https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

The Impact of a National Writing Project Site's Summer Institute: Exploring Educator Beliefs on Writing and Writing Instruction

H. Michelle Kreamer

Educational Curriculum and Instruction, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana, United States

Megan C. Breaux

Educational Curriculum and Instruction, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana, United States

ABSTRACT: This study explores educator attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding writing and writing instruction before and after participating in a week-long Summer Institute (SI) facilitated by leaders at one National Writing Project (NWP) site. Throughout the SI, the 12 educators (i.e., instructional coaches and classroom teachers) participated in personal, creative, and professional writing designed to support them as writers and writing instructors. Study participants completed a survey before the SI and at its conclusion, which captured their perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and experiences about writing and writing instruction, as well as the importance of writing in education. Findings demonstrated that many participants viewed themselves as writers prior to the SI with this amount increasing at the conclusion of the SI, and many reported increased writing confidence. There were inconsistencies in the ways participants defined what it means to "be a writer," and findings suggest that writer identity is influenced by writing confidence and enjoyment, with some participants struggling to navigate the dual identities of writer and writing teacher. Study findings suggest that addressing the writer-teacher identity crisis is crucial for fostering effective writing instruction. Teachers need time, space, and opportunity to immerse themselves in their writing and practice different skills to then apply to their instruction. Buy-in from school districts to provide such opportunities and a willingness to support teacher autonomy will enable teachers to better support students as writers and engage them in meaningful writing instruction for authentic tasks and audiences.

KEYWORDS: educator perceptions, National Writing Project, self-efficacy, writing, writing identity, writing instruction

© University of Toronto Press, 2025 | doi: 10.3138/wap-2025-0011

UTP UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Introduction

Writing has long been considered the "the neglected element of American school reform" (National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges [NCWASC], 2003, p. 9) and is an area of struggle for many students. The most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Report Card for Writing is from 2011. In this report, only 27% of 8th and 12th graders earned a score indicating "solid academic performance" (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2012, p. 1), meaning the vast majority were below academic expectations. Given that 2017 NAEP writing assessment data were not released and, according to the NAEP Assessment Schedule, another is not scheduled until 2032, 21 years will have gone by between writing assessments, whereas reading and math data come out every 2 years (National Assessment Governing Board [NAGB], 2020). Understandably, this lack of regularly collected, large-scale writing assessment data makes it difficult to examine trends in youth writing, as well as the impacts of writing instruction in schools across the nation.

Despite this, writing is an integral part of people's lives (Zinsser, 1988), and writing skills have considerable academic and real-world implications. In secondary schools, writing across the content areas aids in content area understanding (Fisher & Frey, 2013; McLaughlin, 2015), as well as successful communication of thoughts and ideas (Grünke & Leonard-Zabel, 2015). Beyond the school setting, writing skills can impact hiring decisions (Wiens, 2012) and promotions (Simonds, 2013). Those with advanced literacy skills, including reading and writing, have greater access to a variety of well-paying careers (National Literacy Institute, 2024). Unfortunately, research suggests the number of students entering college who require writing remediation has increased since the 1970s (Faulkner, 2013), and writing is frequently ranked by employers as a top deficiency in new hires (NEA, 2007, as cited in Urquhart & Frazee, 2012). To better prepare students for the writing demands they are sure to face, they need effective writing instruction, including more opportunities for writing, teacher modeling, and authentic writing tasks (Fisher & Frey, 2013; Gallagher, 2006, 2011; Zinsser, 1988).

While writing and writing instruction should not just be happening in English Language Arts (ELA) classrooms, "the complexity of writing instruction has left many teachers feeling inadequate and poorly trained to teach writing skills" (Curtis, 2017, p. 18). On one hand, challenges associated with writing, such as writing apprehension, writer's block, and writing intimidation, can impact teachers' confidence toward their writing and their instruction of writing (Grünke & Leonard-Zabel, 2015; Zimmerman et al., 2014). On the other hand, teachers who identify as writers and have a high sense of self-efficacy have been shown to produce favorable outcomes, including in their own writing and instruction of writing

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

(Bandura, 1997; Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Zimmerman et al., 2014). Because teachers who feel confident as writers are more likely to create writing-rich, student-centered classrooms that promote students' growth as writers (Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Hall & White, 2019), understanding these teacher perspectives is essential for improving writing instruction.

For 50 years, the National Writing Project (NWP) has operated with a model of teachers teaching teachers "to advance writing and the teaching of writing" (National Writing Project, 2024). A core principle of NWP is that supporting teachers as writers and writing instructors will impact their teaching of writing, with the goal of supporting students as writers. Participation in this organization "provide[s] opportunities for teachers to understand the full spectrum of writing and help them envision themselves as writers" (Bifuh-Ambe, 2013, p. 138). Through NWP writing-intensive workshops, often referred to as Summer Institutes (SI), teacher participants have developed or strengthened their writing identity (Donovan et al., 2023), reported increased confidence/self-efficacy as writers (Athans, 2022; Locke et al., 2011), and applied this knowledge and skill to their teaching of writing (Athans, 2022). Other research not specifically connected to NWP has also acknowledged the impact of educators engaging in writing to support their writing instruction (Curtis, 2017; Yoo, 2017; Zimmerman et al., 2014). At the same time, many teachers do not have a course specifically focused on teaching writing as part of their teacher preparation programs (Athans, 2022; Donovan et al., 2023), demonstrating a gap in how future educators are being prepared to teach writing.

Given the far-reaching impact of writing, as well as associated challenges, it is essential to provide opportunities for teachers to strengthen their identities and skills as writers and teachers of writing, so they can, in turn, create classroom environments that nurture and develop student writers. To meet this need, as members of the leadership team at one NWP site, the authors planned and facilitated a week-long SI for area educators. The goal of the professional development (PD) was to support the participants as writers and writing instructors as they engaged in writing exercises to encourage discovery, analysis, and reflection. Through a combination of creative, personal, and professional writing, as well as the creation of a writing lesson that could be implemented in their classrooms, participants were encouraged to tap into their identities as writers and writing instructors.

Literature Review

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the belief a person possesses concerning their ability to complete a task or achieve a goal (Bandura, 1986). Informed by social cognitive theory,

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Bandura (1986) asserts that people who view themselves as having high self-efficacy expect desirable or favorable outcomes when working on a task or goal and those with low self-efficacy expect undesirable results. Characteristics associated with individuals who display highly efficacious attitudes include setting personal goals, trying harder when they do not reach set goals, and stressing less, all of which contribute to goal attainment (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Conversely, someone with low self-efficacy often lacks these qualities, making goal attainment much less likely (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

Individuals gain a better sense of self-efficacy through practice and the eventual successful acquisition of skills associated with a goal, ultimately creating a compounding effect (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Therefore, the role of teachers' self-efficacy is important in understanding its impact on classroom instruction. Although self-efficacy has been linked to individuals' success, many teachers have low self-efficacy about their own writing skills and writing instruction (Curtis, 2017; Grünke & Leonard-Zabel, 2015; Yoo, 2017), suggesting that more needs to be done to support increased teacher confidence in these areas.

Recent research has expanded on how teacher self-efficacy specifically impacts writing instruction. Cohen (2023) asserts that teachers' confidence in their ability to teach writing is directly linked to the depth and quality of their instructional practices. Those with higher self-efficacy are more likely to implement varied instructional strategies and maintain persistence when facing challenges in teaching writing. PD experiences, particularly those focused on writing instruction, play a crucial role in building teacher self-efficacy. Collaborative environments provide opportunities to share ideas and develop practical instructional solutions, which can increase teachers' self-efficacy (Chong & Kong, 2012). Furthermore, Philippakos et al. (2023) indicate that targeted PD can significantly improve teachers' confidence in both their writing abilities and their capacity to teach writing effectively. These improvements in self-efficacy contribute to more innovative approaches, with the potential for positive impacts on student writing outcomes.

Self as Writer

Beliefs about what it means to "be a writer" vary and can range from being a published, best-selling author to someone who keeps a journal. Writing identity, enjoyment, and confidence are all contributing factors in viewing oneself as a writer. Research has been conducted on the role of teachers positioning students as writers to help them strengthen their writing identity (Skerrett, 2013; Vetter, 2010). Similarly, participation in writing workshops, such as NWP's Summer Institute, can provide opportunities for educators to be positioned as writers and tap into the

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

idea of seeing themselves as a writer (Athans, 2022; Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Donovan et al., 2023; Locke et al., 2011). This is critical, since Street & Stang (2009) argue that identity is fundamental to teachers' development as writers, asserting that educators must first become comfortable and confident with writing before they can effectively teach it.

