

The problem of writing in mass education

Deborah Brandt

What makes writing difficult to teach and learn? Why has writing been subordinated to reading in the context of literacy education? If more and more people are now expected to do more and more writing (at work, at school, and in the civic and social spheres) how do these demands pose challenges and opportunities for teachers and schools? This article explores writing as a craft skill that differs sharply from forms of *book learning* on which traditional liberal arts education is based. As a craft, writing develops in association with vocation, ambition, publicity, guild membership, and, most critically, apprenticeship to a master craftsman. Development of craft requires time, repetition, experimentation, and embodied understanding—all of which are hard to come by in a crowded and lockstep school curriculum. When writing is understood as a craft, democratizing writing as part of public education is seen to require a radical departure from school traditions, including traditional social relations among students and teachers.

Keywords: writing, reading, History of Education.

Introduction

Democracy and rhetoric have long justified each other. If democracy requires citizens to be self-governing, to know how to petition, how to represent their interests, and how to deliberate with others, then citizens need to own the tools of rhetoric. And if rhetoric is to flourish in its healthy forms, and not in its cynical or oppressive forms, then it needs the open conditions that democracy promises (Hogan 2012). So from a theoretical perspective, at least, this relationship between democracy and rhetoric is straightforward, and, in democratic societies, serves as a mandate for education, especially in areas of language and literacy. But for those engaged in the day-to-day work of teaching,

Deborah Brandt, Professor Emerita of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1118 Central Ave., Ocean City, NJ 08226. E-mail: dlbrandt@wisc.edu

the formal relationship between democracy and rhetoric is not the important issue. Rather, what is important is this question: How do we democratize rhetoric itself? How do we make sure that the language capacities that are needed to petition, represent and deliberate are developed fully in every student, and not just some students? Even as Western democracies have grown more inclusive and civil rights more expansive, the democratizing of the tools of rhetoric lags behind. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the realm of writing. Writing is not the only form that rhetoric or political engagement can take, but it retains, at least for now, a primary role in the way that citizens must communicate with their governments and with each other. Yet, in the United States, for example, most young citizens graduate from high school without proficiency in writing (National Assessment of Educational Progress 2011). Forces that interfere with the development of writing throw up obstacles to the promises and potential of democracy. And while it may be easy, especially these days, to identify some of those interfering forces, many of them are subtle and actually linger in the foundations of public education itself.

My aim here is to examine why writing for citizen engagement struggles in public education and what we might be able to do as teachers, researchers, and citizens to address the sources of that struggle. To do so I draw broadly from findings from two in-depth interview studies I conducted, one in the 1990s (*Literacy in American Lives*) and one in the 2010s (*The Rise of Writing*), which together analyzed the reading and writing experiences of 200 diverse Americans born between the early 1890s and the late 1990s. Their ages ranged from 10 to 90 at the time of the interviews. Using methods of biographical sociology, my goal was to understand the changing conditions for literacy and literacy learning across time and to characterize how mass literacy as a force of change manifests in everyday life. The aim of this method, as French sociologist Daniel Bertaux (2003) has described it, is to gather facts about people's lives, to accumulate accountings of what they have done, how they have done it, where, with whom, for how long, to what degree, in what manner, with what materials, and with what perceived results, as well as to determine what has been done to people and how they reacted to it. The focus is on processes, events, actions, materials, and contexts. Individual accounts matter for what can be systematically and objectively gleaned from them, in my case, about how the long history of mass literacy manifests in particular times, places, and social locations; how particular members of society enter into its force; and with what effects on them and others. Although this research is peopled, the focus is not on people per se but on what their life experiences can show us about mass literacy as

a historical and socially structuring force, a force that will be present in but also always exceeding an individual's account. The aim is to uncover systematic patterns in people's testimonies that reveal structuring forces up against which people live their lives. In my analysis, I look closely and systematically at interview scripts for the appeals people make to such structuring forces, as resources, constraints, explanations, puzzles, and problems in their encounters with literacy. The more these appeals turn up across cases, the closer we get to what might be called the experience of mass literacy. Especially pertinent in this approach is the interplay of past and present.

