those authors of articles in three journals published by NCTE (*Language Arts, Voices from the Middle*, and *English Journal*) who were classroom teachers in a K–12 setting at the time of writing. Those journals were selected by virtue of their status as the "flagship" journals in which teachers might publish work at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels, respectively, in the field of language arts education. All three journals are positioned as the practitioner-oriented journals of their respective grade levels, and all publish work by both classroom teachers and university faculty. As such they represent a site of intersection of many of the issues discussed here—they are peer-reviewed in the academic tradition, and university-based scholars who are accustomed to writing in that context do publish in them. Meanwhile, they are explicitly framed as journals for practitioners and about teaching practice; editors have at various times actively worked to increase submissions by teachers, for example by holding sessions at the Annual Convention of NCTE and more directly by working with teacher-authors in revising submitted articles. As publication venues for teachers, these three journals represent a rather high bar, yet one that historically has indeed been attained by teacher-authors whose works have appeared in their pages.

Participants

Interviewees were selected from a larger participant pool used in a more general study of authorship trends in the three journals (Whitney, 2009b). That pool was formed first by compiling a database of all 407 teacher-authors (defined as authors listing their affiliations in an article's "author blurb" as being in a K–12 classroom setting) publishing in the three journals between 1998 and 2008; those authors were then contacted via email in connection with a survey and were also asked if they would be willing to participate in an interview. One hundred and twenty individuals eventually completed the survey for a final response rate of 34.7% of all authors with working emails at the time of the survey (relatively high for this type

of contact) or 29.48% of the total teacher-authors; of these, 85 indicated willingness to be contacted for an interview. Random stratified sampling was used to identify a group of respondents representing the full range of grade levels (self-reported as elementary, middle, or secondary) and amount of publishing experience present in the pool. The resulting sample was then reviewed to ensure that it reflected the gender and ethnic diversity of the larger pool as well. Thirteen interviewees were eventually recruited to participate. Table 1 summarizes sample characteristics.

Two aspects of the sample limit how the resulting data might be interpreted. First, the small number of participants understandably constrains the kinds of claims we might make based upon the data. We see the reports of these participants as helpful starting points for wider analyses that might subsequently be made. Second, while the characteristics of interviewees in the sample mirror those of the larger pool as closely as possible, we do note that all of the interviewees identified their ethnicity as White. This does reflect the larger pool, as the number of survey respondents indicating an ethnicity other than White was just 4% of the total pool, and only individuals who provided contact information and responded to requests for an interview could be included in the final sample. However, we acknowledge that these results may not reflect ways in which experiences might be shaped by various ethnic backgrounds. We return to this issue again near the end of this article. That said, the sample does offer insight into the experiences of a range of teacher-authors in terms of age, gender, education, type of school, and frequency of publication.

TABLE 1. **Sample Characteristics**

Age range	28–59
Gender	Female: 9 Male: 4
Grade levels taught	Elementary: 2 Middle: 3 High School: 8
Years in education at time of first journal publication	4–26 years
Number of journal articles published	One: 3 interviewees Two to five: 6 interviewees Six or more: 4 interviewees
Highest degree held	Bachelor's: 4 interviewees Master's: 8 interviewees Doctorate: 1 interviewee

Data Collection and Analysis

Previous research with a similar population (Whitney, 2009a; Whitney, 2009b) was used to develop a standardized open-ended interview guide (Patton, 1990, pp. 284–287) that also resonated with the guiding theory and research discussed above. For example, we asked questions about how interviewees envisioned their audiences as they were working on a draft of an article, but we also asked them separate questions about expectations of who readers were. We asked explicit questions about how authors understood those readers to be like or unlike themselves, in an effort to tease out perceived differences in power and status and their implications for authors. We asked questions about the genre of the article, believing that genres represent recurring social action (Miller, 1984), enacted by and within communities of practice. Research team members conducted 90-minute interviews by telephone using this interview guide, the full text of which is included in Appendix A.

An additional note is warranted with respect to data sources: we do not include the participants' published articles themselves as data sources. We read those and, in most cases, directly discussed those with participants in the interviews, but we did not analyze the published texts, and they are not quoted in this article. There are two primary reasons for this. First, the articles are published under participants' real names, and to cite the articles explicitly would make it impossible to offer participants anonymity—which we felt was important in order to make it possible for participants to discuss specific experiences with coauthors, colleagues, school administrators, or even journal editors. Second, our focus in this study was not on the content of the articles or on their finished appearance but on the circumstances of their composition and the perceptions of the authors on their experiences as authors.

Interview transcripts were analyzed collaboratively and recursively. An initial list of codes was developed based on prior conceptualizations; these included codes for references to audience, authority, and the genre of the journal article, for example. Inductive codes were added and earlier codes were revised based on research team observations during and after data collection. The resulting final coding dictionary included both descriptive and interpretative codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and is included in Appendix B. The data were coded by at least two research team members who had participated in common training and feedback. The team then met to further analyze coded data, generate analytical memos (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and offer evidence and counter-evidence in response to one another's memos, finally arriving collaboratively at the assertions we make here.

Finally, we wish to linger on the pronoun "we" that we use as authors of this article. Our research team includes individuals at a variety of stages of professional life: The lead researcher is a tenure-line professor at a research university, and others were at the time of the research graduate students at two research institutions at varying stages of their master's or doctoral preparation. Many are former

classroom teachers from many parts of the United States and other nations. As such, each of us occupies the role of "university-based researcher" with different degrees of comfort and confidence, and some of us once also occupied the roles of "teacher-author" that we now describe. To complicate matters further, several of us are also currently "teacher-authors" in the sense that we write about our own work in university classrooms as well. Thus when we use the pronoun *we,* we usually refer simply to our collective persona as the authors of this article—yet behind that *we,* we note also the *we*s of the teaching profession, of the university research community, and the many and varied slippery places to stand between those locations. In fact, as we discuss below, awareness and manipulation of what is meant by *we* was an important activity of the teachers in the study. It reflects flexible and, sometimes, deliberately alterable conceptions of what makes someone peripheral to or more central to activity with a community of practice. This activity is consistent with our view of teachers' writing activities as situated within communities of practice that include a range of stakeholders in education—and readers of the three journals discussed here—such as university-based and K–12 classroom-based educators possessing varying kinds of expertise both as teachers and as authors, all of whom have been differently "authorized" by themselves and one another to speak to and for the field.

