

Writing and Visiting Fellowships: Strategies to Inform the Development of Educational Leadership Faculty

Dannielle Joy Davis
Alabama State University

Marisa Herawell, Robert Gunnip, Lisa Green Derry,
Jovan Wells and David Trimble
University of Texas at Arlington

Abstract

This article features the practice of writing accountability as a productivity tool for research related fellowship experiences. The significance of this work lies in offering strategies that may be employed by faculty developers and higher education administrators to facilitate entry into the professoriate via the visiting fellowship and continued writing productivity beyond academic promotion and tenure, particularly for underrepresented minorities. Descriptions of the first author's fellowship experiences offer strategies for the cultivation of intellectual talent that might be employed on other postsecondary campuses interested in developing more diverse learning environments via fellowship program implementation or strengthened faculty development initiatives.

Research suggests challenges in writing constancy for those transitioning from the role of graduate student to that of an academic (Boice 2000). While some assume that doctoral training prepares prospective academics for futures in scholarly writing, research on faculty writing productivity suggests otherwise. Boice's (2000) work with new faculty found that novices not only lacked constancy and fluency in their writing, but also tended to work in isolation, felt they were too busy to write and rejected efficient writing strategies (Boice 2000). The intent of this work is to illustrate the practice of mutuality, intellectual community and writing accountability as productivity tools within research related fellowship experiences for aspirants to the professoriate, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds. Minority faculty continue to be underrepresented in American postsecondary institutions, with Blacks comprising merely 5.5% and Hispanics making up 3.5% of tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track academics (Cataldi et al 2005). The significance of this research lies in offering strategies to postsecondary institutions to facilitate entry into the professoriate for diverse populations via the visiting research fellowship and programs geared toward continuing academic writing productivity beyond academic tenure.

Review of Literature

To reach doctoral conferral, academic tenure and promotion a vertical labyrinth must be tenaciously navigated. Success in academe requires its members to be prolific writers and yet writing itself is often under taught, often assumed an already present and mastered skill upon entrance into doctoral programs. It is also the expectation for doctoral graduates transitioning into faculty positions to be avid writers and published. Research suggests challenges in writing

constancy for those transitioning from the role of graduate student to that of an academic (Boice 2000). With the ever increasing demands of increased publication placed on faculty by institutions of higher education, demystifying the process and pathway to prolific publishing should be a central theme in research oriented doctoral programs. Cramer and Eodice (2001) point out that scholars acknowledge their need to publish to move upward along the academic employment ladder, but that actual know how and expertise in writing may be missing.

Given the publish or perish mantra in higher education, one would expect a plethora of research findings on the topic of academic writing for publication available for faculty, doctoral students and administrators. This would be expected since “arguably, most faculty and professional staff (whose current and potential positions increasingly require published writing) have obtained advanced degrees based mainly, if not entirely, on written products” (Cramer & Eodice 2001, p. 113). Worldwide these pressures are felt. Internationally, students in doctoral programs and junior faculty feel pressure to publish in American and British journals (Kwan 2010). Yet, Boice (1992) observed young professors are not prepared to meet the demands of writing and publication. The significance of this research lies in offering strategies that may be employed by postsecondary institutions to facilitate entry into the professoriate.

Doctoral students need to find ways to avoid being “all but dissertation” non-completers, thereby preventing academic and occupational stagnation. There must exist a way to support doctoral students and young scholars through the journey of conferral, tenure and promotion that includes a distinct focus on writing.

Several possibilities for improved scholarly writing processes and productivity exist that promise to help young scholars overcome the perceived challenges writing and publishing present. For those who view themselves as naturally gifted or proficient writers, meeting publication writing goals and deadlines can be far less arduous than it is for those struggling to realize their writing abilities. Writer’s block poses as one of the most potent challenges faced. “There are few experiences as depressing as that anxious barren state known as writer’s block, where you sit staring at your blank page...feeling your mind congeal, feeling your talent run down your leg and into your sock.” (Lamott 1994, p.176). Many writers face writer’s block, but novice professors may not be aware that others experience this challenge as well. A young scholar’s success in facing writer’s block begins with acknowledgement of its commonality. Other obstacles in writing include personal insecurities that block writing, the challenge of writing as a craft and lack of motivation (Silvia 2007).