One study on the impact of participation in an SI found participants appreciated the opportunity to collaborate, found writing to be a "creative release" that allowed for self-discovery, and felt empowered and more confident to use their voice (Athans, 2022). In Cremin & Oliver's (2016) systematic literature review on teachers as writers, the researchers explained that teachers' own school experiences with writing impacted whether or not they identified as a writer. They also noticed there was a "tendency towards negativity, often marked by the language of self-doubt and self-critique" (p. 22), with many teachers not identifying as writers themselves. Dierking & Fox (2013) provide crucial insight into this dynamic, with research showing that as teachers develop stronger professional identities through support and advanced knowledge, their instructional confidence grows accordingly. This suggests that targeted PD can simultaneously enhance teachers' writing identities and instructional capabilities.

Yoo (2017) also examined the concept of teacher as writer with a focus on creative writing. She found many participants had limited confidence in their creative writing abilities, impacting their self-efficacy and writing identity. However, through participation in creative writing, participants saw the impact on their writing skills as well as how this could impact their writing instruction. This highlights how writing identity and confidence are interrelated and how identifying as a writer has the potential to impact writing instruction. In one study that examined impacts of a writing methods course for pre-service teachers (PSTs), participants engaged in personal and creative writing following a writer's workshop approach (Zimmerman et al., 2014). Through course participation, researchers noted that writing self-efficacy increased and "created powerful shifts in the ways PSTs thought of themselves as writers and future teachers of writing" (p. 149), highlighting the value of in-depth writing experiences to support future teachers as writing instructors.

Writing Instruction

While specific student writing data is a notable gap in existing literature (NAGB, 2020; NCES; 2012), there has been some research on writing instruction. Graham (2019) examined studies about classroom writing practices, explaining that "the overall picture that emerged from the 28 studies reviewed was that writing instruction in most classrooms is not sufficient" (p. 280). Among other issues, limited

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

time spent teaching writing and insufficient opportunities for student writing were noted concerns (Graham, 2019). Another issue is the idea of "assigning" writing tasks rather than providing writing instruction (Benko, 2016; Gallagher, 2006). When this happens, teachers might explain a writing task, but mini-lessons, teacher modeling, and/or writing workshops are not being consistently used to help students truly progress their writing skills. To break from this common challenge of assigning versus teaching writing, an understanding of effective writing instruction is needed.

Effective Writing Instruction

Whether elementary students creating their first narrative, high schoolers tackling a research essay, or members of a community writing group, certain instructional approaches are consistently described as best practices for effective writing instruction. Among these are the use of writing workshops, explicit instruction, and authentic writing and publishing opportunities.

Writing workshops are a structured approach to writing instruction "in which students are engaged in developing their craft and are guided by a mature writer—the teacher" (Whitaker, 2005, p. 2). Writing workshops provide time for students to compose writing, conference with peers and the teacher, and allow opportunities for reflection (Whitaker, 2005) and are powerful because they can help establish a writing community, requiring students to actively engage in the writing process (Tompkins, 2019). Furthermore, conferencing as part of a writing workshop allows teachers the opportunity to provide individualized support, an important component of effective writing instruction (Mulligan & Dawson, 2014).

Given the challenge of writing being assigned and not taught, explicit instruction is needed to aid in effective writing. Benko (2016) explains this is instruction that "target[s] a particular writing skill" (p. 219). In one study, PSTs realized the need to provide secondary students with explicit instruction in writing conventions and types of writing (Sherry, 2017). Teacher modeling can provide instruction on specific writing skills. For example, when a teacher models writing an opening paragraph or brainstorming ideas for an essay, they are showing students their thinking and making the process transparent as opposed to simply sharing a final, polished piece of writing (Gallagher, 2006; Hall & White, 2019).

Another frequent practice of effective writing instruction is the need for authentic writing and publishing opportunities. The Understanding by Design (UbD) framework calls for authentic assessments (Wiggins & McTighe, 2011), and writing is no different. In one science class, a teacher brought in writing to aid students' content area understanding while simultaneously providing a real-world writing task (Kohnen, 2013). When students choose what they will write about

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

or select a topic of interest, this promotes ownership and can make the writing experience more personally meaningful (Kinloch & Drew, 2008; Tompkins, 2019). Additionally, the chance to make writing public, whether through instructional approaches like Author's Chair (Tompkins, 2019) or submissions to online blogs, writing competitions, or news outlets, can engage and motivate student writers because it will be experienced by a real audience (Whitaker, 2005).

Barriers to Effective Writing Instruction

Despite existing research on the elements of effective writing instruction, many teachers lack the support, resources, confidence, or experiences to implement these practices effectively. In one study, teachers described their own secondary writing experiences as lacking guidance on how to improve their writing and attributed writing success to "natural" skills (Read & Landon-Hayes, 2013). In this way, the teachers saw writing as something that was inherent rather than a learned skill that could be improved on. Beyond secondary schooling, many universities do not adequately prepare future teachers to teach writing (Graham, 2019) or lack a writing methods course altogether (e.g., Athans, 2022; Read & Landon-Hayes, 2013). Donovan et al. (2023) addressed the issue of not having a writing methods course for PSTs, explaining that teachers "recalled having to figure it out on their own" (p. 19) and that their writing instruction was influenced by "replicating what they saw colleagues do or how they were taught as K-12 students" (p. 19). Relatedly, Graham (2019) acknowledged this concern, recommending approaches to writing-focused professional development to address the gap in writing instruction preparation, highlighting the need for teachers to cultivate these necessary skills. However, Cremin & Oliver (2016) found that in studies in which PSTs had writing methods courses or workshops, their writing confidence was positively impacted. Similarly, another study found that PSTs began to see themselves as writers and writing instructors following involvement in a writer's workshop (Zimmerman et al., 2014). Therefore, it is critical teachers are not only equipped with knowledge of best practices for writing instruction but are positioned as writers, becoming immersed in experiences that increase their confidence as writers and writing instructors.

The Present Study

Writing instruction has long been considered "the neglected 'R'" (NCWASC; 2003), and understanding educator attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding writing and writing instruction remains essential for supporting student writers (e.g., Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Hall & White, 2019). Prior research, notably Cremin & Oliver's (2016) systematic review, indicated that reflecting on one's writing experiences,

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen 'Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

participating in the writing process, and being immersed within a writing community can shape teachers as writers and writing instructors. However, this review synthesized studies conducted prior to 2016. As such, it did not account for significant changes in education brought about by the past decade, including the COVID-19 pandemic (Hamilton et al., 2020; Van Lancker & Parolin, 2020) and evolving expectation for teachers' roles (Trybus, 2019). These shifts have likely influenced how teachers view themselves as writers and educators, underscoring the need for updated, in-depth understanding of their perspectives.

While research has been conducted to determine what makes writing instruction effective (e.g., writing workshops, explicit instruction, authentic opportunities for writing and publishing), there is little recent research examining teacher beliefs on writing. Furthermore, this study is needed because it allowed the researchers to examine if intensive, writing-focused PD influenced teachers' identities and perceptions of instructional approaches in today's educational landscape. As such, the purpose of this study was exploratory in nature, meant to identify potential changes in teachers' beliefs and perceptions about themselves as writers and writing instructors following a week-long, writing-intensive Summer Institute (SI). Specifically, the researchers sought to answer the question: In what ways, if any, do intensive writing experiences influence teachers' perceptions of themselves as writers and their outlook on writing instruction?

Methodology

Research Design

For the present study, researchers used a convergent parallel mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017) to explore educators' perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding writing and writing instruction before and after participating in a writing-focused SI. A survey was used to collect quantitative data through Likert-scale survey items, as well as qualitative data through open-ended items (See Appendix A for survey items analyzed as part of this study). Pre-survey data were collected at the start of the first day of the institute, and post-survey data were gathered on the last day. This pre–post design enabled comparisons to identify changes in participants' writing identity, confidence, enjoyment, and beliefs about writing and approaches to writing instruction.