Reading Not Writing in Early Public Schooling

The problem of writing in mass education actually goes back to the beginning of universal public schooling, and it is worthwhile taking a look back because this history still presses on schools today. In Sweden, as in the United States, common schools were founded in order to promote reading but not writing. Reading and writing were two separate parts of literacy that developed differently (Johansson 1977, Lindmark 2004). They spread differently, at different times, and they held different meanings to the people who took them up. Mass reading developed under the sponsorship of church and state. Reading was considered critical to salvation in the dominant religious thought and to civic responsibility in secular thought. Access to reading and books was seen as a right, and teaching reading was seen as a duty. But the initial projects of mass literacy excluded writing. Harder to teach, messy to learn, not as suitable a vehicle for religious or social control, and especially subversive in the hands of the oppressed, mass writing spread separately from mass reading and more slowly. As the Swedish scholar Egil Johanson explains, writing spread not through the insistence of church and state but through the attraction of artisanship and commerce. While reading was taught freely and free of charge in the state-sponsored schools, students who sought to learn writing had to pay for private instruction. Most of the students were male and in the U.S. had to be free. Writing was not linked with worship but with work; it was never central to doctrines of universal salvation or assimilation (Monaghan 2005). And in the formation of democratic government, reading was considered the skill that mattered for citizens. The quintessential citizen was the informed citizen, the reading citizen (Brown 1977). Reading was for the many, and writing remained for the few. As a consequence, schools organized themselves around the promotion of reading, making reading the basis for many

other forms of learning in school, including, ironically, the learning of writing itself (Kaestle 1983, Kaestle et al. 1991).

School Writing as Reading-Based Writing

How often do we hear the claim that to write well, you must read well? That you can only write as well as you can read? That the best way to learn how to write is to read, read, and read some more? These are deeply held beliefs, promoted by teachers and often well-known authors as well. When it comes to writing vs. reading, reading holds the morally superior position. Reading is considered a strong foundation for living well. It is seen as the springboard to learning. Reading is said to be the best way to exercise the mind. It is thought to contribute to the development of character. People who read are thought to be better citizens than those who don't. Above all, reading is thought to provide the wisdom and worldliness that make one worthy to write (Prose 2007, Sicherman 2010). We readily honor the well-read life and perhaps the well-written text but the well-written life? The phrase scarcely has meaning. This preference for reading can be seen everywhere. One example I like to point to is a regular series in one of our national newspapers that features interviews with well-known or highly-regarded writers, mostly literary writers but others too. The interviews consist exclusively of questions about their reading: the books they like, the books they read as children, the books that have influenced them, etc. But the interview questions cover not a bit about how these authors write or how they learned to write. Nor are the authors asked how their writing might have shaped them as readers or as people. The assumption is that they learned to write by reading and everything we need to know about them as writers can be revealed through what they have read. Or maybe it is the idea that being a writer makes you a good judge of books. In any case, the interview questions display no curiosity about the act of writing and no light is shed on the experience of being a writer or developing as a writer. Similarly, the U.S. government published a report earlier this century about the terrible decline in literary reading among adults and young people (National Endowment for the Humanities 2004). Buried in that report was a little footnote about writing. Literary reading was down but literary writing, the writing of fiction and poetry, had increased since the previous survey, especially among youth and across racial and socioeconomic lines. But that fact was left in the footnote. In fact, at the end of the report, this rise in writing was treated as a problem

as the analysts believed that any writing ungrounded in reading was bound to be solipsistic and immature.