It is expected that scholars have the ability to overcome all of these challenges due to the intense training of doctoral education, yet strategies to overcome writing challenges are rarely purposefully addressed in any one doctoral course. It appears that in the doctoral process good writing is a product of osmosis, rather than the target of instruction. “Given the stakes and difficulties involved in publishing [internationally] during and beyond the doctorate, doctoral programs...need to accord some priority to instruction in research publication” (Kwan 2010, p.56). As this Hong Kong case identified, publishing in American journals is so competitive and strategic, it must be deliberately taught. “It is clearly time to focus our collective, international attention on questions of writing/publication pedagogy, as the current and future demands on our doctoral graduates require it” (Lee & Kamler 2008, p.522).

McGrail, Rickard and Jones (2006) analyzed 17 studies whose focus was on writing interventions to increase publication rates. The interventions were grouped into approaches of a writing course, a writing support group, or a writing coach. All were found to be effective ways to increase publication rates. Other benefits reported included an increase in confidence, skills and teamwork. There was also some indication that writing support groups generated better improvements in publication rates than writing courses or coaches and that longer courses were more effective than shorter ones (McGrail et al 2006).

Multiple researchers have found that membership in a writing group can increase writing productivity (Lee & Boud 1999, 2003; McGrail et al 2006; Cuthbert et al 2009; Pasternak et al 2009). Mutuality trumps collegiality in such groups by allowing members to collectively “group-think” or “group-write” for the purpose of reaching a mutual publication goal. In the McGrail, Rickard and Jones’ (2006) study, members formed positive working relationships and all participants reported successfully on their experiences. At the same time, group members became comfortable addressing each other directly about each other’s writing. The writing group also comprised reciprocal relationships, with members taking-up multiple roles within the group at different times. A significant distinguishing feature of the writing groups was that every member took a turn at fulfilling one of the roles available within the group (McGrail et al 2006).

Writing groups alone are just one way to enhance writing abilities. Co-authorship often serves as the means doctoral professors use to mentor students. Yet, Kamler (2006) reports that co-authorship alone may not be enough:

While doctoral research is a major source of new knowledge production in universities, most doctoral students do not receive adequate mentoring or structural support to publish from their research, with poor results....It is argued that co-authorship with supervisors is a significant pedagogic practice that can enhance the robustness and know-how of emergent scholars as well as their publication output. There is a need, however, to rethink co-authorship more explicitly as a pedagogic practice and create more deliberate structures in subject disciplines to scaffold doctoral publication... (p. 283)

A 2000 study by Caffarella and Barnett looked into this relationship of professor and student. The report stated that students gained the greatest reward from the relationships that provided one-on-one feedback and provided continued feedback versus a one-time snapshot critique (Caffarella & Barnett 2000). This type of writing relationship was identified as the most significant in increasing their writing confidence (Caffarella & Barnett 2000). Caffarella, Barnett and Kamler highlight the need once again for doctoral programs to be purposeful in their writing instruction.

The trend of working students in doctoral programs is increasing, magnifying the importance of teaching writing strategies to manage workloads. One study conducted by Cuthbert and Spark (2008) analyzed a graduate student program, GRiP (Graduate Researchers in Print). GRiP was developed to assist graduate students to publish, adding scholarly publications to the students’ curricula vitae. The program had positive outcomes. During program participation, twenty-five

of twenty-six Grip participants drafted articles for eventual publication in referred journals, 14 submitted articles for publication, four had journal articles accepted, while others awaited reviewers' reports. In addition, five had started drafts of chapters for publication in a book collection and six had conference papers accepted for publication in an edited conference proceedings (Cuthbert & Spark 2008). The students in this study shared they felt *support to publish rather than pressure to publish*. They had also increased confidence and an increased awareness of quality writing (Cuthbert & Spark 2008). The few research articles available related to graduate student publication all shared impressive results. Graduate students and young scholars in each of the writing research articles experienced positive outcomes, including increased writing confidence and higher levels of article submissions.

It is not doctoral students alone that struggle with writing and publishing. One study found that over two thirds of junior faculty did not produce adequate writing output during the first two years of their employment (Boice 1992). In the U.S., as institutions continue to rise research university status or meet the demands of existing research universities, publishing can become a cloud looming over students and young faculty heads. Friend and Gonzalez (2009) looked at the results of a junior faculty writing group. One of the most valuable outcomes for these faculty members was the strategy of time management (2009). The group provided accountability to one another that improved each participant's use of deadlines (2009). Another outcome was improved scholarly writing (2009). The writing groups also helped participants better understand what was expected of them as they progressed towards tenure (2009). Even though expectations of junior faculty, whether being self-applied or presented in a department's strategic plan, are very high it is clear from the research that doctoral students and junior faculty long to receive support in writing.