SI: Context, Structure, and Participants

The SI, hosted by a local NWP site, was grounded in a theoretical perspective that views writing as a social, meaning-making activity, particularly emphasizing teachers' own writing identities (Cremin & Baker, 2010). Central to the institute's

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

approach was the belief that teachers must first engage deeply with their own writing to support student writers effectively. This perspective aligns with NWP's core principle of teacher-writers developing personal writing identities and reflective practices (Cremin & Baker, 2010). The SI was designed for middle and high school teachers and instructional coaches, who were invited to apply for the PD experience. Those accepted to participate in the SI earned a $500 stipend provided by a local school district that partnered with the NWP site.

Framed within the NWP approach, the institute emphasized writing as a recursive, generative process that prioritizes personal exploration, critical reflection, and pedagogical innovation (Pella, 2011). Each day of the SI followed a consistent structure designed to support participants' writing and professional growth. Mornings began with an opening writing exercise that invited personal reflection, followed by a book discussion of selected chapters from the text *When Challenge Brings Change: How Teacher Breakthroughs Transform the Classroom* (Murphy & Smith, 2023). SI participants engaged in various writing exercises targeting different aspects of writing identity.

Participants were provided multiple opportunities for generative writing across various genres and purposes. Writing exercises were carefully designed to help participants explore their professional and personal writing identities, challenge formulaic writing approaches, develop creative and critical writing skills, and cultivate supportive, collaborative writing environments. Furthermore, the institute emphasized the social nature of learning by incorporating peer sharing and feedback sessions, team meetings for collaborative planning, and authentic opportunities for participants to share their work.

The week concluded with a showcase where participants shared a piece of writing and an original mini-lesson with an audience including district and university personnel, an authentic opportunity to demonstrate the integration of personal writing experiences with pedagogical practices. This final activity served as a culminating experience, enabling participants to synthesize their learning and reflect on their growth as teacher-writers.

Participant Demographics

SI participants brought diverse educational backgrounds, years of experience, and subject areas, contributing a broad range of perspectives on writing and writing instruction. Furthermore, they represented a mix of teachers new to the NWP model as well as those who had prior experience with NWP. The group consisted of two instructional coaches, eight high school teachers, and two middle school teachers. In total, the 10 classroom teachers represented seven different schools within the district. Regarding teaching experience, four participants were classified

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

as early-career educators, with fewer than 6 years of experience. Another four participants were mid-career educators, with 6 to 15 years of experience, and the remaining four participants were late-career educators, with over 16 years of experience. Among the teachers, one taught social studies, one taught math, and eight taught ELA.

Study Recruitment

The SI was invitational in nature, with approximately 20–25 teachers invited. While 18 educators completed the application, some declined upon acceptance, resulting in a total of 12 participants for the week-long SI. Since these individuals participated in the SI, they met the inclusion criteria to be part of this research study.

On the first day of the SI, the 12 participating educators were presented with the option to participate in this study to better understand their experiences, beliefs, and practices as writers and writing instructors. The researchers provided them with a physical copy of the consent form, read this aloud, and made clear to the group that participation in the research study was not a requirement of the SI. The consent form explained that SI participants who joined the study would be entered into a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card, held after the SI. To ensure participants did not feel coerced into consenting to be part of the study, everyone submitted a consent form marking whether or not they would participate. In doing so, everyone submitted a form, but individual choices were not disclosed to the group. It was also made clear that everyone would be asked to complete a survey at the start and end of the SI; however, only the data of those who consented to be part of the study would be analyzed. All 12 SI participants (100% participation rate) consented to be part of the study.

Data Collection

Pre- and post-surveys were administered through Qualtrics to capture perspectives across several dimensions, including participants' perceptions as writers and writing instructors and their beliefs about writing instruction. The surveys were developed by the researchers—both experts in writing and writing instruction—grounded in relevant literature and refined through an iterative process. These surveys included both Likert-scale items (some of which had multiple subquestions) and open-ended questions, allowing for a comprehensive exploration of participants' experiences. For this study, the researchers specifically looked at items addressing perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding writing and writing instruction, excluding questions about writing community and participant views of the teaching profession more broadly. As such, 16 pre-survey items

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

(7 open-ended and 9 Likert-scale) and 10 post-survey items (4 open-ended and 6 Likert-scale) were analyzed. The difference in total survey items varied because some questions did not need to be repeated. For instance, on the pre-survey participants were asked, "What types of writing do you typically engage in?" Since there were only 5 days between surveys, this would not have changed and therefore did not need to be asked again. Similarly, participants were asked about the frequency of the types of writing tasks assigned to students on the pre-survey, but were not asked about this on the post-survey, since the SI took place in the summer and this would not have varied during this period. Appendix A includes all survey questions analyzed for this study.

The pre-survey was administered on the first day of the SI (a Monday) and the post-survey was administered at the end of the week-long PD (a Friday). Once surveys were completed, data were downloaded from Qualtrics and stored securely on a university OneDrive to ensure confidentiality.

Data Analysis

For the Likert-scale survey items, researchers calculated the frequency of responses for each scale point (i.e., 1 to 5) to observe shifts in participants' ratings before and after the SI, following established methods for analyzing Likert-type data in educational research (Harpe, 2015). Additionally, averages were calculated for each survey item using Excel's average function to provide a general sense of participants' responses at each time point while acknowledging the limitations of applying means to ordinal data (Sullivan & Artino, 2013). The averages were used descriptively to compare pre- and post-survey trends and were not interpreted as indicative of a normal distribution or central tendency, following best practices for educational research using Likert scales (Chen & Liu, 2020). This approach allowed researchers to examine changes in participants' self-reported enjoyment, confidence, instructional practices, and beliefs without overemphasizing statistical generalizations.

Qualitative data from open-ended questions were analyzed thematically. Responses were coded and categorized to identify recurring patterns and key themes related to writing identity, confidence, enjoyment, and instructional practices. Thematic analysis provided insights into participants' experiences and perceptions, complementing the quantitative findings (Pregoner, 2024). Qualitative themes were triangulated with the observed quantitative trends to offer a comprehensive understanding of the data (Silva et al., 2024). This integrated analysis highlighted both the nuanced changes captured in open-ended responses and the shifts in patterns revealed through the Likert-scale items, providing a holistic picture of the impact of the SI on participants' writing-related attitudes and practices.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

To further enhance the trustworthiness and transferability of the findings, the researchers have included detailed descriptions of the research setting, participants, and procedures, as recommended by Creswell & Poth (2018).

Ethical Considerations

Prior to the SI, Institutional Review Board approval was obtained, and the study was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for educational research. As stated previously, participation in the study was voluntary and not a requirement for the SI. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before data were collected. Those who chose to participate in the study were entered into a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card, which took place after the conclusion of the SI. Survey data collected did include participant names to analyze pre- and post-survey data effectively and examine changes in participant beliefs; however, this was securely stored to protect participant identity.

Results

This study explored educators' perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and experiences regarding writing and writing instruction, before and after participating in a writing-intensive SI. Findings from survey data are detailed below.

Self as Writer

Participants' perceptions of themselves as writers centered on three main aspects: identity, enjoyment, and confidence. The following subsections detail how research participants viewed themselves as writers before and after the SI, as well as changes in their writing enjoyment and confidence.

Writer Identity

To assess writer identity, participants were asked if they viewed themselves as a writer and to share an experience in which they felt like a writer. Analysis revealed that many participants (9/12; 75%) identified as writers before participating in the SI. Additionally, all participants, even those who did not self-identify as writers, were able to share moments when they saw themselves as writers. The initial positive identification as writers is unsurprising given that they opted into the writing-intensive SI. However, some responses highlighted a lack of self-assurance or reliance on external markers of legitimacy. One participant noted, "I feel like I am more of an amateur writer. My work has never been formally published, and I only write for my own pleasure," suggesting self-recognition was tempered by the absence of formal publication. Another participant shared, "I start[ed] really

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

writing when I was in my late twenties. I've published several education articles under a pen name and published two poetry books." Interestingly, this participant uses the adverb *really* suggesting that writing is only meaningful if published for a larger audience. Another said, "For a while, I didn't call myself a writer, but rather just a person who writes," hinting at a reluctance to claim the title.

On the post-survey, nearly all participants affirmed themselves as writers (11/12; 91.67%). Many expressed a continued identification as writers with responses such as, "I've always considered myself a writer," and "I think anyone who writes can be a writer." However, post-survey responses reflected a nuanced shift with more confident writer self-identification. For example, one participant who did not initially identify as a writer said, "Yes, I didn't realize I could write like that." Several others touched on the idea that anyone can be a writer, no matter the level at which they write, pointing to a developing writer identity.