Believing that reading is the basis for writing drives most educational approaches to writing, and, many theories of literacy and language development (Shanahan 2016). In the early years of schooling, reading gets more instructional time and is usually taught before or instead of writing. Later and especially in higher education, assigned writing is almost always based on some sort of prior reading of published material. Indeed writing is often used to test how well students have understood or interpreted what they have been assigned to read. These practices in different ways all rely on a largely untested assumption that writing is a subsidiary of reading—and an outgrowth of it—and that writing requires reading for its nourishment. We have yet to seriously test the opposite assumption: how reading might require writing for nourishment.

This tucking of writing inside reading is justified in part by cognitive research that shows both processes as active, constructive, mutually supportive and inextricably intertwined. Both rely on a shared pool of language resources. And all of that is true. But at the same time recent brain research, although still rudimentary, suggests that reading and writing fire up distinctly different parts of the brain (Dehaene 2009, Flaherty 2005, James et. al. 2016). During writing, both the instinct to communicate and the pleasure (or terror) of social connection become prominent. From the point of view of our brains, we are undertaking a different kind of literacy when we write and even a different kind of reading when we read our own emerging texts during composition. These findings from neurology would help to explain why reading and writing are not instructional substitutes for each other, why we learn to read best by reading and learn to write best by writing. But our assumptions are hard to let go.

So ingrained is what we might call reading-based writing that we just tend to accept it as common sense, rather than the accident of educational history that it is. As a result, throughout the history of mass literacy, writing has remained under-theorized and under-taught and will be until we have developed a fully robust understanding of writing-driven literacy, writing on its own terms, writing as the source of literacy development. Further, we need as good an understanding of writing-driven reading as we have of reading-driven writing. Below I try to pinpoint some of the challenges we face in order to change our perspective.

Reading and Writing Remain “Culturally Dissociated” in Ways We Need to Consider

Schools may do their best to subdue writing and keep it safely under the jurisdiction of reading. But it is a different story when we get beyond the official curriculum. We can find lots of evidence that the different cultural histories of reading and writing, the different ways they have been sponsored, regulated, and valued, continue to matter in how everyday contemporary people experience these two halves of their literacy (Furet & Ozouf 1983, Graff & McKinnon 2009). I first became aware of the lingering power of these differences or dissociations between reading and writing when I was doing research back in the 1990s for what became the book *Literacy in American Lives* (2001). As part of that research I interviewed 80 people from all walks of life born between 1895 and 1985, asking them to recount their experiences with literacy from birth to the present. To be comprehensive (and not thinking too much about it at first), I started collecting memories of both reading and writing. But I was surprised at how these memories mapped on to the past. It was now the late 20th century and yet the older arrangements of mass literacy continued to cling in everyday literacy practices (Brandt 1994; Brandt 1998). Many early reading events typically were described as taking place in domestic settings, with adult endorsement and often as part of shared social rituals. Household reading was associated most strongly with leisure, learning and self-improvement, or worship. Reading was considered a wholesome pastime, a sign in many households of progressive thinking, and a way that some families distinguished themselves as socially or morally superior to others. Books were given as gifts at holidays or birthdays, especially to children. Reading, quite simply, was revered. One man I interviewed went on the road alone as a teenager in the 1940s after his parents separated. He became a migrant farm laborer, riding freight trains as a form of transportation, and spending nights in makeshift labor camps along railroad tracks where he often did not feel safe. He told me that he always made sure to carry a book among his belongings. “If you were reading,” he said, “people generally left you alone.”

Early memories of household writing were connected less with leisure, learning or worship and more with parental employment, practical household business, and communication with others at a distance. This writing sometimes went on over the heads of children or took place in spaces off limits to children or else children would use writing to imitate grownups, pretending to sign checks or make shopping lists or write letters. Whereas many parents believed it was