While the vertical journey through the labyrinth leading to attainment of doctoral conferral, tenure and promotion may appear perilous, it does not have to be. Both graduate students and young educational leadership scholars can successfully meet publication requirements when writing support exists. While the problem with young scholars and students appears to be publishing, writing itself in faculty development often goes overlooked.

The problem that comes up over and over again is that these people want to be published. They *kind of* want to write, but they *really* want to be published. You'll never get to where you want to be that way..." (Lamott 1994, p.13)

This work explores mutuality, intellectual community and writing accountability as strategies for conquering writing challenges through examination of varied academic fellowship experiences. Given that the purpose of each initiative centered upon minority retention and access to academe, discussion of the data informs efforts to diversify predominantly White postsecondary settings, while offering strategies that faculty developers and other administrators may employ to cultivate the writing talent of their clientele.

Conceptual Framework

While sparse contemporary research has been conducted on writing groups, work on the topic offers insight into their utility in promoting academic writing productivity and satisfaction in the

postsecondary workplace. In examination of writing groups as a strategy for research development, Lee and Boud (2003) found mutuality or relocating writing from the margins to “normal business” in work environments, as well as identity and desire as key components to academic work. Mutuality journeys beyond superficial collegiality, to peer reciprocity and genuine commitment or interest in “developmental goals, the needs for change and development of its members in meeting those goals and working to build collective strategies to meet those needs” (p. 194). Writing as normal business integrates and increases the value of writing by making it central to workplace practice. Intellectual or professional desire and identity serve as elements that sustain writing groups (Lee & Boud 2003). Similarly, Aitchison and Lee (2006) note research writing proves most effective when writing group participants hold common identification, such as similar interests and life experiences, commitment to peer review and learning and establishing as well as maintaining a sense of community amongst writers. Mutuality, establishing intellectual community and writing accountability collectively serve as a suitable framework in understanding the effectiveness of writing groups and herein informs understanding of the first author’s experiences within the featured writing centered programs.

Methods

This research employs an auto-ethnographic approach to the fellowship experience with the first author as the “autobiographical subject,” (Reed-Danahay 1997, p. 6) illustrating her varied experiences as both a participant and a facilitator of writing centered fellowships for doctoral students and recent Ph.D. graduates. She analyzes prior writing experiences with fellowship programs using auto-ethnography, which “occurs when individuals become formally and informally socialized, after indoctrination, into a specific group or role-type with some specialized knowledge or way of life” (Hayano 1979, p. 100). In this case, the examined role is that of the visiting fellow.

The aforementioned conceptual framework serves as a lens in understanding the first author’s journaling and reflection. Journaling prompts researchers to become more reflexive (Janesick 1999; Mertens 2009) and facilitates “deepening knowledge of whatever subject matter the researcher takes part in,” while serving as a member check for one’s thoughts (Janesick 1999, p. 522). Journal writing allows “individuals [to] become connoisseurs of their own thinking and reflection patterns and indeed their own understanding of their work...” (1999, p. 506). Other sources of data include literature on the featured writing programs.

Description of Program Writing Components in Relation to Mutuality, Intellectual Community and Accountability

Each of the fellowship and writing programs in which the primary author participated was research-based and held expectations for writing outcomes upon conclusion. That is, each expected fellows to complete either a chapter, the dissertation in its entirety, or other scholarly work during participation. These fellowship opportunities were both short term and long term in duration. The following briefly describes the writing components of these fellowship programs in terms of mutuality, intellectual community and accountability from the first author’s perspective.

Washington State University Summer Doctoral Fellows Program

Washington State University's (WSU) Summer Doctoral Fellows Program selects doctoral candidates for residential fellowships during the summer semester. Each member of a given cohort was assigned a mentor to coach them towards their dissertation writing goals. Due to the nature of the fellowship, writing was normal business throughout the experience. In addition to mentorship, fellows look part in periodic meetings on topics related to academic life. The meetings also provided space to share our research:

Today we discussed our topics during our group meeting today. Every project was simply outstanding! It's so nice being in an environment with others working towards the same goal and being guided by people who believe in me and want to see me succeed. Although I am on the right track, I feel motivated to step up my writing...to keep stretching myself.