When examining pre-survey data, there was evidence of both external and internal factors that impacted participants' writer identity. For some, writer identity was tied to past achievements or external praise, such as winning a contest or receiving positive feedback from a professor. While these experiences validated their writing, they also suggest that, for some, writer identity was not fully internalized and was dependent on external factors. Interestingly, other participants connected their identity as writers with emotional coping mechanisms, highlighting writing as a vital outlet for emotional processing. Several respondents emphasized the role of writing in managing emotions and navigating challenging times. For instance, one described journaling as a tool to center themselves. In the post-survey, there were still examples of a focus on external validation, but there was greater emphasis on authentic self-expression and connection rather than public recognition. The experience of the one participant who did not fully internalize a writer identity following the SI provides important insight into the complexity of identity development. The description of feeling like a writer "in this bubble" suggests that identity shifts can be limited by contextual or personal factors and may require personalized, ongoing support. This finding calls attention to the need for differentiated and sustained PD approaches that acknowledge individual differences in growth and barriers to identity integration. Examples of internal and external factors impacting writer identity are in Table 1.

Writing Enjoyment

All participants were asked to rate their enjoyment of writing on the pre- and post-surveys using a Likert scale (1 = Not enjoyable to 5 = Extremely enjoyable). By converting the Likert-scale items to numbers, averages were calculated using Excel. The average of responses on the pre-survey was 3.8, showing participants

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Pre-Survey
Perceptions based on external factors
• "I remember hearing from my professor that this is your best writing prompt ever."
• "Winning a first-place award in a writing contest convinced me of my passion."
• "Being recognized for my poetry gave me confidence."
Perceptions based on internal factors
• "Writing has always been a way to process my emotions."
• "I keep a diary to process emotions, especially in high-stress situations."
• "Writing as a reflective activity helps me center and problem-solve."
• "When I struggled in life, writing was my escape."
Post-Survey
Perceptions based on external factors
• "Sharing my breakthrough and getting a connected response … it is hard to get a message across when others haven't lived it."
• "Hearing affirmations from a peer made my writing feel valuable."
Perceptions based on internal factors
• "Writing the poems felt good to let out stories and emotions I've kept locked up for years."
• "Writing the ode allowed me to express deeply held emotions without needing perfection."

Table 1: Writer Identity: Perceptions Based on External and Internal Factors

generally considered writing to be moderately to very enjoyable. On the post-survey, the average increased to 4.5, showing participants generally considered writing to be very enjoyable to extremely enjoyable. It is worth noting that on the pre-survey, professional writing tasks were reported as being most frequently completed while creative writing tasks, such as poetry or fiction, were the least frequent. In particular, many participants reported focusing on practical tasks such as emails, lesson planning, and reports while some expressed a desire for more creative outlets, such as poetry or prose.

While not all participants engaged in creative writing, survey data did reveal writing served as a source of fulfillment and self-expression for some SI participants. One teacher described writing as a "happy place where I can express myself fully," underscoring a deep, emotional connection to writing. Following the SI, participants reported enhanced enjoyment in writing activities that allowed them to experiment without judgment. For instance, one participant described how they enjoyed the "playful exercises that made writing feel like an exploration, not a task," demonstrating an appreciation for the process of writing. Another stated, "Participating in daily reflective writing warm-ups made writing feel more integrated

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

into my routine." These experiences allowed participants to reconnect with the enjoyment of writing, free from external demands, and appreciate it as a space for personal growth and professional exploration.

Writing Confidence

Prior to the SI, when asked to rate their confidence in writing based on Likert items (1 = Not confident to 5 = Extremely confident), participants' average response was 3.8, indicating participants were moderately to very confident in their writing abilities. The average rating after the SI was 4.1 (very confident).

Pre-survey reflections highlighted how past experiences with positive feedback from mentors and teachers influenced participants' confidence. Others explained that they gained confidence from presenting their work to a wider audience, including one participant who shared that they had recently submitted a poem for publication. Even though several participants indicated positive experiences, others noted the challenge of transferring personal writing confidence to their writing instruction. For instance, one participant explained, "I feel confident as a writer and love the process but translating that to teaching students can be tough." Another explained that despite feeling confident, they "still feel challenged in a curriculum that stifles creativity," indicating external factors that can impact one's teaching instruction and perceived abilities.

Despite these challenges, post-survey responses suggest that the SI nurtured participant confidence by emphasizing process over perfection, providing a space for writing feedback, and encouraging them to reframe their thinking about academic writing. Table 2 includes participant quotes that highlight participants' writing confidence following the SI.

Post-Survey
• "This experience has been a confidence booster, especially letting go of rigid 'academic' writing structures."
• "I realized my level of intelligence and skill in writing through the community's feedback."
• "Now I believe in my abilities to get kids interested in writing and feel less doubtful."
• "Realizing I don't need to write perfectly made me more confident."

Table 2: Self as Writer and Writing Confidence

Self as Writing Instructor

The researchers also examined participants' perceptions and practices as writing instructors, including beliefs about effective writing instruction, instructional practices, and confidence level.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Beliefs About Writing Instruction

Participants rated the effectiveness of various approaches to writing instruction using a Likert scale (1= Not effective to 5 = Extremely effective) before and after the SI. On the pre-survey, most participants indicated they believed the approaches were at least slightly effective, with only one participant indicating their belief that the statement "Authentic writing experiences such as publishing for real audiences" was not effective. Direct instruction, genre-based approaches, and blended instructional methods were seen as most effective (66%–75% rated as very or extremely effective). Workshop models with peer collaboration and authentic writing experiences were rated as less effective (only 50% rated as very or extremely effective).

However, on the post-survey, zero participants responded "not effective" to all the statements, indicating participants believed all approaches were at least slightly effective following the SI. All participants indicated workshop models with peer collaboration to be very or extremely effective on the post-survey, and 75% of participants ranked authentic writing experiences as very or extremely effective. These increases are notable because these were seen as the two *least* effective approaches prior to the SI. However, it must be noted that these were value/belief statements regarding certain approaches to writing instruction and did not address whether study participants changed their practices or not.

Practices as Writing Instructor

Experiences with writing instruction were addressed through a Likert-scale item (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree) that asked about participants' writing instruction. All participants agreed or strongly agreed that they demonstrate stages of the writing process as part of writing instruction. Except for one, all teacher participants agreed or strongly agreed that they share their own experiences related to writing with their students and provide personal writing examples to their students. These statements demonstrate writing instruction that most participants reported they engage in when teaching or coaching teachers.

However, there was greater variation in response from teacher participants regarding modeling writing for students and discussing their writing habits/routines with students. Interestingly, the statements that blend the ideas of teacher as writer and teacher as writing instructor had greater variation in response, with three teachers indicating neither agree or disagree to modeling writing and two teachers disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that they discuss their writing habits/routines with students.

When asked to describe a typical writing lesson, one participant explained that students frequently "write a CER paragraph that incorporates an original

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

claim, relevant evidence, and sound reasoning." However, they added that this is a "formulaic type of writing standardized testing requires" that removes the joy of writing instruction. When compared to this participants' explanation of personal writing, there seems to be a disconnect between the writing they compose and the kind of writing they teach / their students compose. If this is the case, it is possible modeling their writing or discussing their writing habits would not be aligned or not seem appropriate given curricular expectations. Similarly, another teacher explained they "find it difficult to add creativity and fun to writing instruction due to the restrictions of [the curriculum]" but noted they still model writing for their students.

Survey participants were also asked about the extent to which they prioritize their responsibility as a writing instructor or coach compared to other aspects of literacy instruction (e.g., reading instruction). Initially both instructional coaches indicated they give writing equal priority, but after the SI both indicated prioritizing writing much higher. In the teacher subgroup on the pre-survey, all participants indicated writing received equal or higher priority as part of their literacy instruction. On the post-survey, writing priority as part of literacy instruction increased on average, with two (20%) indicating equal priority, two (20%) indicating somewhat higher priority, and six (60%) indicating much higher priority. On both surveys, there was no instance in which writing was seen as *less of a priority*, but after the week-long SI, writing did increase as a priority for many participants.