their obligation to teach their children to read, they expressed a weaker obligation and less confidence in teaching children to write, except for the rudiments of forming letters or printing their names. While families often read together, they rarely wrote together. Early self-sponsored writing was often recalled as occurring in isolated places, for example, a dilapidated garage, a tree, a highway overpass, or a hospital bed. In many cases, the first writing acts that were remembered were those that challenged domestic tranquility: angry notes to siblings or parents, scrawls on walls or doors, forgeries, profanities, and secret codes. In these memories, writing was often hidden: under mattresses, in ceilings, in well-guarded journals or destroyed altogether to avoid detection. If reading was remembered as flourishing in rituals, writing was remembered as flourishing during periods of unusual or intense experience like traveling, falling in love, giving birth, or during difficult periods like adolescence, military service, divorce, death of a loved one, incarceration. Writing was described as more dangerous than reading, deemed to be less wholesome or benign, more likely to be associated with trouble or humiliation. One woman told me that her father found her childhood journal and without a word to her crossed out all of the entries she had written about him. Another woman recalled her teacher confiscating a note she was passing in class about another classmate, a note she described as being “not very nice.” “My teacher seized the note from my hand and after class warned me gravely: *Never write things down, Michelle, never!*” And still another person I interviewed was still smarting twenty years after he had accidentally dropped a poorly graded school essay on the floor of his school bus, where it was scooped up by his seat mate and read aloud to the other bus passengers, to their howling amusement and the author’s utter and, apparently, long-lasting humiliation.

In an interesting contrast to the respected reading laborer mentioned above, another man I interviewed said he was hitchhiking around the country in the 1960s and keeping a travel journal. One night he went into a small town diner, ordered a meal, and started writing in his journal, but he had to put it away after another customer approached him and demanded to know if he was government spy. These days, of course, with so many portable computers and Wi-Fi hot spots, we have become more used to seeing people writing in public spaces. The literacy event in the diner was a product of its time and place, as are all literacy events. But the association of writing with incrimination, surveillance, trouble, pain, and suspicion still hangs around and, if anything, has been amplified by the new technologies and literacy practices. A week cannot go by, it seems, without a news report about somebody getting in trouble over writing. This goes for

students as well as public figures. As students' extracurricular writing circulates via social media, it poses heightened concern for schools, parents, law enforcement, and mental health workers. Teachers also can get in trouble for their unauthorized writing. Not too long ago an American teacher lost her job because she used her Facebook page to make comments about her students and their parents, comments that we might say were not very nice (Heussner & Fahmy 2010).

As we think about writing as a tool for rhetorical action, we have to take into consideration this long-standing association between writing and trouble, writing and recrimination, writing and surveillance. In the United States, at least, writing has never enjoyed the same civil protections that have been accorded to reading—there is far from a perfect ring of privacy or autonomy around the writing of everyday people (Fisk 2009). Because writing is considered a form of labor and a work product in many contemporary settings, the words that an individual composes in these settings can be inspected, changed, censored, or regulated in other ways (Brandt 2015). We need to acknowledge rather than obscure the significant differences between reading and writing that make their regulation so different.

Reading is an inward and internalizing experience. Reading can be done silently. You may read out loud with others or share your reading thoughts with others but sharing is not a requirement of reading. The internalizing experience of reading makes it ideal for spiritual practice and intellectual development. Our reading thoughts are private thoughts. They belong to us and only to us unless we choose to or are required to share them and even then our true and private thoughts can remain hidden.

Writing, on the other hand, is by nature an externalizing experience—our words and thoughts flow outward into a public form when we write and our thoughts come back to us from the outside. We cannot fully control our writing thoughts or their meaning. Other people, our readers, even if the reader is only the writer, will determine the meaning of a piece of writing. Our writing has a life of its own, outside of us. It is this externalizing thrust of writing, its materiality, the way it can live on its own and do things in the world beyond our reach—that makes writing rhetorically powerful but also potentially dangerous, incriminating, destructive to self and others. Managing those powers must be part of writing instruction. When it comes rhetorical writing, finding courage is a basic skill in need of development.