Interactions at these meetings offered a form of formal and informal accountability. Formal accountability was provided through the presentation of our individual research projects. Informal accountability, which occurred more often, was provided via discussing daily or weekly progress on our dissertations. This accountability surfaced as what I perceived as friendly competition.

We have a friendly competition amongst ourselves, the other fellows and I. I love seeing the others on campus working and sharing how much we each accomplished during the day. It helps keep me on track.

Community serves as an element of mutuality. A distinctive feature of the program included the strong sense of commonality and community the participants held as doctoral candidates. The following provides an illustration of the strong sense of community we formed as fellows.

It's the 4th of July. After our writing today, we [the other fellows and I] all went to a local park for a community celebration. My favorite part of the event was watching the fireworks as a group. There we were...five young scholars of varying shades and sizes, literally lying on the grass like a human patchwork quilt, looking up, meditating on the sea of lights in the sky...marveling at how wonderful they were. I feel so filled with joy to be in the company of such a great group of thinkers. All so down to earth, kindhearted and brilliant in their own ways...there is so much ahead of us...so many good things ahead...

While we did not regularly meet to discuss specific dissertation issues as a cohort, formal meetings with my assigned mentor served this purpose. Though we represented different fields, my mentor's experiences in working with marginalized groups and commitment to diversity served to foster mutuality between us, bridging potential racial and gender divisions. With his support via feedback on drafts and regular meetings on my progress, I successfully completed my dissertation and defended by the end of the summer fellowship experience. Due to my advanced stage as a doctoral candidate upon entry into the fellowship program, I was the only

fellow to accomplish this goal. The other fellows joined me in celebrating this important life event:

Today the other fellows gave me a “Congratulations” card for successfully defending my dissertation. They wrote such kind things in the card, saying how much they looked up to me and admired me...I feel so honored and humbled...I didn't realize that they viewed me in this way and that they thought so highly of me. Looks like I need to express to them how much they have inspired me this summer...This is a summer and experience I will never forget.

The residential nature of the fellows program provided opportunities such as these to share experiences outside of the writing process. This may have contributed to the strong sense of camaraderie and community felt amongst participants. In essence, fellows created a home away from home in our new temporary environment.

The Vermont Experience

The George Washington Henderson Fellowship at the University of Vermont offered a competitive residential fellowship to doctoral candidates for one academic year. The three fellows were assigned a mentor and were required to meet regularly with the fellowship program director. Her guidance proved particularly useful in that she at the time was writing a book on the dissertation writing process. Drawing from her own research on mentoring and experience writing, bi-weekly sessions with her proved valuable and offered writing accountability. During these sessions, we discussed our writing projects, productivity and learned tools or strategies for dissertation completion. While the academic fields of the fellowship director and fellows differed from my own, regular cohort meetings, with the director as our mentor and coach, provided the mutuality needed to write and complete the dissertation. During these meetings we addressed writing blocks and other challenges.

Today we learned the benefits of tracking our daily writing time. I never thought about this and think it may help me in the future. I know that as a faculty member I will have to write regularly. Maybe this strategy will help me down the road.

Informally tracking time is a strategy of great value to graduate students and tenure-track faculty members alike. The director introduced us to other writing tools as well.

Today we shared our writing charts with each other. I am happy that my writing schedule is strong, but am concerned about the lack of writing for [one of my peers]. He openly discussed his challenges with us. Hopefully next week will be better for him.

The writing charts helped the director identify challenges and address them so that we met both short and long term goals. As a community we helped those struggling problem solve in a supportive, nurturing environment. These tools and experiences enhanced my productivity as a doctoral fellow.

Writing Groups: A Gen. Xer's Tool for Postdoctoral Productivity

As a postdoctoral fellow at Auburn University, I longed for the structure I previously had as a doctoral candidate and fellow that kept me focused with writing. Scheduled phone conferences with my chair or committee members no longer were available to provide a sense of accountability. Because of my desire to increase my own writing output, I knew that I needed to create an environment that provided the elements resulting in successful completion of my doctoral dissertation: accountability and professional support.

My postdoctoral mentor invited me to collaborate on an internal university grant with four junior faculty members. Preparation for submission of the grant required a number of meetings. At one meeting I invited the grant collaborators to become members of a writing group. In my oral proposal, I discussed the benefits of being in a writing group and offered a preliminary plan of how future group meetings might be organized. All members of the grant team responded favorably and accepted this invitation.