Findings and Discussion

We found that published teacher-authors reported tensions with respect to audience and their own stances of authority relative to an audience. These tensions surfaced as concerns about authority and the right to speak on a particular topic or to a particular audience. They were particularly palpable, first, as teachers considered the possibility of writing for publication and began developing a draft—and again later, as they considered outcomes for themselves and for their articles. In between, during the writing itself, the teachers focused their attention more rhetorically, on the actual audience for the article and conventions for reaching that audience within the genre of the article. They mobilized audience in two ways—by defining who the audience is (and strategically limiting it as they actually engaged in their writing processes), and by considering how this particular audience might interact with their finished piece.

Moving into Authorship: Authority at the Inception of an Article

Authority issues were in play from the moment a teacher-author began to prepare an article. Considering Wood and Lieberman's notion of "authorship" as a creator position from which a writer generates, takes ownership of, and develops ideas, it was not the case that participants in this study found themselves to be in positions of authorship and then, as authors, looked around for something to write about. Instead, teacher-authors' decisions to try writing for publication were tied to specific

content. Content/topic was a way into finding the sense of authority required to enter into the conversation on a topic for all participants in the study. However, there were three main variations in the way this stance of authority translated itself into an attempt at article writing (with some participants reporting more than one of these). First, five of the 13 participants began to write in response to a direct invitation, such as a call for papers on a particular topic or an invitation from a collaborator. Second, four of the 13 participants responded in a more abstract way to a conversation that was beginning or in process in a journal (such as a question raised in a previous article, or a trend in the field they deemed wrong-headed and wanted to challenge). Third, seven of the 13 participants reported receiving reinforcement for their sense of content expertise outside the journal first, for example by being told they were good presenters on a topic, and then moved to writing. (Note that these numbers add up to more than the total number of participants because some participants reported more than one way of entering into writing.)

Excerpts from the interview transcripts help to illustrate how these entry points to article writing worked in practice. For example, Stacey Hillman, a middle school teacher who has published two articles and who had been teaching eight years at the time of her first publication (all names are pseudonyms), saw a call for papers for *Voices from the Middle* that spoke directly to something she was actively working on at that very moment:

> Their theme for this month was [a theme I had been working on in my school], and I thought, "OK. Here I've been working for a long time with this" . . . it really helped me to clarify my ideas about what I was doing with this work, and also to say that "you know, I feel like I do know something about this and can contribute to this issue" . . . I guess I feel like when I read publications, "Wow, everybody knows so much more; this has been done," but [in this case] I felt this field was something that not so much had been written about. But I *had* been working on it, and I could offer something.

In her case, the call acted as an invitation, making the once-distant notion of writing for publication suddenly seem more connected to her teaching and more possible because she had contributions to make.

While Stacey was responding to an explicit invitation in a call for papers, Eileen Smith's sense of invitation was more implicit. A high school teacher who has published three articles with five years of experience at the time of first publication, she began to feel she had authority to submit an article when, after working on a set of issues in her classroom for a while, she encountered journal articles by other authors addressing similar ideas. Her reaction to this was positive: "I think just the idea that, 'hey I read these things in a journal, and I think *I* have ideas that might be interesting to other people' was a challenge that was very intriguing to me." Realizing that she and those authors were thinking about the same things, she found it possible to add her own contribution to an ongoing conversation.

Other teachers reported developing comfort in presenting content in person before claiming authority to write about that content. Jim Weinrich, a high school teacher with one publication who had been teaching nine years when his article was published, for example, moved from a presentation that had received an enthusiastic response to trying an article: "I had it already written up . . . and everybody thought it was so cool." Jerry Matthews, a high school teacher with three published articles who had been teaching 26 years when his first article was published, had long thought of writing about a particular set of teaching practices, but it was only when he had spent three years developing workshops on those practices and sharing them with teachers throughout his region that he eventually felt he had enough authority to publish about them. As he noted, "I think I did the workshops for three years before I wrote the [article] . . . they had to be tested, and I wanted to see that it would work, and once I realized that it did work, then I felt like I had the authority to write the article."

Teachers reported making content-based decisions to begin writing an article—that is, to actively enter established conversations within the larger educational field in which they had heretofore been only listeners. They were already monitoring the dialogue around classroom practices similar to their own, and perhaps had been participating in that dialogue through presentations and workshops, but they needed a way to envision themselves as legitimate participants. They began the process of developing an article via entry points tied to specific content expertise. These entry points ranged from explicit invitations to a more implicit sense of resonating with a topic to cultivating one's own expertise in a certain aspect of the field as a presenter first. An overarching theme, regardless of which entry points were reported, was that the author came to perceive that there were readers who would be able to connect with and understand their ideas. In other words, the author sensed the presence of a potential audience *for particular content* around which he or she had begun to claim some authority to speak.

Audience and Authority within the Genre of the Article

Teacher-authors reported defining the audience for their work differently at various times during the process of preparing an article for publication, shifting between a realistic sense of the readership of the journals they targeted and a less-realistic, more limited sense of the audience of teachers they envisioned as they wrote. In this way, teacher-authors used audience as a handle by which they could maneuver and manipulate authority relationships among various members of the community of practice they saw instantiated in a journal, in ways conducive to producing an article.