To further examine writing instructor practices, the teacher participant subgroup was asked about the frequency (Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Frequently, Always) with which they teach or assign certain types of writing. Argumentative and persuasive writing were types that all indicated they implement at least sometimes. Seven participants (70%) indicated argumentative writing assignments occur frequently or always as part of their writing instruction, while six (60%) said the same about persuasive writing. Creative writing was the kind of writing less frequently assigned, with two (20%) participants indicating they rarely assign this and six (60%) indicating this is something they assign sometimes.

Confidence as Writing Instructor

Participants were also asked to select the Likert response (1 = Not confident to 5 = Completely confident) that best represents their level of confidence in effectively performing 18 writing-related tasks. On the pre-survey, the teacher subgroup was *most* likely to indicate the following statement as a task in which they felt completely confident in their teaching ability: "Address common writing challenges and obstacles" (9/10; 90%). The following four statements were next most frequently

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

noted as tasks in which the teacher subgroup felt confident performing with 8/10 participants (80%) indicating feeling completely confident:

- Develop writing prompts
- Foster a supportive writing environment
- Assess writing for content and organization
- Guide students in generating and organizing ideas for writing

The instructional coach subgroup indicated feeling completely confident in their ability to "Utilize rubrics effectively for writing assessment" (2/2; 100%). With one notable exception, no participants from either subgroup indicated feeling not confident about the various tasks. The statement that did receive a response of "not confident" came from a teacher participant addressing the task "Differentiate writing instruction for diverse learners."

Upon examination of post-survey data, there were increases in reported levels of confidence on some items while participants indicated less confidence for others. For instance, on the post-survey, no participants selected "not confident," and there were fewer overall responses of "slightly confident." However, these increases in confidence did not necessarily extend all the way to participants feeling completely confident in their abilities. In fact, all five statements on which teachers were most likely to indicate complete confidence on the pre-survey had fewer instances of complete confidence on the post-survey. While 90% of participants initially indicated complete confidence when addressing common writing challenges and obstacles, only 60% reported this same level of confidence on the post-survey. On the pre-survey, 80% of teacher participants reported they were completely confident in their ability to (a) develop writing prompts, (b) foster a supportive writing environment, (c) assess writing for content and organization, and (d) guide students in ideas for generating and organizing writing. However, the number of participants who were completely confident in these skills on the post-survey ranged from 40% to 60%, showing a drop in those who were completely confident in these tasks prior to the SI. This suggests exposure to best writing practices throughout the SI might have impacted participant perceptions regarding their perceived confidence in implementing said practices.

Importance of Writing in Education

To understand beliefs about the importance of writing in education, participants ranked statements using a Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 =Strongly agree) on the pre- and post-surveys. These were: (a) "All teachers are teachers of writing," (b) "All educators should prioritize teaching writing skills," (c) "Proficiency in writing is essential for academic and/or professional achievement," (d) "Effective writing instruction enhances students' overall learning experience," (e) "Writing

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

is a fundamental skill that should be integrated across all subject areas," and (f) "Developing strong writing abilities is crucial for students' future success." Based on pre-survey data, no participants disagreed with the above statements; however, some indicated they neither agreed nor disagreed with certain statements. The highest levels of agreement were noted for statement (f) (average rating = 4.9) and statement (d) (average rating = 4.8). Statement (a) received the lowest level of agreement on the pre-survey (average rating = 4.6). Following the SI, every statement received a unanimous rating of strongly agree (average rating = 5.0).

Discussion

What It Means to "Be a Writer"

The study revealed the participants' initial hesitation in claiming a writer identity. At first, 75% of participants identified as writers, but their responses demonstrated a range of beliefs about what constitutes a legitimate writer identity. After the SI, this percentage increased to 91.67%, suggesting a positive shift in participants' self-perception as writers. Furthermore, the criteria for identifying as writers also evolved. This complexity aligns with existing research showing that writing identity is shaped by various factors, including personal experiences and self-efficacy (Cremin & Oliver, 2016).

At the start of the SI, many participants relied heavily on external markers to validate their identity as writers. One participant expressed uncertainty about writing status due to lack of formal publications, underscoring the perception that without formal recognition, they could not fully claim a writer identity. This hesitation supports Street & Stang's (2009) research showing that teachers must be comfortable and confident with writing before they can effectively teach it. By the SI's conclusion, participants began adopting a more internalized understanding of what it means to be a writer, demonstrating that targeted PD experiences that emphasize personal engagement with writing enable participants to redefine what counts as legitimate writing (Athans, 2022; Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Zimmerman et al., 2014).

Self-Efficacy and Writer Identity: An Interplay Between Identity, Confidence, and Enjoyment

After being given the space to write creatively and reflectively, study data revealed increases in participants' writing identity, confidence, and enjoyment of writing with a notable increase in enjoyment. This finding echoes Dierking & Fox's (2013) description of the relationship between confidence and identity: greater confidence encourages teachers to write more, reinforcing their sense of self as writers. Additionally, participants described stronger emotional connections to writing, using

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

it as a form of self-expression and a coping mechanism, allowing them to process difficult moments in their lives. This finding underscores the role of personal investment and enjoyment in writing identity development. The emergence of emotional and personal connections to writing in participants' responses suggests a transformation as they moved beyond viewing writing solely as a professional obligation.

The observed interplay between identity, confidence, and enjoyment aligns with Bandura's (1997) concept of self-efficacy. Participants who began the SI with low self-efficacy regarding writing reported considerable increases in both their confidence and willingness to identify as writers by the end of the SI. This shift in participants' understanding of writer identity aligns with Bifuh-Ambe's (2013) research showing that sustained PD can help teachers develop more positive attitudes toward writing and increased confidence in their abilities both as writers and writing teachers.

Identity Crisis: Writer Versus Writing Teacher

The study also highlights a recurring tension in participants' professional lives: balancing their personal identity as writers with their instructional role as writing teachers. While many participants initially identified as writers, they struggled to reconcile their own writing practices with the demands of teaching writing in structured, often prescriptive environments. Cremin & Oliver (2016) highlight the challenges teachers face in navigating their writing identities within institutional contexts, noting that teachers often have narrow conceptions of writing and experience tensions between their personal writing practices and professional expectations.

One of the most notable findings was that the SI provided participants with a space to renegotiate their dual identities as both writers and writing teachers. Initially, many participants reported feeling disconnected from their personal writing because of pressures of classroom instruction. This underscores the professional dilemma faced by educators who view writing primarily as a task to teach rather than as a meaningful practice to experience alongside their students (Cremin & Oliver, 2016; Street & Stang, 2009). However, the SI experience facilitated a shift in perspective for many. Participants described how engaging in personal and creative writing during the SI allowed them to see writing not just as a skill to be taught but as a shared experience that could enrich their classroom instruction. This aligns with Zimmerman et al.'s (2014) findings that personal writing experiences can transform teaching approaches.

Despite positive shifts in participants' identities, challenges remained, particularly regarding the tension between authentic writing practices and curricular

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

mandates. Many participants expressed frustration with the constraints imposed by standardized testing and prescribed curricula, which often leave little room for creativity or personal expression in the classroom. This finding illustrates the broader systemic issue that while research-based best practices advocate for creativity, student choice, and authentic writing (Cohen, 2023), many teachers operate in environments that prioritize formulaic approaches. In this study, participants' reflections on tensions between personal writing identity and institutional expectations reveal how school context likely shapes the translation of PD learning into classroom practice. Factors such as curricular mandates, administrative support, available resources, and student demographics may either facilitate or constrain teachers' ability to implement new writing instruction strategies. Therefore, future research should explore how these contextual variables impact the sustainability and nature of instructional changes following PD. The collaborative nature of the SI enabled participants to explore innovative strategies for blending mandated curricular requirements with more meaningful writing experiences. As Chong & Kong (2012) argue, collaborative contexts have an impact on teacher efficacy. Thus, teacher self-efficacy in writing instruction could increase when educators collaborate in supportive environments where they can share ideas and develop practical solutions. The next section details ways PD can be leveraged to aid teachers as they bridge the gap between formulaic writing practices and approaches to writing instruction that allow for creativity and enjoyment of writing.