I was concerned however that only one member of the group (my mentor) was tenured. Members of other successful writing groups I have encountered noted the importance of having tenured faculty members in writing groups who may have more information and experience to share with junior colleagues. However, I knew that in the selection of additional people, I would need to consider the professional relationship and politics of existing members. While one additional senior member was invited, a heavy work load restricted her involvement in the group.

The strategy I employed as a postdoctoral fellow stemmed from my prior fellowship experiences at other institutions. Through these experiences, I knew the importance of group accountability and intellectual community in meeting writing goals. My employment of these strategies continued as I moved into a tenure-track faculty position.

Write on Site: Accountability Across Academic Rank

My varied writing related fellowship experiences prompted my interest in creating a "Write on Site" group as a tenure-track faculty member in Educational Leadership. Designed after a group with the same name from the University of Illinois at Chicago, our group met weekly for 2-3 hours. Participants included visiting fellows and tenure-track faculty. All group members were African American and ranged in age from 25-35 years of age. Sessions generally began with participants informally sharing what writing they were working on that day. This portion of the meeting (approximately 30 minutes) also included discussion of writing challenges or sharing information on professional development resources related to writing. Boice's (1990) work, "Professors as Writers," suggests multiple internal barriers to writing. These writing problems include having a dislike of writing, lacking time for writing, poor confidence, writing anxiety, challenges initiating the writing process, inability to complete writing, as well as additional psychological barriers such as depression, phobias and psychosomatic cramping (Boice 1990). A writing accountability group offers the opportunity to discuss issues of anxiety and lack of confidence. While a small amount of time was allocated for such purposes, efforts were made so that the majority of the meetings centered on individual writing or collaboration.

The remainder of the session focused upon work on individual projects. Group members were encouraged to share their progress on projects. Face to face and electronic accountability strengthened the group's productivity. While the disciplines of the five participants varied, representing education, social work, psychology and Spanish, mutuality occurred in terms of the racial background and age of participants. Session attendance was flexible in that participants were free to come as frequently or as sporadically as they chose. As facilitator, I played an active role in sharing tools learned in during previous writing fellowship experiences.

Today I shared with the group a strategy I learned for writing productivity. I think this part of Write on Site helps the more junior members of the group by providing tools to counter writer's block.

The intellectual community resulted in our evolution from isolated academics to prolific, engaged scholars.

Today I felt so productive and supported in my scholarship during Write on Site. People are making so much progress on their projects. This energy of progress is so inspiring! I'm not sure if it's my early experiences with homeschooling or just my personality, but working in this environment meshes with how I best operate as a person: in a collegial, noncompetitive, nurturing way...

Accountability helped us realize our individual goals and address periods of stagnation for individual group members. The varied mediums (email to announce reaching goals or work progress and regular face-to-face meetings) of accountability employed enhanced its effectiveness. It further added structure to our often unstructured academic work lives.

Conclusion

Writing fellowship programs reflect the importance of having a sense of community in academic work. They provide fertile ground for sharing ideas and countering professional isolation. This is particularly important as the writing process by nature often calls for a degree of solitude. Common elements of the featured fellowship experiences include regular group meetings, utilizing research proven writing strategies and having minority retention or access to the professoriate as ultimate goals. All of the initiatives incorporated elements of mutuality, intellectual community and accountability. These experiences worked to build on each other, resulting in the professional growth of the primary author.

Employing mutuality into the writing culture of a fellowship program holds the potential to increase the productivity of participants. Incorporation of writing accountability groups in particular hold implications at the meso, administrative level by serving as an institutional strategy to improve the productivity of scholars and to increase minority retention. These implications extend beyond the occupational outcomes of one institution, addressing the continued dearth of underrepresented groups in the academic ranks. The format of the featured writing programs may be adopted at the meso level within postsecondary institutions as either fellowship opportunities or other professional development efforts. For instance, Mullen's Writer's in Training program, initiated at the departmental level, included regular meetings for

doctoral candidates to discuss writing projects, maintaining an intellectual community via feedback and accountability (Mullen, 2008). Faculty developers and administrators of fellowship programs should consider incorporating writing accountability within their programs to increase the success and productivity of their faculty or fellows. Accountability may be included in faculty development programs to improve success of junior faculty, particularly those from marginalized groups.