Teacher-authors reported a strong awareness of the genre of articles represented in *Language Arts*, *Voices from the Middle*, and *English Journal*. They understood the need for such articles to capture readers' interest and offer specificity through

description of classroom activities and/or student work, to ground discussion in existing research and theory without making the writing inaccessible or allowing the ideas of others to drown out one's own, and to depict complex acts of teaching with nuance and sensitivity. More concretely, they could (with variations in specificity) articulate conventions such as the appropriate length for an article, MLA format, and use of the first person. Further, participants demonstrated that, before writing, they understood an article as an instantiation of a discourse community ("the field") that included both classroom practitioners and others such as university-based researchers. Their accounts of their writing processes frequently included trying to strike a balance between meeting the needs of both teachers and researchers (whose desires as audiences might sometimes conflict), finding a voice that was neither too "academic" nor too colloquial, and citing just the right amount and kind of support for their ideas.

Depending upon the context and point in the writing process, participants talked about audience either as actual readers or as idealized readers (what Ede and Lunsford might call "audience addressed" or "audience invoked"). Before and after writing their articles, all of the participants had fairly explicit understandings of the genre of articles in their target journals, and they were aware of the broad audience for those articles encompassing the discourse communities of both practitioners and scholars. Ten of 13 participants explicitly commented on ways those different audiences' expectations, along with perceived differences in status between school-based and university-based authors, as well as teachers' reluctance to tell other teachers what to do, made it difficult to write an article and/or expressed concerns about having the authority needed to meet those expectations. In these interview responses, we hear echoes of the notion of "audience addressed"—that is, the "real" readers into whose hands a published article might find its way. For example, readers of *English Journal* include secondary English teachers who receive the journal as part of their NCTE memberships, and those teachers represent the full spectrum of backgrounds, teaching contexts, and stances with respect to the issues a teacher-author might take up in an article. Further, the journal is read by university English education professors, graduate students preparing papers, preservice teachers in search of guidance as they approach a particular teaching problem, etc. In other words, audiences were seen as neither a monolithic group nor a necessarily warm and encouraging one to imagine when composing; the university professors in particular caused concern for at least the seven teacher-authors who mentioned them explicitly.

While actually drafting and revising their articles, teacher-authors recast these authority issues in a more pragmatic frame, as audience issues. Asked how they envisioned their audience while drafting, all of the 13 teacher-authors described their audiences as people like themselves, classroom teachers with whom they could identify. These authors often described their purpose in terms of this per-

ceived audience: they wanted to produce something that classroom teachers could use. They wanted to share their own experiences of what worked and sometimes of what did not. For example, Meagan Berthold, a high school teacher who has published two articles with ten years of experience at the time of the first publication, described the audience for *English Journal* as incorporating the full range of "Teachers, college students, grad students." However, while drafting her article, she imagined her audience as "teachers that might be frustrated by students not understanding or using comments on papers," focusing specifically on "how can I make this make sense, and appealing also, to another English teacher?" In a similar manner, Eileen Smith described the readers of *English Journal* as:

> professors or grad students . . . people that work at universities and colleges. I do think that there is a substantial readership of practicing . . . teachers, but at least in my teaching experience, I think that there are a lot of teachers at the high school or middle school level that don't know about [the journal] or if they do, don't read it . . . There are a lot of classroom teachers that read it, but I think it is more known in universities and colleges.

That description characterizes the range of readers of the journal in which her article appeared. Yet when asked how she imagined the audience for her article as she was writing, she replied that she focused on "people that had considered starting a student-publication class" [a class in which a student magazine or other publication would be produced]. This representation of the audience is a tightly bounded subset of classroom teachers, who themselves are just one subset of the larger group of people she earlier listed as readers of the journal.

Writing for *Language Arts*, Kathleen Durand, an elementary school teacher with three published articles who had been teaching 14 years when her first article was published, described her impression of the authors and readers of the journal in this way:

> It's interesting, because I always look because I want to see who is doing the publishing. One of my great frustrations is that in a lot of the articles that are co-authored and at least one of the persons is associated with a university. I would like to see even more teacher authors, or teacher co-authors even. I would love to say that [the readers are] all classroom teachers, but I think it isn't that. I think some classroom teachers read *Language Arts*, but I also know that it's somewhat intense reading, and so I think that people doing professional development read them. I don't know who all reads them. A lot of people I hang out with read them, but they're mostly associated with the Writing Project; a lot of my colleagues at my school don't even know the journals exist.

These comments show Kathleen's awareness of and concern about the mixed audience for articles in the journal, yet when describing her own writing process she took a very different tack, explaining that "when I was writing it, I really did envi-

sion the audience as classroom teachers, and I'm actually glad that I envisioned it in that way, because I've found that the article's been useful for classroom teachers."

In his interview, Jim Weinrich characterized *English Journal* readers as including classroom teachers but also "people that might have been classroom teachers once . . . many of the people in those journals are graduate students and college professors of various sorts." He named this mix as a tension that editors of the NCTE journals must be responsive to, and he described an irony that,

> I do know they want classroom teachers to be part of those journals, and they're not enough a part of it, and [editors] are all very sensitive about that. The university people would love to have classroom teachers involved in the discussion and sometimes they have trouble finding classroom teachers who will contribute.

Yet when asked who was the audience for his own article, he named not university professors or graduate students but "classroom teachers." It is not that the readership of graduate students and professors left his mind entirely, for he remarked that "I wanted to be smart enough for that teacher or researcher type of person, so that could be helpful to them as well—but mostly I wanted classroom teachers to read about it, get interested, and maybe adopt some of the strategies." He reported crafting the article with the classroom teacher audience in mind, making specific choices about language and content accordingly:

> I chose plain English, and I tried to make it compelling to somebody who might be thinking of taking some risks with their own classroom. And I was honest; I talk about my frustrations and things like that . . . all things that I think classroom teachers would have related with. It wasn't written in that kind of obscure language that is so popular at the university level, where they deliberately make writing as convoluted as possible—well, I'm not saying that that's what all university writing is, but that sense that writing has to be inaccessible to be official writing somehow . . . So I wrote it in plain English.