Ultimately, study findings suggest that addressing the writer-teacher identity crisis is crucial for fostering effective writing instruction. When teachers can integrate their personal writing practices with their instructional responsibilities, they are better positioned to advocate for meaningful writing experiences, even within rigid institutional constraints. Participants demonstrated a transformative understanding of their dual professional identities, recognizing that being a writer and teacher are not mutually exclusive (Cremin & Oliver, 2016; Street & Stang, 2009). Moving forward, PD programs should prioritize creating spaces where teachers can engage deeply in personal writing while simultaneously exploring ways to bring authentic writing into their classrooms. Doing so can help teachers move beyond the identity crisis and develop a more holistic sense of themselves as both writers and educators (Bifuh-Ambe, 2013; Yoo, 2017; Zimmerman et al., 2014).

Fostering Teacher Writers: Time, Space, and Opportunity

For teachers to "be" writers, they need an environment conducive to writing, including both time and space to immerse oneself in their practice. The SI provided this environment, offering extended periods for writing and peer discussion.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Participants, some of whom reported rarely writing creatively before, indicated enjoying both creative and reflective writing during the SI. However, without time and space for writing exploration, teachers might be less likely to engage in writing that brings enjoyment or personal exploration, which could impact their identity as writers. This aligns with post-survey data in which multiple participants specifically referenced "time" as a needed support to foster a writing community. Relatedly, lack of time was seen as a barrier to continued writing for some. This aligns with the work of Bifuh-Ambe (2013), who called for PD workshops with "adequate time for teachers to explore their own writing skills" (p. 152), something still needed today. Graham (2019) recommended that teachers and administrators design and deliver writing-focused PD, use the same materials in classrooms, and prioritize "changing classroom practices to ultimately promote students' growth as writers" (p. 294). In this way, PD is addressing the disconnect between formulaic writing often happening in schools and the types of writing that was privileged during the SI. To extend this study, it would be beneficial to examine teachers' classroom practices following the SI to see how, if at all, their instruction is impacted by their participation in the SI.

When asked what supports would be needed to aid them in continuing to prioritize their personal writing, over 40% of SI participants specifically referenced writing retreats, suggesting the importance in dedicating not only time but a place to immerse oneself in writing without other distractions. Since past writing experiences can impact teacher confidence and ultimately influence writing pedagogy (Cremin & Oliver, 2016), educators need ongoing opportunities to engage in writing that can increase their confidence and enjoyment of writing. When given the opportunity, Yoo (2017) found teachers saw value in engaging in creative writing to improve their own writing and writing instruction, and that there was a need to "generate spaces for teachers to authentically engage in writing … as teachers were eager to voice their desires to develop their writer selves" (p. 9). By positioning educators as writers through PD opportunities, such as the SI or a writing retreat, teachers are practicing necessary skills that can positively impact self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). This can also strengthen their writing identity (Athans, 2022; Bifuh-Ambe, 2013) and improve their confidence regarding their writing and ability to teach writing (Philippakos et al., 2023).

Teachers also need to experience being writers to aid them in seeing the impact of various approaches to writing instruction. Prior to the SI, workshop models with peer collaboration and authentic writing experiences were rated as less effective compared to other approaches to writing instruction. However, after the SI, beliefs about the effectiveness of these two approaches increased considerably. Since participants experienced both approaches during the SI, this suggests they found them to be effective throughout the week, resulting in higher ratings of

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

effectiveness following the SI. Not only does this show a need for integrating these approaches into participants' writing instruction, but it highlights the value of teachers experiencing instruction and not just assigning writing tasks. For instance, the importance of collaboration was not as strongly recognized until the participants engaged in a workshop model and experienced the benefit of peer collaboration. Relatedly, modeling effective writing strategies, such as those used throughout the SI, has been found to improve teacher attitudes toward writing (Curtis, 2017). By providing teachers with such PD opportunities, they will be exposed to best practices, which can influence writing instruction with the ultimate goal of supporting student writers.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to report findings following a week-long, writing-intensive PD examining potential changes in teachers' beliefs and perceptions about themselves as writers and writing instructors. While many study participants indicated they saw themselves as writers prior to the SI, following the week-long PD there was an increase in participants who identified as writers. Furthermore, there was a notable difference in participants' confidence regarding their writing identity. Similarly, participant perceptions regarding the importance of writing instruction were generally strong at the start of the SI; however, post-survey data indicated that beliefs about the effectiveness of certain writing practices and the priority of writing instruction increased and strengthened. This study supports previous research that has indicated the positive impact that collaborative, targeted PD experiences (Chong & Kong, 2012; Philippakos et al., 2023), like NWP's Summer Institute, can have on teachers as writers and writing instructors. However, there are study limitations that must be noted.

This study's findings are limited to the experiences and perceptions of a small sample of 12 educators who voluntarily participated in the writing-intensive SI. Previous research has indicated teacher self-efficacy as writers/writing instructors can have impacts on their pedagogy and student writing outcomes (e.g., Cohen, 2023). Given the potential of sustained PD positively impacting teachers' writing identity, it is recommended this research be expanded with larger groups of teachers participating in writing-focused PD. Since study participants mainly consisted of ELA educators, it is also recommended that teachers from across content areas and grade levels are exposed to this kind of PD. Given different content expertise, it would be interesting to see the ways, if any, in which teachers differ before and after experiencing an SI in their writing identity, beliefs about writing instruction, and confidence in teaching writing. It would also benefit PSTs to participate in a writing methods course so they are equipped with best practices for writing pedagogy

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

during their teacher preparation experience. While not all PSTs are exposed to such a course (Athans, 2022; Donovan et al., 2023), early educational experiences to prepare future teachers as writing instructors can aid their writing confidence, better preparing them to serve as writing instructors and support student writing.

Additional study limitations include the self-reported nature of survey responses, which may introduce biases, and the brief time between the pre- and post-survey being administered. To address the latter, a follow-up survey administered later could have shed insight on if post-survey data remained consistent over time or was a result of the SI having just ended. As such, future research should examine long-term impacts of intensive PD experiences (such as participant perceptions over the course of a year), as well as the impact of ongoing PD. While study findings indicated positive impacts on participants' writing identity and confidence as writers at the end of the SI, future research should be conducted over a longer period, such as the duration of an academic year. In particular, future research should examine how, if at all, instruction is impacted during the academic year following participation in the SI. The need for this was made evident by one participant who acknowledged that the "isolated setting" of the SI allowed her to have a somewhat increased writer identity but explained that outside of this setting she did not anticipate viewing herself as a writer. This further highlights the need for sustained partnerships between PD providers, such as NWP sites, and school districts to prioritize ongoing authentic writing opportunities that encourage teachers to assume and maintain a writer identity, aligning with recommendations from Graham (2019). This will require buy-in from school districts, which must provide teachers with time and space for writing. Additionally, districts must support teacher autonomy so existing curricula can be modified and instruction adjusted as needed. In doing so, teachers will be better able to support students as writers and engage them in meaningful writing instruction for authentic tasks and audiences. By embracing the NWP's "teachers teaching teachers" model, districts can create an ecosystem where writing instruction thrives. When educators see themselves as writers, they transform their classrooms into communities of authors in which every student finds voice and the power to improve the blank page.

References

Athans, K. (2022). The mystique of the National Writing Project. *Texas Journal of Literacy Education*, *9*(2), 58–76.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Benko, S.L. (2016). Instruction matters: Secondary English preservice teachers' implementation of cognitively demanding writing tasks. *English Education*, *48*(3), 201–236. https://doi.org/10.58680/ee201628483

Bifuh-Ambe, E. (2013). Developing successful writing teachers: Outcomes of professional development exploring teachers' perceptions of themselves as writers and writing teachers and their students' attitudes and abilities to write across the curriculum. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, *12*(3), 137–156.

Chen, L.T., & Liu, L. (2020). Methods to analyze Likert-type data in educational technology research. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, *13*(2), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1302.04

Chong, W.H., & Kong, C.A. (2012). Teacher collaborative learning and teacher self-efficacy: The case of lesson study. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *80*(3), 263–283. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2011.596854

Cohen, L. (2023). *Third-to fifth-grade teachers' training and their confidence in teaching writing*. ProQuest LLC.

Cremin, T., & Baker, S. (2010). Exploring teacher-writer identities in the classroom: Conceptualising the struggle. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *9*(3), 8–25.

Cremin, T., & Oliver, L. (2016). Teachers as writers: A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 32(3), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1187664

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Curtis, G. (2017). The impact of teacher efficacy and beliefs on writing instruction. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *84*(1), 17–24.