What Other Differences between Reading and Writing Must We Address? Writing Is a Craft Skill

When we hide writing inside reading, when we treat it as just another analytic, critical liberal art, we hide its rich, messy, inky, vocational heritage—the very heritage that initially kept it out of the common school and, in my mind, continues to marginalize it in the language arts (Monaghan 2005). Recall that as reading spread as a mass skill, it did not matter much who taught you to read. It might be a school-teacher but it could be a parent, a sibling, a neighbor, a Sunday-School or union leader. It didn't matter. That is because the real instructional authority rested not in the instructor but in the book, initially, the Good Book, the Bible, but then eventually any good book (Soltow & Stevens 1981). The book dictated the style of its reading and was seen as the formative focus for the learner. Teachers were there to mediate the text, and their skill was measured by how well they could undertake that mediation. This model of the authoritative text and the mediating teacher still mostly holds today in language arts education.

But writing was not taught this way initially. It was taught mostly through the efforts of writing masters, penmen, who epitomized the physicality of the writing act, its reliance on control of the body and the tools (Cressy 1980, Eaton 1985, Thornton 1998). As pedagogues, they showed their students how to hold the head, the elbow, the hand, how to whittle pens and how to blot mistakes. Writing masters were themselves working writers or publishers, copyists, typesetters—they worked in the writing trades—and they attracted students to their private-pay schools not through the formal degrees they had earned but in the ways that they performed in public—in contests and demonstrations through which they would compete with other teachers for the recruitment of students. Who they were *did* matter to instruction. They became known through their distinct writing styles and teaching styles. Writing schools were workshops crammed with materials of production and based in collective efforts. The model of instruction was apprenticeship. It was vocational. And as alien and seemingly impractical as this model may seem today, it is a model that we need to restore to achieve writing-driven literacy. It has at its heart teachers who are not custodians of the canon and not even model readers, but rather practicing, engaged writers, teachers who participate in the craft of writing and can perform and demonstrate it to students—much like traveling teachers of rhetoric in ancient Greece who attracted young learners to rhetorical practices through the sheer power of their own performances. In this model, the authority to teach writing resides in one's writing skills and one's commitment

to the craft. When teachers of writing are practicing writers, when their classrooms become workshops geared toward the production of writing and are crammed with the stuff of writing and publishing, more students have more of a chance for success.

The National Writing Project network, which has been in place in the U.S. since the 1970s and has expanded internationally, provides examples of what can happen when the teacher-writer is at the center of writing instruction. When teachers are busy writing along with students (instead of sitting behind a desk grading papers), they expose the writing act for what it is: messy, difficult, multi-faceted, and in need of a writer's full engagement. On their part, teachers develop a depth of visceral experience from which to draw as they test their own assignments through the eyes of a writer, evaluate and adapt curriculum, or respond to student work. (For recent treatments of teacher-writers, see Hicks et al. 2016, Dawson 2016 and Yagelski et al. 2014. For the elegant and still powerful original concept, see Gray 2000).

In his book *The Craftsman*, Richard Sennett (2009) associates craft with the desire to do something well for its own sake. The aim is making. Craft is a form giving activity and requires a fusion of thinking and feeling, involving the head but also the hand; commitment as well as judgment, motivation more than innate talent. Craft skill is slow growing, requires repetition, trial by error, tolerance for ambiguity and improvisation. It thrives on repeated opportunities to localize a problem, pose questions, and open up possibilities and innovation (Sennett 2009, p. 277-798). Its development is not always in a forward motion. Above all the development of craft requires time—it emerges from a longer rhythm of experience than the typically segmented school year. Some experts estimate that you need to devote three hours a day for ten years to master a complex skill (Gladwell 2011). And writing is nothing if it is not a complex skill. Writing requires an integration of muscle, mind, knowledge, language or languages, tools, and social worlds. Writing is effortful and remains effortful at all ages. It may become more tacit but it never becomes automatic (Bazerman et al. 2018). Craft develops through an ongoing dialogue between tacit knowledge, know-how, and explicit critique. Interestingly, it is only after someone has developed a knack for a craft, only after they have had repeated opportunity to make something, say, a text, that they can begin to benefit from exposure to abstract instructions about their craft. In other words, writing skill is not deduced from reading about writing or being given rules for writing.