Concerns about the "worlds" within which articles and journals are situated did raise authority concerns and perhaps sometimes stalled writers initially. Yet the successful writers in this study found ways of limiting their sense of audience while writing to a specific group. They imagined peers who sat ready to listen and learn. These were interestingly, however, distant peers whom they typically did not know in real life rather than the actual peers teaching in the classrooms down the hall.

This target audience—teacher-peers interested in the practices under discussion, trying similar practices themselves, and thoughtfully reflecting on their teaching—may or may not reflect the real readership of the journal or, more immediately, the reviewers who might recommend a piece for publication. In fact, those actual audiences contain many more university-based readers than the participants' characterization of "teachers who want to know." In this contrast, between

the acknowledged audiences that authors understood to be readers of the journal and the designated, created and composed audience teachers thought about and spoke to as they wrote, we see teacher-authors engaging in skillful reconceptualizing of audience for a strategic purpose. It is not that teachers were unaware of the incompleteness of their described audience. Instead, in targeting a particular audience, the teacher-authors made a deliberate rhetorical decision that enabled them to inhabit an authoritative footing from which they could write. Thus the "audience invoked" by teacher authors was often consciously at odds with the "audience addressed," depending upon which audience would help the writer be productive in moving forward with the development of the article. The teacher-authors repeatedly acknowledged the wider audience (the discourse community of the field as represented in the journal) and took it into consideration in observing main conventions of the genre. However, to move forward in generating a draft, he or she chose to narrow the vision of audience to focus on a smaller, friendlier, and more local group. We connect this choice to legitimate peripheral participation, noting that perceiving oneself as peripheral, while perhaps accurate, can be inhibiting to writing. Thus these successful teacher-authors, in shifting their conception of audience to one in which they would be more central rather than peripheral, also quite literally *wrote* themselves into more central positions in the field at large. In this way they figure worlds (Holland et al., 1998) that allow them to author themselves and their articles.

While most of the interviewees (11 out of 13) discussed imagining their audience as classroom teachers while writing, there were two divergent responses. These were the two respondents whose publishing records were particularly long (one has published more than sixty articles in various peer-reviewed journals and educational magazines, and the other has published a great number of widely cited and assigned articles and books). These two teachers spoke of simply writing first, and then later considering who might read or relate to what they wrote. We concluded that they had either published so frequently that they had internalized the stances they needed to take with respect to audience or they did not share the fears of rejection and concerns about legitimacy that troubled most beginning teacher-authors. Instead, their interview responses focused on content and self-expression. Thus a first-time publisher such as Julie Devlin, a high school teacher with 17 years of experience at the time her article was published, worried about her audience looking at her context (a private school) and either challenging her knowledge or discounting her arguments because her teaching setting was somehow too advantaged or not enough like those of her readers. In contrast, a more frequent publisher, Thomas Grimes (a high school teacher with six published articles who had seven years experience at the time of the first publication), described his attention as focused first more on what he wanted to "get across," or content and then later on considering the audience. Grimes' responses resonate with the find-

ings, addressed above, that the authority-taking necessary even to begin a piece is tied to content—and that a strong sense of the relevance of a piece's content and the writer's authority related to that content can help teachers overcome concerns about authority as they begin writing. In general, teachers made a wise rhetorical move when they reduced the scope of their imagined audience to include only those they felt most wanted to know about an article's content.

"Authorizing" in/as an Outcome of Writing for Publication

After an article was published, authority issues again became relevant, this time as an outcome of having produced the piece. All 13 of the teachers in the study reported that writing for publication had influenced them to see themselves and/or position themselves as authorities in one or more ways, including: (a) authority with students as a teacher of writing, (b) authority to take a stand with teacher-colleagues, and/or (c) authority to step into leadership roles. These forms of authority usually had less to do with the specific content of published work or the direct expertise in writing developed through the process of publication and more to do with the fact of having published at all. To return to Wood and Lieberman's terms, publication was "authorizing" for teacher-authors to the extent that it opened up possibilities for taking authority stances.

Authority as a Teacher of Writing

Seven of the interviewees talked explicitly about their experience in publication as a source of their authority as teachers of writing working with their own students. They found that having experience in trying to shape a piece for a particular audience—and perhaps, through the article's acceptance, legitimization that the author's practices were indeed successful—helped them to recommend writing practices to students. While they mentioned ways they brought their own specific composing practices and experiences from writing their articles back to their classrooms, these interviewees also spoke more broadly of a stance they felt entitled to take with their students, a position from which to speak "from one writer to another." Thomas Grimes, for instance, mentioned that his writing experiences lent him a kind of credibility as a teacher of writing:

> I could always say to my students and their parents, when I'm teaching writing, "I am a professional writer. I've been a professional writer for a long time. I do a lot of professional writing. I've got a lot of rejection slips, and I've got a lot of acceptances. I've been an editor," just to establish my credibility with my students . . . and so to be able to be in a writing conference with a kid and say, "Oh man, really and I have that problem too; this is what I've tried to do a couple of times."

Living the experiences of a published author allowed these teachers to expand their interaction with students beyond those roles the writing classroom commonly offers—evaluator, behavior manager, and project manager. Instead, they

were able to position themselves as fellow writers—veterans working alongside beginners in a shared craft.

Authority to Take a Stand

Nine teachers reported gaining a sense of the authority needed to take a stand on the merits of particular teaching approaches—whether publicly or for oneself. This entailed not just teaching in a particular way but feeling entitled to do so and even defending it aloud if necessary. The fact of the published article, even if not directly cited, offered teachers a basis from which to claim (silently or aloud) "I know what I'm doing." At times this authority stance was tied to the specific content of a published article; for example, Stacey Hillman described how having published an article about an initiative at one school helped her to feel she could offer her expertise to new colleagues when she later changed jobs. She explained that when the article came out, she was more willing to approach colleagues and try to engage them in taking up similar work, feeling the article gave her the right to say "I know what I'm talking about in this, and I would like to work with you in this realm" even though she did not explicitly mention the article. Thus, she used a publication on a topic as authorization to assertively engage others on that topic, something she felt the social norms of the teaching profession had stopped her from doing before.