Dierking, R.C., & Fox, R.F. (2013). "Changing the way I teach": Building teacher knowledge, confidence, and autonomy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(2), 129–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112462893

Donovan, S.J., Sanders, J., DeFauw, D.L., & Myers, J. (2023). K-12 writing teachers' careerspan development: Participatory pedagogical content knowledge of writing. *Literacy Practice and Research*, *48*(2), 4.

Faulkner, M. (2013). Remediating remediation: From basic writing to writing across the curriculum. *CEA Forum*, *42*(2), 45–60.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2013). A range of writing across the content areas. *The Reading Teacher*, *67*(2), 96–101. https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.1200

Gallagher, K. (2006). *Teaching adolescent writers*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032682631

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen 'Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write like this: Teaching real-world writing through modeling and mentor texts*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032683263

Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, *43*(1), 277–303. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821125

Grünke, M., & Leonard-Zabel, A. (2015). How to support struggling writers: What the research stipulates. *International Journal of Special Education*, *30*(3), 137–149.

Hall, A.H., & White, K.M. (2019). Do my students know I don't like writing? Shifting attitudes and instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, *73*(3), 362–366. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1850

Hamilton, L.S., Kaufman, J.H., & Diliberti, M. (2020). *Teaching and leading through a pandemic: Key findings from the American educator panels Spring 2020 COVID-19 surveys*. Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License, 2020. https://doi.org/10.7249/RRA168-2

Harpe, S.E. (2015). How to analyze Likert and other rating scale data. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, *7*(6), 836–850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2015.08.001

Kinloch, V., & Drew, S. (2008). Innovative writing instruction: Authentic beliefs. *English Journal*, *98*(3), 85–89. https://doi.org/10.58680/ej20086732

Kohnen, A.M. (2013). The authenticity spectrum: The case of a science journalism writing project. *English Journal*, *102*(5), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.58680/ej201323584

Locke, T., Whitehead, D., Dix, S., & Cawkwell, G. (2011). New Zealand teachers respond to the 'national writing project' experience. *Teacher Development*, *15*, 273–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2011.608509

McLaughlin, M. (2015). *Content area reading: Teaching and learning for college and career readiness* (2nd ed.). Pearson.

Mulligan, R., & Dawson, K. (2014). Learning from our youngest writers: Preservice teachers in primary classes. *English Education*, *46*(2), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.58680/ee201424564

Murphy, S., & Smith, M.A. (Eds.). (2023). *When challenge brings change: How teacher breakthroughs transform the classroom*. Teachers College Press.

National Assessment Governing Board. (2020). *The nation's report card: Assessment schedule*. https://www.nagb.gov/naep/assessment-schedule.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *The nation's report card: Writing 2011 (NCES 2012–470)*. Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). *The neglected "R": The need for a writing revolution*. College Entrance Examination Board. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475856.pdf

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

National Literacy Institute. (2024). *Literacy statistics 2024-2025 (Where we are now)*. https://www.thenationalliteracyinstitute.com/post/literacy-statistics-2024-2025-where-we-are-now

National Writing Project. (2024). *Who we are*. National Writing Project. https://www.nwp.org/who-we-are

Pella, S. (2011). A situative perspective on developing writing pedagogy in a teacher professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*(2), 107–126.

Philippakos, Z.A.T., MacArthur, C.A., & Rocconi, L.M. (2023). Effects of genre-based writing professional development on K to 2 teachers' confidence and students' writing quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *135*(5), 104316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104316

Pregoner, J.D. (2024). Research approaches in education: A comparison of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. *IMCC Journal of Science*, *4*(2), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5111007

Read, S., & Landon-Hays, M.M. (2013). The knowing/doing gap: Challenges of effective writing instruction in high school. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, *2*(2), 3. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol2/iss2/3/

Sherry, M.B. (2017). Prospective English teachers learn to respond to diversity in students' writing through the Student Writing Archive Project (SWAP). *English Education*, *49*(4), 347–376.

Silva, E.F., dos Santos Elias, L.C., Grande, M.C.L.R., & Dessen, M.A. (2024). Inclusive education: A data triangulation study. *Trends in Psychology*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-024-00394-z

Simonds, L. (2013). *Good writing can help you succeed*. TIME. https://business.time.com/2013/04/19/good-writing-can-help-you-succeed/

Skerrett, A. (2013). Building multiliterate and multilingual writing practices and identities. *English Education*, *45*(4), 322–360.

Street, C., & Stang, K.K. (2009). In what ways do teacher education courses change teachers' self confidence as writers? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *36*(3), 75–94.

Sullivan, G.M., & Artino Jr., A.R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *5*(4), 541–542. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4-18

Tompkins, G.E. (2019). *Teaching writing: Balancing process and product* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Trybus, M. (2019). The evolving role of teachers amid change. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *85*(5), 6–8.

Urquhart, V., & Frazee, D. (2012). *Teaching reading in the content areas: If not me then who?* (3rd ed.). ASCD.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Van Lancker, W., & Parolin, Z. (2020). COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A social crisis in the making. *The Lancet Public Health*, *5*(5), e243–e244. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0

Vetter, A. (2010). Positioning students as readers and writers through talk in a high school English classroom. *English Education*, *43*(1), 33–64.

Whitaker, C. (2005). Best practices in teaching writing. *Write in the Middle*, *6*, 1–8.

Wiens, K. (2012). *I won't hire people who use poor grammar. Here's why*. Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2012/07/i-wont-hire-people-who-use-poo

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2011). *The understanding by design guide to creating high-quality units*. ASCD.

Yoo, J. (2017). Writing out on the edge: Using creative writing approaches in teacher education. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, *7*(1), 20–28.

Zimmerman, B.S., Morgan, D.N., & Kidder-Brown, M. (2014). The use of conceptual and pedagogical tools as mediators of preservice teachers' perceptions of self as writers and future teachers of writing. *Action in Teacher Education*, *36*(2), 141–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2014.898598

Zinsser, W.K. (1988). *Writing to learn*. Harper & Row.

About the Authors

H. Michelle Kreamer, EdD, is an Associate Professor in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and Site Director of the National Writing Project of Acadiana. Her research interests include pre-service teacher education and writing and writing instruction. Her publications have appeared in the *English Journal* and the *Journal of Literacy Innovation*. Email: hmkreamer@louisiana.edu

Megan C. Breaux, EdD, is a Visiting Assistant Professor in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and Assistant Site Director for the National Writing Project of Acadiana. Her research focuses on writing pedagogy and student support initiatives, with recent publications in the *English Journal* and the *Journal of At-Risk Issues* examining virtual writing instruction and social-emotional learning. Email: megan.breaux@louisiana.edu

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen 'Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

Appendix A: Survey Excerpts

The following appendix includes pre- and post-survey items that were analyzed for the scope of this research study. Survey items that were not analyzed as part of this study have been removed for relevance and space. In the sub-section, "Perceptions, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Experiences Regarding Writing Instruction," italicized text indicates a slightly varied survey question for those participants who were instructional coaches, not current classroom teachers.

Part 1: Pre-Survey

Section I:
Perceptions, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Experiences Regarding Writing

1. Do you consider yourself a writer? Why or why not?
   a. Can you describe a specific moment or experience in which you saw yourself as a writer?
2. What types of writing do you typically engage in (e.g., professional reports, emails, creative writing)?
3. What barriers or concerns, if any, do you have regarding your personal writing (e.g., time constraints, writing skill/ability)?
4. For this item, please indicate how you rate your enjoyment of writing.
   1= Not enjoyable at all
   2= Slightly enjoyable
   3= Moderately enjoyable
   4= Very enjoyable
   5= Extremely enjoyable
5. For this item, please indicate how confident you feel in your writing abilities.
   1 = Not confident
   2= Slightly confident
   3= Somewhat confident
   4 = Fairly confident
   5= Completely confident
6. For this item, please read the following statements and select the Likert response that best represents the frequency at which you engage in the listed writing activities.
   1= Never
   2= Rarely
   3= Sometimes
   4= Frequently
   5= Always

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen 'Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

a. Writing emails
b. Writing texts
c. Keeping a personal journal or diary
d. Writing notes or memos
e. Writing lesson plans
f. Writing creative fiction or poetry
g. Writing creative nonfiction
h. Updating a blog or personal website
i. Participating in online forums or social media discussions
j. Writing letters to friends or family members
k. Writing to-do lists or task reminders
l. Writing in a planner or calendar
m. Writing professional reports
n. Crafting résumés or cover letters
o. Participating in collaborative writing projects