As part of the research I did for a recent book, *The Rise of Writing* (2015), I interviewed 30 young people aged 15 to 25 who

wrote intensively outside of school. Most of them were poets and fiction writers but some were political activists, student journalists, bloggers, or entrepreneurs. Some held jobs that engaged them with writing or editing. Nearly all of them were connected to figures we could call writing masters—living, breathing role models or mentors who practiced the craft of writing and shared something of themselves with the young person. Some of these writing masters were parents. Here is one 15-year-old novelist talking about her father, who was a government worker by day and a short story writer by night:

It's kind of nice to have someone who understands what it feels like to write. You know, 'Don't bother me, I have a great idea.' And it's 'Okay, I understand.' Or if you don't have quite the right way to say something, you can get help in different ways. We exchange ideas. He has plots in mind that he has told me about. And there is this writing contest we enter together every so often.

Another teen, an ardent poet, started making a point of attending adult poetry readings in the city where he lived. These events sometimes included appearances by published poets. He observed:

If you go to an adult poetry slam, you now know someone who does poetry and you have their book or they have your email. You can start a thread. You send a poem. They write back a poem. Or I always like to read authors' acknowledgement pages. You start to see that it's a whole world out there.

Another young adult spent a summer as an intern at a local TV news station, where she worked closely with three on-screen reporters with three different writing and mentoring styles. She explained:

One was a great storyteller. One just used fact, fact, fact but made it so interesting. And one was the strict teacher with me. I was always talking to them about my writing, and I tried to blend their styles.

I interviewed a college-aged accounting student who worked as a financial clerk at a pediatric dental practice. Astonishingly, she told me how she spent many hours of her week ghostwriting letters for the dentists. These letters were directed at insurance companies arguing for why they should pay for a certain procedure for their clients. She would write these letters and the dentists would sign them. Her writing master was the supervisor in her office. She reported:

I don't particularly like writing. It is not something that's been easy for me. It is not something I would choose to do with my personal time. But I have had to get better at it. My supervisor is a good role model for me. She has a way of using language with people to get them to do things they don't want to do, and she makes them feel it was their idea and what a great idea. That is how I have to communicate too.

Very few of the 30 young writers I interviewed mentioned teachers as writing masters, although some of them did, especially those who took elective courses in creative writing or journalism and were taught by current or former working writers. But that was only a few. For others, writing masters who showed up in school showed up not in the classroom but in unexpected places. I talked to one teen who started writing poetry with the encouragement of a social worker. The social worker had been assigned to the homeless shelter where this young student lived. During a school assembly, the student had a chance to read one of her poems. She recalled:

After the show, one of the security guards came and got me and said we should read our poems back and forth. I had a little notebook where we kept in contact with each other so she could see how I was doing. She also introduced me to a website for urban poetry and we wrote to each other there.

Another young woman I interviewed was a star athlete at her high school and wrote poetry in her spare time. Two of her basketball coaches found out about her interest, let her know that they wrote poetry too, and began giving her writing guidance. At the time of our interview, she was following a poetry blog that was written by one of those coaches.

It seemed a little sad to me that support for literary writing had to come from the athletic department—until I considered that coaching is a pretty good method for the teaching of writing. In any case, the appearance of these writing masters is another indication of how the buried heritage of writing lingers in the experience of contemporary literacy. Listen again to the financial clerk from the pediatric dental clinic. She compares her school-based writing class, which is steeped in what I would call reading-driven writing, to the consequential rhetorical writing she was doing at work:

I had a communication course [in community college] but it did not prepare me for the things I try to accomplish. The course was just about different kinds of letters and their for-

matting. Spelling. Grammar. That is what we were scored on. But that is not the most important part of a letter and it is not the most important part of your writing. When I am trying to communicate something effectively, I find myself taking more time to think about how I'm going to say it. I have had to learn through the experience of saying the wrong thing and having it backfire. Or putting something a certain way and having it not go over well. Writing is something I have had to acquire and work on.