More often, the "stand" taken by a teacher-author as a result of publication was less about a specific piece of content and more about a stance of authority taken on the basis of one's expertise as a practicing teacher. In this way, publication served an authorizing function, bolstering credibility perhaps to others but primarily in one's own estimation. Thomas Grimes explained that he believed the voices of teachers should be heard more, and he saw his professional writing as a way of doing that. Kathleen Durant explained that publication,

> means that somebody outside of my classroom values what I have to say, that they publish it, that it's important. I also think that it shows that I'm part of the knowledge-making community, which to me is really significant, that as a classroom teacher I have something to offer to the broader community of educators.

Regina Dodd, a high school teacher with three published articles who had been teaching 15 years at the time of the first publication, explained that having been published "made me more willing to talk about what I believe in" because those beliefs about what constituted good teaching had been validated by the journal reviewers/editors. Sandra Rabinski, a high school teacher with several article publications as well as two books who had been teaching 16 years at the time of the first article publication, explained that publishing had helped her "rebel" in a climate of test-driven curriculum, helping her to advocate for practices that she maintained were important even if currently discouraged by administrators: "It's

my little rebellion that I can either publish or present, and I can go out there and . . . say "No, no, try this way" . . . It's not the power of having the power, but the power of being able to keep some of the things in my teaching alive." One outcome of publishing an article was a feeling that teachers had the right to voice—whether to others or simply to themselves—beliefs about professional practice, adopting an authority stance with respect to ideas.

Authority for Leadership

A third form of authority which publication seemed to afford teachers was the authority to step into formal teacher leadership roles. This form was explicitly identified by five participants, and at least another three occupied formal leadership roles at the time of the interview. Moves into formal leadership positions were tied to the stance-taking discussed above, in which teachers claimed the right to voice beliefs about teaching; here, they found themselves willing to consider taking on formal responsibilities for leadership. For example, Mary Farnsworth, a middle school teacher who has published one article after teaching for eight years, described how having published an article helped her to imagine herself as a leader. She explained that it helped her to "see herself in that kind of position" as someone authorized to lead workshops, to work with other teachers—someone those teachers could plausibly listen to and believe. But the connection between publication experiences and the assumption of formal leadership roles was more concrete. For a more prolific author such as Thomas Grimes, the publications themselves led to invitations into leadership. People who read his published work invited him to speak or conduct workshops. These teachers saw connections between their publication experience and a sense of authority to adopt a leadership role in their field.

However, moving into teacher leadership—or claiming professional authority in general—was not automatic or unproblematic for teacher-authors when it came to face-to-face interactions with colleagues. Only two teachers described receiving any positive attention from building-level colleagues or administrators for their publication activities, and seven teachers described their immediate professional context as a setting in which teachers and even administrators discouraged stepping above one's peers or being seen as telling other teachers what to do. For example, Jeffrey Barnes, a high school teacher with more than 20 articles published who began publishing in his first two or three years teaching, detailed how, when he asked a colleague to help him develop photographs for one of his first major publications, the colleague said "You haven't told anyone, have you?" When asked what the colleague meant by this, Barnes explained:

> what he meant was basically some variation of the Japanese saying that the flower that grows up above the others gets its head chopped off. You know, the nail that sticks out gets pounded down . . . basically, I keep a very low profile, because most people in my

> department and the school at large don't read professional materials, frankly a lot of them just don't know the scale [of my professional writing].

Sandra Rabinski also noted how her publications were usually unrecognized within her school building, noting that "I think publishing, when you're a high school teacher, is somehow a little bit threatening to everyone else. It's so out of your field of vision . . . I'm not saying that people are not polite, but I don't get a lot of positive feedback in my school community." This begins to explain why teachers in the study tended to talk about leadership roles in an arena beyond their building, such as in the context of a professional organization or district-level work—or why, when the leadership was local, it occurred in times of conflict in which *someone* simply had to speak up. As we discussed earlier, teachers initially found ways into publication by first claiming authority over some slice of content and imagining an audience of teachers who might like to learn about that content. In their discussions of the article's target audience, which they used to focus their efforts while drafting, they did not say they were writing something for Bill or Ann down the hall; rather they imagined a more vague and distant but also more interested and supportive audience external to their own school building. Thus, it was a very particular construction of the audience of "the field" that mattered when these teacher-authors considered and developed senses of authority, rather than the audience of particular individuals.

Conclusion and Questions: On Audience and Authority

To prepare an article for publication, a teacher must grapple with the twin questions of what he or she has to say and to whom he or she might be saying it. We think these questions work reflexively and engage questions of authority in ways that are important for both teacher-authors and those who work for the professional development of teachers to understand. It is by envisioning an audience and assuming the right to speak to that audience that a teacher-author determines what such an audience might find important and what sorts of arguments might be persuasive. Simultaneously it is by the need to say something important that a teacher-author finds the authority to position him- or herself as a peer to the imagined audience. To use the language of Wood and Lieberman (2000), we see teachers engaged in *authorship,* using the envisioning of audience as a strategy for gathering *authority* needed to produce articles, and taking further actions *authorized* via publication in NCTE journals. Our work highlights connections between audience and authority that are often underestimated or left implicit in the words journal editors or professional developers say to teachers about writing for the profession.