How does this work inform faculty developers and other educational leaders in postsecondary settings? The visiting fellowship or formal writing groups provide strategies for the retention and promotion of Educational Leadership faculty. Retention and promotion are especially important for underrepresented faculty, who may lack professional networks and strong mentorship (Author 2008). Making writing central to the academic workplace, whether through the fellowship experience or organized group work, increases research and scholarship productivity. The increase in academic research and publication comprises a central element of institutions attaining or maintaining major research status as universities. Promoting the success of minority academics allows for their continued contributions to various disciplines that expand and are strengthened from their unique alternative perspectives.

The implication of this work also holds the potential to gradually shift academic organizational culture from an individualist, “publish or perish” mentality; to fostering a nurturing community of scholarship. Rather than behaving like crabs in a barrel clawing for morsels of opportunity, mutuality and collaboration promote a less stressful mindset. The following chart summarizes other potential paradigm shifts offered by this work’s conceptual framework and implications:

Figure 1.
Shifting of Organizational Cultures

Shifting of Organizational Culture...	
From...	To...
Individualistic, publish or perish mentality	Fostering a nurturing community of scholarship
Countering organizational toxicity and the “culture of arrogance” in academe (Thompson & Louque 2005)	Less toxicity and personal stress due to improved campus and departmental climates
Rigid perspectives on field and discipline	Interdisciplinary
“Good ole’ boy” or “us” versus “them” mentality	Inclusive, welcoming intellectual community

The aforementioned paradigm shifts move towards an inclusive, interdisciplinary academe. Such transformation may encourage academics to employ more complex ways of viewing their research and ultimately teaching. These intellectual benefits promise to increase work satisfaction for Educational Leadership faculty as well as increase writing and research productivity.

References

- Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil nimus*. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boice, R. (1995). Developing writing, then teaching amongst new faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(4), 415-456.
- Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Barnett, B. G. (2000). Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 39-52.
- Catladi, E.F., Bradburn, E. M., & Fahimi, M. (2005). 2004 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF: 04): Background characteristics, work activities and compensation of instructional faculty and staff: Fall 2003 (NCES 2006-176). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved July 28, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006176>.
- Cramer, S., & Eodice, M. (2001). Write on! A model for enhancing faculty publication. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 18(4), 113-121.
- Cuthbert, D., Spark, C., & Burke, E. (2009). Disciplining writing: The case for multidisciplinary writing groups to support writing for publication by higher degree by research candidates in the humanities, arts and social sciences. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(2), 137-149.
- Cuthbert, D., & Spark, C. (2008). Getting a grip: Examining the outcomes of a pilot program to support graduate research students in writing for publication. *Studies Higher Education*, 33(1), 77-88.
- Davis, D. J. (2008). The mentorship of a sharecropper's daughter: Being young, gifted and Black in academe. In Mullen, C.A. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Formal Mentoring in Higher Education: A Case Study Approach* (pp. 73-83). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Friend, J., & Gonzalez, J. (2009). Get together to write. *Academe*, 95(1), 31-33.

- Guillory, J. (1996). Preprofessionalism: What graduate students want. *Association of Departments of English Bulletin*, 113, 4–8.
- Hayano, D.M. (1979). Autoethnography. *Human Organization*, 38, 99-104.
- Janesick, V. J. (1999). A journal about journal writing as a qualitative research technique: History, issues and reflections. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(4), 505-524.
- Kamler, B. (2006). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 283–294.
- Kwan, B.S.C. (2009). An investigation of instruction in research publishing offered in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education*, 59, 55-68.
- Lamott, A. (1994). *Bird by bird: Some instructions on writing and life*. New York: Random House.
- Lee, A., & Boud, D. (2003). Writing groups, change and academic identity: Research development as local practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 187-200.
- McGrail, M.R., Rickard, C.M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 25(1), 19–35.
- Mertens, D.M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mullen, C. A. (Ed.). (2008). *The handbook of formal mentoring in higher education: A case study approach*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Reed-Danahay, D. E. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social*. Oxford: Berg.
- Pasternak, D., Longwell-Grice, H., Shea, K. A., & Hanson, L.K. (2009). Alien environments or supportive writing communities? Pursuing writing groups in academe. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 8(3), 355-367.
- Silvia, P. J. (2007). *How to write a lot*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Thompson, G.L., & Louque, A.C. (2005). *Exposing the “culture of arrogance” in the academy: A blueprint for increasing Black faculty satisfaction in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Wilson, R. (2001). A higher bar for earning tenure. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(17).