Perceptions, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Experiences Regarding Writing Instruction

7. For this item, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your writing instruction.
   1= Strongly disagree
   2= Disagree
   3= Neither agree nor disagree
   4= Agree
   5= Strongly agree

   a. I actively demonstrate various stages of the writing process to my students/*to the teachers I work with.*
   b. I share personal anecdotes and experiences related to writing with my students/*with the teachers I work with.*
   c. I provide examples of my own writing to illustrate writing concepts to my students/*to the teachers I work with.*
   d. I encourage students/*teachers I work with* to observe my writing techniques and strategies as a model for their own work/teaching.
   e. I regularly discuss my writing habits and routines with students/*teachers I work with* to help them develop their own writing practices/*develop or enhance their writing instruction.*
8. For this item, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the importance of writing in education.
   1= Strongly disagree
   2= Disagree
   3= Neither agree nor disagree

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

4= Agree
5= Strongly agree

a. All teachers are teachers of writing.
b. All educators should prioritize teaching writing skills.
c. Proficiency in writing is essential for academic and/or professional achievement.
d. Effective writing instruction enhances students' overall learning experience.
e. Writing is a fundamental skill that should be integrated across all subject areas.
f. Developing strong writing abilities is crucial for students' future success.

9. For this item, please indicate to what extent you prioritize your responsibility as a writing instructor/*coach* in comparison to other aspects of literacy instruction (e.g., reading instruction).
   1= Much lower priority
   2= Somewhat lower priority
   3= Equal priority
   4= Somewhat higher priority
   5= Much higher priority
10. For this item, please indicate how frequently you teach or assign the following types of writing to your students/*provide support to the teachers you work with for the following types of writing.*
    1= Never
    2= Rarely
    3= Sometimes
    4= Frequently
    5= Always

    a. Argumentative writing
    b. Expository writing
    c. Narrative writing
    d. Descriptive writing
    e. Persuasive writing
    f. Creative writing
11. Describe a typical writing lesson/example of writing instruction in your classroom. */Describe a typical coaching or professional development session you might facilitate that is focused on writing instruction.*
12. For this item, please select the Likert response that best represents your level of confidence in your ability to effectively perform each of the stated tasks.
    1 = Not confident
    2= Slightly confident

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

3= Somewhat confident
4 = Fairly confident
5= Completely confident

a. Design writing tasks
b. Deliver writing instruction
c. Provide grammar feedback
d. Facilitate students' peer review sessions
e. Develop writing prompts
f. Incorporate technology into writing instruction
g. Foster a supportive writing environment
h. Differentiate writing instruction for diverse learners
i. Utilize writing conferences for individualized feedback
j. Scaffold writing instruction for varying skill levels
k. Implement strategies for teaching revision and editing
l. Integrate writing across the curriculum
m. Address common writing challenges and obstacles
n. Assess writing for content and organization
o. Utilize rubrics effectively for writing assessment
p. Provide feedback on writing mechanics (e.g., punctuation, spelling)
q. Guide students in generating and organizing ideas for writing
r. Foster a growth mindset in students' approach to writing

13. For this item, please select the Likert response that best represents your opinion on the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching writing.

1= Not effective
2= Slightly effective
3= Moderately effective
4= Very effective
5= Extremely effective

a. Direct instruction with structured writing exercises
b. Process-based writing instruction with emphasis on drafting and revision
c. Inquiry-based approaches where students explore topics through writing
d. Workshop models incorporating peer review and collaborative writing
e. Genre-based instruction focusing on specific types of writing (e.g., narrative, argumentative)
f. Authentic writing experiences such as publishing for real audiences
g. Blended approaches combining multiple instructional methods

14. What barriers or concerns, if any, do you have regarding your writing instruction (e.g., time constraints, teacher or student skill/ability, curriculum*)/ability to support teachers as writing instructors (e.g., time constraints; teacher, student, or coach skill/ability, curriculum)?*

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

15. Please upload an example of a writing task you assigned to your students during the 2023-24 school year. */Please upload an example of writing-focused resources you provided to teachers during the 2023-2024 school year, if applicable.*
16. Reflecting on your own experiences, in what ways does your identity as a writer shape both your approach to teaching writing and your efforts to foster a supportive and empowering writing environment for your students/*your approach to supporting teachers' writing instruction?*

Part 2: Post-Survey

Section I:
Perceptions, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Experiences Regarding Writing

1. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, do you consider yourself a writer? Why or why not?
   a. Can you describe any moments during the institute when you felt like a writer?
2. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, please indicate how you rate your enjoyment of writing.
   1= Not enjoyable at all
   2= Slightly enjoyable
   3= Moderately enjoyable
   4= Very enjoyable
   5= Extremely enjoyable
3. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, please indicate how confident you feel in your writing abilities.
   1 = Not confident
   2= Slightly confident
   3= Moderately confident
   4 = Very confident
   5= Extremely confident
4. What supports (e.g., curriculum resources, professional development sessions, writing retreats) do you think would help you to continue pursuing/prioritizing your personal writing?

Perceptions, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Experiences Regarding Writing Instruction

5. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the importance of writing in education.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

1= Strongly disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither agree nor disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly agree

a. All teachers are teachers of writing.
b. All educators should prioritize teaching writing skills.
c. Proficiency in writing is essential for academic and/or professional achievement.
d. Effective writing instruction enhances students' overall learning experience.
e. Writing is a fundamental skill that should be integrated across all subject areas.
f. Developing strong writing abilities is crucial for students' future success.

6. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, please indicate to what extent you prioritize your responsibility as a writing instructor/*coach* in comparison to other aspects of literacy instruction (e.g., reading instruction).
   1= Much lower priority
   2= Somewhat lower priority
   3= Equal priority
   4= Somewhat higher priority
   5= Much higher priority
7. Do you have ideas for future writing lessons/*coaching or professional development sessions* sparked by this week's professional development? If yes, please describe one idea or potential lesson/*coaching or professional development session.*
8. Now that you have participated in the Summer Institute, please select the Likert response that best represents your level of confidence in your ability to effectively perform each of the stated tasks.
   1 = Not confident
   2= Slightly confident
   3= Moderately confident
   4 = Very confident
   5= Extremely confident
   a. Design writing tasks
   b. Deliver writing instruction
   c. Provide grammar feedback
   d. Facilitate peer review sessions
   e. Develop writing prompts
   f. Incorporate technology into writing instruction

© University of Toronto Press, 2025

https://utppublishing.com/doi/pdf/10.3138/wap-2025-0011 - Helen "Michelle: Kreamer <hmkreamer@louisiana.edu> - Saturday, December 27, 2025 11:26:36 AM - IP Address:76.72.127.251

g. Foster a supportive writing environment
h. Differentiate writing instruction for diverse learners
i. Utilize writing conferences for individualized feedback
j. Scaffold writing instruction for varying skill levels
k. Implement strategies for teaching revision and editing
l. Integrate writing across the curriculum
m. Address common writing challenges and obstacles
n. Assess writing for content and organization
o. Utilize rubrics effectively for writing assessment
p. Provide feedback on writing mechanics (e.g., punctuation, spelling)
q. Guide students in generating and organizing ideas for writing
r. Foster a growth mindset in students' approach to writing

9. Now that you have participated in the NWP-A Summer Institute, please select the Likert response that best represents your opinion on the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching writing.
   1= Not effective
   2= Slightly effective
   3= Moderately effective
   4= Very effective
   5= Extremely effective
   a. Direct instruction with structured writing exercises
   b. Process-based writing instruction with emphasis on drafting and revision
   c. Inquiry-based approaches where students explore topics through writing
   d. Workshop models incorporating peer review and collaborative writing
   e. Genre-based instruction focusing on specific types of writing (e.g., narrative, argumentative)
   f. Authentic writing experiences such as publishing for real audiences
   g. Blended approaches combining multiple instructional methods
10. In what ways, if any, have your barriers or concerns regarding your writing instruction (e.g., time constraints, teacher or student skill/ability, curriculum)/*ability to support teachers as writing instructors (e.g., time constraints; teacher, student, or coach skill/ability, curriculum)* shifted after being part of the NWP-A Summer Institute? Please explain.

© University of Toronto Press, 2025