Overall, we find ourselves thinking about authority stances taken by teacher-authors in two main ways. One is authority in one's own estimation; the other is

authority we perceive others will grant us. These forms of authority are related but not quite the same. The first is a basis for speaking at all, and the second for our sense that people will/should listen. We note as well that neither of these stances necessarily means that anyone *will* listen—that outcome is external. The teachers in our study spoke more about their own senses of themselves as authoritative and as worth listening to. Teachers' sense of "what they think," of their right to think what they do, and of whether it is appropriate to bring those ideas to the attention of others, are all bound up in tensions about the audiences for professional discourse—even for teachers like those we studied, who have published articles in highly respected professional journals and thus inserted themselves successfully into professional discourse on a wide scale.

Like most studies, ours tends to raise as many questions as it answers. We wish to point out a few of those as promising directions for further research. First, this article should make clear that power relationships, both institutionalized ones and those more temporary, context-dependent, or informal, are of central importance in the situation and conduct of teacher-writers. Yet our study does not reflect experiences of teacher-authors of color or others from historically marginalized groups, even though their backgrounds and positions might further complicate their situations with respect to power and authority both within and outside the field of education. Further research on this gap would be very valuable. Second, this was an interview-based study involving just 13 participants. In the analysis we found a basis for claims about what teacher-authors do as they compose. It follows that we need to investigate with teachers the process of composing, to understand empirically what actually does happen as teacher-writers and their publications come into being. Some of us are in fact involved in studies of just that, in the context of teacher writing groups online or in person (Dawson, 2011; Whitney, Zuidema, & Fredricksen, 2011). Yet much more is needed, particularly studies that can follow the work out into the publications themselves and even into the school contexts where teacher-authors work. Third, at the outset of this article we connected this inquiry to research on writing's role in professional development, yet our study's design only very partially illuminated how professional writing is situated within professional development or contributes to the wider professional development trajectories of these teachers. We do find promising the notion of authorship as a lens for examining the professional development of teachers, and we wonder how teachers "author" professional knowledge and practice in a wider way than we have been able to address here.

We wish to highlight two general implications of our work. The first is that in much of the currently available scholarship on audience, and even more strongly in many of the teaching practices we see pertaining to audience, there is a conception of audience as somehow unproblematic with respect to authority. For example, many texts offering advice to prospective teacher-writers suggest considering one's

audience, remembering one's audience, or addressing one's audience (Dahl, 1992; Henson, 1997; Hurst & Camp, 1999; Reissman, 1993). While these suggestions may at many points be good suggestions, our findings support Elbow's (1999) contention that thinking of audience in such a way may often be more inhibiting than productive. A view of audience more responsive to issues of power is also more compatible with sociocultural views of writing that now dominate writing scholarship (Prior, 2008, p. 54). A more concrete suggestion for practice follows from this point as well, which is simply that those of us who work with teachers and want to support teachers in taking authority stances might do well to focus our efforts on issues of audience. We might aim to set up writing groups for teachers and help those groups function as surrogate audiences, develop actual audiences for the writing of teachers by developing a forum for their work or, if we act as editors, devoting extra energy to helping teacher-authors develop their pieces. More specifically, we can also help other teachers make use of the strategy that these successful authors employ, deliberately narrowing the intended audience of a draft to a representation of a peer audience that will welcome the article during much of the composing process while attending to broader audiences at certain, perhaps later, points. Our research suggests that supports of this type will help teachers to succeed in writing for publication.

The second implication we wish to highlight has to do with the nature of expertise and authority within the communities of practice within which our participants work. We are not the first to connect work on teachers as writers and on "going public" with teacher scholarship to Lave and Wenger's ideas about communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), nor will we be the last. However, we do wish to draw attention to one way in which our work might complicate people's understandings of legitimate peripheral participation and how members of communities of practice are positioned relative to one another vis-à-vis expertise and authority. Lave and Wenger are quite specific in pointing out how boundaries of communities of practice are not fixed, and that centrality is not a fixed position; rather, participants are variously peripheral at different moments and in changing relation to others in the system.

Here we see that in shifting between ways of imagining audience at different moments in the composing process, teacher-authors took control of the boundaries of communities of practice strategically and purposefully. In articulating ideas about the audiences for their work—both the "real" or addressed audience of readers and the invented, invoked audience of the reader to whom an author most hopes to speak—these teacher-authors are temporarily delineating an image of their community of practice. Learners within a community of practice may have a sense of their peripherality as excluding or disabling, or as empowering and filled with potential. However, here teacher-authors redefined some readers as central and others as peripheral, in ways that shifted according to the author-

ity stances those definitions allowed them to take in composing. That is, at times teacher-authors imagined the field, as instantiated in the readership of a journal, as a community of practice in which they themselves were peripheral to "more central" actors (often those working from universities and possessing greater familiarity with scholarly publishing) whom they saw as better empowered to write and to negatively evaluate their own work. Yet a peripheral position understood in that way is a difficult one to compose from, as a certain amount of authority is necessary simply to assert one's point of view in the public forum of the journal. To make it possible to compose an article, teacher-authors also composed audiences for their work and composed new versions of the very community of practice within which and for which they wrote—communities of practice in which teachers very much like themselves (thoughtful, inquiring, classroom-based) were legitimate and authoritative. This highlights a sometimes-ignored aspect of Lave and Wenger's work—namely, communities of practice are really about a constellation of practices, and there can be shifts in the potentiality of peripherality in the eyes of the participant, depending both on the practice and on stances taken by various participants as to what constitutes full participation and how authority is distributed among members—either in relationship to one another or simply in members' own estimation. The teacher-authors in this study actively managed such shifts by making specific conceptual moves within a rhetorical act, envisioning audience in different (productive) ways at different points in their composing process. They used audience as a strategy by which they could work not only on written products but also on themselves as authors and how they are perceived.