Notice that this young woman's description of school-based writing instruction refers to no people. She refers to this experience as an "it." The focus is on a standard course of study and a canonical text, the business letter. But when she returns to describing her writing development, which she locates in her job site, she spontaneously captures the essence of craft learning—testing, trying, trying again in a context of drama and consequence, a context that grips both thinking and feeling and is oriented to others and action in the world. Writing, she knows, is not an innate talent but an acquired skill.

In Conclusion

The new Swedish language curriculum presents problems and challenges for teachers as they revitalize rhetoric as a basis for language arts. My argument is that many of the problems in the teaching and learning of rhetoric will have at their root the problems of writing in mass education. As the productive half of literacy, writing did not find its footing in the initial projects of mass literacy. It did not gain the same stature, the same mandates, or the same protections as reading—and we continue to live out this legacy in schools today. Writing is as difficult to teach as it is to do, yet compared to reading, writing has gotten little attention in the professional preparation of most teachers (Applebee & Langer 2006). Writing takes an inordinate amount of time. Responding to writing responsibly takes an inordinate amount of time. Yet it struggles for time and space in a crowded pedagogical agenda. It does not help that research on writing is scattered across disciplines. We have few comprehensive theories of writing development to inform the design of the school curriculum or motivate appropriate assessment practices across the years of formal education. We know too little about how writing develops before, during, and after schooling; too little about how a person's writing experiences relate to each other developmentally across the lifespan (Bazerman et al. 2017). But among all these challenges is the one I

focused on here—the continued alienation of writing-based literacy from the reading-based school. Schools need to put aside easy and unproven assumptions about reading-writing relationships and find a way to reunite with the alternate legacy of writing—especially its association with craft, avocation, and vocation—and address its complicated, often compromised relationship to democratic principles. We need public education that makes universal writing as strong an expectation as universal reading and that treats writing-driven literacy as a norm.

Note

1. By “public education,” I mean schools in democracies that are government mandated and publicly funded to provide primary, secondary, and higher education to the population. In other words, public education is schooling that is available to everyone on democratic principle.

References

- Applebee, Arthur N. & Langer, Judith (2006): *The State of Writing Instruction in American's Schools: What Existing Data Tell Us*. Albany: Center on English Learning and Achievement at Albany State University of New York.
- Bazerman, Charles; Applebee, Arthur N.; Berninger, Virginia W.; Brandt, Deborah; Graham, Steve; Matsuda, Paul Kei; Murphy, Sandra; Rowe, Deborah Wells & Schleppegrell, Mary (2017): Taking the long view on writing development. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(3), 351-360.
- Bazerman, Charles; Applebee, Arthur N.; Berninger, Virginia W.; Brandt, Deborah; Graham, Steve; Jeffery, Jill V.; Matsuda, Paul Kei; Murphy, Sandra; Rowe, Deborah Wells; Schleppegrell, Mary & Wilcox, Kristen Campbell (2018): *The Lifespan Development of Writing*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bertaux, Daniel (2003): The usefulness of life stories for a realist and meaningful sociology. In Robin Humphrey, Robert Miller & E. A. Zaravomyslova, eds.: *Biographical Research in Eastern Europe: Altered Lives and Broken Biographies*, pp. 39-52. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.