To compose an audience or to compose authority is also to compose an author. That is, in defining, redefining, and otherwise taking control of the notion of audience, writers also take control, at least within the context of the composition at hand, of their own places and spaces as authors, as agentic actors on the scene of their own compositions. Our experience with teacher authors (resonating with research on professional development) suggests that *this* is the heart of the professional learning that happens when teachers research and write. We find composing interesting, we think it important to understand how writers write for a long list of reasons, and we would see this study as valuable solely for what it can tell us about the writing processes of the participants and about the notion of audience. However, it is what it shows us about teachers composing themselves as authors and authorities that we find most exciting. We are working at a point in time in which many participants in discourse about education offer visions of teachers as passive, thoughtless, even corrupt. We know we are not alone among readers of *RTE* in wishing that more of those participants would listen more carefully to teachers, or listen to them at all. We see in the composing activities of teacher-authors—both their composing articles and their composing authoritative stances from which to speak—a way for teachers to "write back" and talk back to those who would position teachers as peripheral to the project of education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research was funded by grants from the NCTE Research Foundation and from the Penn State College of Education. We are also indebted to the editors and reviewers of *Research in the Teaching of English* for their contributions to this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Berkenkotter, C. (1981). Understanding a writer's awareness of audience. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*(4), 388–399.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(2), 2.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, *28*(7), 15.

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

Dawson, C. M. (2011). Inventing teacher writers. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

DeBlase, G. (2007). Learning to speak in a political voice. *English Education*, *39*(2), 3.

Ede, L. (1984). Audience: An introduction to research. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*, 140–154.

Elbow, P. (1987). Closing my eyes as I speak: An argument for ignoring audience. *College English*, *49*, 50–69.

Elbow, P. (1999). In defense of private writing: Consequences for theory and research. *Written Communication*, *16*, 139—170.

Fleischer, C. (1995). *Composing teacher-research: A prosaic history.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Giroux, H. (2004). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In A. S. Canestrari & B. A. Marlowe (Eds.), *Educational foundations: An anthology of critical readings.* (pp. 205–212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Original work published 1985)

Henson, K. T. (1997). Writing for publication. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *78*, 781–784.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hurst, B., & Camp, D. (1999). If you can write a lesson plan, you can write an article. *Reading Teacher*, *53*(1), 22–23.

Ivanic, R. (1994). I is for interpersonal: Discoursal construction of writer identities and the teaching of writing. *Linguistics and Education*, *6*(1), 3–15.

Kroll, B. M. (1984). Writing for readers: Three perspectives on audience. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*, 172–185.

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

Lieberman, A. (2000). Networks as learning communities: Shaping the future of teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*, 221–227.

Lieberman, A., & Wood, D. R. (2003). *Inside the National Writing Project: Connecting network learning and classroom teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Long, R. C. (1980). Writer-Audience relationships: Analysis or invention? *College Composition and Communication*, *31*, 221–226.

Lunsford, A., & Ede, L. (1996). Representing audience: "Successful" discourse and disciplinary critique. *College Composition and Communication*, *47*, 167–179.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, C. (1984). Genre as social action.

Quarterly Journal of Speech, *70*, 151–167.

ONG, W. J. (1975). The writer's audience is always a fiction. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, *90*, 9–21.

PATTON, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative interviewing. In *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* (pp. 277–335). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

PRIOR, P. (2008). A sociocultural theory of writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, and J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 54–66). New York: Guilford.

REISSMAN, R. (1993). Your guide to getting published. *Instructor*, *102*(9), 53–55.

SHANNON, P. (1990). *The struggle to continue: Progressive reading instruction in the United States.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

STOCK, P. L. (1993). The function of anecdote in teacher research. *English Education*, *25*, 173–187.

STOCK, P. L. (2001). Toward a theory of genre in teacher research: Contributions from a reflective practitioner. *English Education*, *33*, 100–114.

STOCK, P. L. (2005). 2004 NCTE presidential address: Practicing the scholarship of teaching: What we do with the knowledge we make. *College English*, *68*, 107–121.

STREET, C., & STANG, K. K. (2009). In what ways do teacher education courses change teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(3), 75–94.

SUNSTEIN, B. (1994). *Composing a culture: Inside a summer writing program with high school teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

WHITNEY, A. E. (2009a). NCTE journals and the teacher-author: Who and what gets published. *English Education*, *41*(2), 95–107.

WHITNEY, A. E. (2009b). Classroom teachers as authors of the professional article: National Writing Project influence on teachers who publish. In C. Bazerman et al. (Eds.), *Traditions of writing research.* (pp. 237–248). New York: Routledge.

WHITNEY, A. E., ZUIDEMA, L. & FREDRICKSEN, J. (2011). Understanding authority in teachers' talk and texts. Manuscript submitted for publication.

WOOD, D. R., & LIEBERMAN, A. (2000). Teachers as authors: The National Writing Project's approach to professional development. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *3*, 255–273.

APPENDIX A: TEACHERS-AS-AUTHORS STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE

General professional questions:

1. It has been a while since you filled out the survey. Can you tell me a little about what you're doing now?
2. In your classroom/teaching, when do you turn to outside sources for ideas? What sources? [workshops, publications, colleagues, etc.]
3. Tell me about your history with professional writing.
4. Have you ever been a member of a writing group?
    a. How did it come about?
    b. What would happen at a group meeting?
    c. What was your role?

   d. How, if at all, did your experiences in the group affect you as a writer?
   e. How, if at all, did your experiences in the writing group affect you as a teacher?
5. What kinds of publication activities have you been involved in?
6. How, if at all, have you experienced rejections of your writing?
   a. How did you respond to those rejections?
7. How would you describe yourself as a writer?
   [Would you say that you are a writer? Can you say more about that?]

About the article:

I'd like you to think back to the time you first began to work on this piece.

8. Describe what was happening in your work at that time. [Job, students, how long, how long teaching at that time period]
9. What professional activities were you involved in at that time?
10. What first prompted you to work on an article at that time?
    [Something happening in classroom?
    Did someone suggest it?
    Something you read?
    etc.]
11. How would you characterize your teaching practice at that time?
    [What were you trying that was new? What were you struggling with? How did you deal with the situation?]
12. What were you reading at that time that might have influenced you?
    [professional books, journals, other materials (fiction, etc. If listing different kinds of things: how, if at all, do you see those as related?] [You have the list of journals and can prompt from there if needed]

About the journal you published in:

13. Think about what you know about the articles in those journals as a genre or type of writing. What are some of the features of a journal article?
14. What was your sense of the format the article should have? To what extent does your published article match that expectation?
15. Who do you think of as the authors of articles in the journal? [Teachers? College people? Etc] In what way are those people like you or not very much like you?
16. Who do you think of as the readers for the journal? [Teachers? College people? Etc] In what way are those people like you or not very much like you?
17. Thinking about what you just told me about the authors and readers for the journal: where did you get those impressions?
18. Thinking about what you just told me about the authors and readers for the journal: to what extent do you consider yourself a colleague to the people you have described? In what way are you (or are you not) member of those groups?
19. Thinking specifically about your article [title], how did you envision the audience for this piece? When, if at all, did you think of that audience while writing? How did that affect you? Who did you want to speak to through the article?

People and resources:

20. [If coauthored] I see that the article we've been talking about was coauthored. Who participated in what way; what were the relationships? What were the roles? What effect did this have on the final product?
21. When, if at all, have you ever participated in the research of others or been mentioned in the publications of others? What was memorable about that experience?
22. [if single authored] What people have been involved in your publication activities? What was their role? [if coauthored:]Besides your coauthor, what other people have been involved in your publication activities? What was their role?
23. As you look back on your past experiences with professional writing, what individuals stand out as having been particularly influential on you? What was their role?

Outcomes of publication:

24. How, if at all, is publication recognized or rewarded in your teaching setting? [By admin, by peers, by students? [Do they know? How, if at all, has it affected your relationships with colleagues? The stance you take in your teaching setting?]
25. What difference has publication made to you, if any?
    [In the classroom]
    [Opening of opportunities]
    [Status]
    [New lines of thinking/new research activities/other publications]
    Confidence, voice, self-perception]
26. What plans, if any, do you have to write for publication again in the future?

Writing processes:

27. How, if at all, did your article draft build off of prior work [presentations, other publications, etc]
28. What problems did you encounter in writing the piece? [Can you point to it in the piece?]
29. How did you work through those problems? [Can you point to it in the piece?]
30. What revisions did you make along the way? [Can you point to it in the piece?]
31. What kinds of feedback did you receive along the way?
    [From whom?]
    [When?]
    [How did it feel?]
    [How did you respond to the feedback?]
32. Describe your communication with the people at [journal]. [Editors, reviewers, staff.]
33. How, if at all, did the piece change in between submitting it and its eventual publication? What influenced those changes?

Closing:

34. What's next for you professionally?
35. Is there something else I should have asked you today that we have not discussed? Anything else you would like to comment on?

Appendix B: Teachers-as-Authors Coding Dictionary

CODE	Long name	Definition
EXIG	Exigencies	What prompted a teacher to write; reasons for starting a piece; motivations
PROC	Processes	Practices, steps, or activities engaged in while writing
PROC-INV	Invention	Prewriting; brainstorming; coming up with ideas
PROC-RESP	Response	Getting feedback; having someone respond to a draft
PROC-REV	Revision	Revising; changing ideas; adding or cutting
PROC-EDIT	Editing	Correctness; finding and dealing with errors
ENV	Environments	Resources; challenges. People and things surrounding the writer that influence him/her. The context code.
OUT	Outcomes	Benefits; costs; consequences.
AUD	Audience	Audience, readers, who they imagine, even who they exclude (ex. "I don't care what college people think; I am writing for teachers")
AUTH	Authority	Claiming authority; having the right to speak or write; Right, Authority, Claim
COAUTH	Coauthor	Relationships with coauthors, who they are, processes of working with coauthors, issues that arise in coauthoring
CONF	Confidence	Expressions of confidence or lack of; sense of ability or competence
ENJOY	Enjoyment	What the speaker likes or doesn't like, enjoys writing or doesn't, what is fun about writing
ETHICS	Ethics	Dilemmas, worrying about what is right; for example how it is OK to use students' words or quoting
IDENT	Identity	References to identities—ethnic, gender, as teacher, as parent, etc.
IDENT-WRITER	Writer's identity	Identifying oneself as a writer; "I am a writer"; who counts as a "real" writer

GENRE	Genre	Features of a type of writing; Scheme for an article, headings, expectations, "academic writing". The code for preconceptions and notions of what an article can be, how different from other kinds of writing, etc.
ORG	Organizations	Organizations, networks, societies, etc. For example, membership in NCTE.
OTHER-WRITE	Writing other than articles	Reference to other outlets of publication or other forms of writing, such as poetry, websites, newspapers, books, you name it.
PRES	Presentations	Presentations; conferences; moving from presentation to article
PUB	Publication	From submitting a piece to its appearance in print: editors, journals, etc.
READ	Reading	Reading articles, books, etc. at any time
RECOG	Recognition	Getting recognition from school or district for pub (or not getting it). Colleagues noticed the piece, or didn't, or it is or isn't rewarded at my school.
RISK	Risk-taking	Risk-taking—things that feel risky or don't! "Vulnerable"; putting it out there
SPONSOR	Sponsorship	A mentor, an inviting person or "activating relationship." Possibly even an event. Someone takes the speaker under his/her wing or "showed me the ropes". Cf. Deborah Brandt's *Literacy in American Lives*
STU	Student memories	Remembering one's own life as a student; drawing on that to think about teaching or about writing
TEACH	Teaching	Classroom activities, students, practices
TEACH-WRITE	Connections between writing and teaching	Links between writing practice and classroom practice. "It affects my teaching in that…"
TECH	Technology	References to technology including the Internet
UNIV	University	Contact with a college or university class, faculty member, etc.
WORLDS	Worlds	References to the "college world" or "K–12 world;" Crossing boundaries, moving between worlds; borders; spheres