- Brandt, Deborah (1994): Remembering reading, remembering writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(4), 459-479.
- Brandt, Deborah (1998): Sponsors of literacy. *College Composition and Communication*, 49(2), 165-185.
- Brandt, Deborah (2001): *Literacy in American Lives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brandt, Deborah (2015): *The Rise of Writing: Redefining Mass Literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Richard D. (1977): *Strength of a People: The Idea of an Informed Citizenry in America 1650-1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Cressy, David (1980): *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawson, Christine M. (2016): *The Teacher-Writer: Creating Writing Groups for Personal and Professional Growth*. Berkeley CA: National Writing Project.
- Dehaene, Stanislas (2009): *Reading in the Brain: The Science and Evolution of a Human Invention*. New York: Viking.
- Eaton, William E. (1985): American school penmanship from craft to process. *American Journal of Education*, 93(2), 252-267.
- Fisk, Catherine (2009): *Working Knowledge: Employee Innovation and the Rise of Corporate Intellectual Property, 1800-1939*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Flaherty, Alice Weaver (2005): *Midnight Disease: The Drive to Write, Writer's Block and the Creative Brain*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Furet, François & Ozouf, Jacques (1982): *Reading and Writing: Literacy in France from Calvin to Jules Ferry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gladwell, Malcolm (2011): The 10,000-hour rule. In *Outliers: The Story of Success*, pp. 35-68. Boston: Bay Bay Press.
- Graff, Harvey J. & Mackinnon, Alison, eds. (2009): *Understanding Literacy in Its Historical Contexts: Socio-Cultural History and the Legacy of Egil Johansson*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Gray, James (2000): *Teachers at the Center: A Memoir of the Early Years of the National Writing Project*. Berkeley, CA: National Writing Project.
- Heussner, Ki Mae & Fahmy, Dalia (2010): Teacher loses job after commenting about students parents on Facebook. [Abcnews.go.com](http://abcnews.go.com).

- Hicks, Troy; Whitney, Anne Elrod; Frederickson, James & Zuidema, Leah (2016): *Coaching Teacher-Writers: Practical Steps to Nurture Professional Writing*. Berkeley, CA: National Writing Project.
- Hogan, J. Michael (2012): Persuasion in the rhetorical tradition. In James Price Dillard & Lijan Shen, eds.: *Sage Handbook of Persuasion: Developments in Theory and Practice*, pp. 2-19. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- James, Karin H.; Jano, R. Joanne & Berninger, Virginia (2016): The development of multilevel writing systems of the brain: Brain lessons for writing instruction. In Charles A. MacArthur & Steve Graham, eds.: *Handbook of Writing Research Second Edition*, pp. 116-129. New York: Guilford.
- Johansson, Egil (1977): *The History of Literacy in Sweden in Comparison with Some Other Countries*. Umeå Research Report 12. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University Press.
- Kaestle, Carl F. (1983): *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kaestle, Carl F.; Damon-Moore, Helen; Stedman, Lawrence C.; Tinsley, Katherine & Trollinger, William Vance (1991): *Literacy in the United States: Reading and Readers Since 1880*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lindmark, Daniel (2004): *Reading, Writing and Schooling: Swedish Practices of Education and Literacy, 1650-1880*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University Press.
- Monaghan, E. Jennifer (2005): *Learning to Read and Write in Colonial America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress at Grades 8 and 12 (2012): *National Report Card: Writing 2011*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.
- National Endowment for the Arts (2007): *To Read or Not to Read: A Question of National Consequence*. Research Report 47. Washington D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Prose, Francine (2007): *Reading like a Writer: A Guide for People Who Love Books and for Those Who Want to Write Them*. New York: Harper.
- Sennett, Richard (2009): *The Craftsman*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Shanahan, Timothy (2016): Relationships between reading and writing development. In Charles A. MacArthur & Steve Graham, eds.: *Handbook of Writing Research Second Edition*, pp. 194-207. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Sicherman, Barbara. (2010): *Well Read Lives: How Books Inspired a Generation of Women*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Soltow, Lee & Stevens, Edward (1981): *The Rise of Literacy and the Common School in the United States: A Socioeconomic Analysis to 1876*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thornton, Tamara Plakins (1998): *Handwriting in America: A Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Yagelski, Robert, Whitney, Anne Elrod, Fredericksen, James & Hicks, Troy. Teacher-Writers: Then Now and Next.” *Research in the Teaching of English* 49 (2), 177-184.