# Appendix B. Chapter by Chapter Data Analysis

The book includes many kinds of analyses of the datasets described in Appendix A. I have provided notes on each analysis from the chapter for the purposes of replicability, aggregability, and data-supported research (Haswell, 2005).

**Chapter 1:** Data for Table 1.2 comes from the interviews of emerging scholars. Participants were asked "What do you see as the differences between writing in coursework and writing dissertations?" Answers to this question and any other places that emerging scholars discussed differences were open coded using the methods outlined Johnny Saldaña, (2015). If at least four of the 11 emerging scholars (approximately one-third) mentioned an item, it was included in Table 1.2.

**Chapter 2:** All interviews from expert and novice scholars (n = 11 novice interviews; n = 21 expert interviews from a total of 17 participants) as well as the journals kept by expert scholars (n = 6) were analyzed using an open coding scheme (Saldaña, 2015) to explore creative idea generation and evaluation. For creative idea generation, if at least five of the 17 emerging and expert scholars used these methods (approximately one third), they were included and discussed in this chapter.

**Chapter 3:** The expert data from this chapter was analyzed using videos and writing analytics from Google Draftback. These are quantitative metrics compiled by the Draftback program. Google Draftback allows metrics and videos of the part of the writing process that is on the page, providing some useful metrics for how these writers worked on their initial texts. For the purposes of this study, these metrics generally represent the document up until the time it was submitted for review by an author, so represent the initial invention, drafting, and revisions to prepare for submission. This method of data collection has limitations: it only can collect data when the author is actively in the document, making changes. Anything in between—reading, writing, taking a break—are not documented (these show up as gaps in writing, which triggers a new writing session). A "writing session" is defined by Google Draftback as any work on a document without more than a 10-minute gap. If a writer were to work on a document, then return to it 15 minutes later or even pause to read a text for more than 10 minutes, that program would count that as a new writing session. Changes in document (what Draftback defines as "revisions") indicate how many times the writer made additions, revisions, or deletions to the text.

After early analysis of the composing styles of the expert writers, which generated the three approaches, I conducted a field-wide study to understand the prevalence of composing styles and writing processes of those engaged in writing for publication more broadly. Participants reported a range of expertise in writing for publication, which was distributed fairly evenly among those considering

themselves experts (27, 13.6%), advanced writers (52, 26.3%), intermediate writers (58, 29.6%), novice writers (49, 24.7%) or those not yet experienced (10, 5.1%). As part of the field-wide survey, participants were asked to respond to nine questions on the survey using on a 5-point Likert (strongly agree to strongly disagree):

- I am able to create an outline before I write and largely stick to my outline when writing (Planning)
- I plan my writing extensively in my head in between writing sessions (Planning)
- Even if I go in with a writing plan, my plan often changes considerably as I write (Discovery)
- I find myself moving between multiple documents and drafts during writing (Discovery)
- When I am drafting, I typically start writing at the beginning (introduction) and continue writing in a linear fashion to the end (conclusion) (Planning)
- I find that I have to "write" my way into understanding (Discovery)
- My writing process is messy, and I jump between sections a lot (Discovery)
- I find myself jumping around to different sections of the document as I write (Discovery)
- The act of writing itself allows me to deepen my understanding of my purpose (Discovery)

The answers for these questions were compiled into a single composite score to indicate an individual's preference for planning or discovery. The composite score was used to run Pearson's correlations on a range of demographic factors. A statistician (the Applied Research Lab at IUP) was consulted for these tests.

**Chapter 4:** Survey participants were asked to provide information both on their self-reported expertise and frequency of experiences with flow states. This data was analyzed descriptively and inferentially, as described in more detail in the results portion of Chapter 4.

Participants in all three studies were asked about their flow states and flow experiences—how they experience flow, how they cultivate flow, and what prevents flow states. Survey qualitative responses and interviews with both emerging and expert scholars were open-coded (Saldaña, 2015) to explore major themes across the datasets. As with other chapters, answers offered by at least a third of participants were included in the discussion.

**Chapter 5:** Revision trajectories of the six experts were mapped by reading all interviews, and reviewing writing process documents in Google Draftback, reviewing editor and writer communications, reading all published articles, and reading the writing journals. Based on this, I created a timeline and map of their trajectory. I shared this with all six writers to ensure that I had everything accurate—they responded with feedback, and I revised the trajectories after receiving their feedback.

Table 5.1 was created as part of the trajectory analysis for the expert writers above. For the emerging scholars, I asked interview questions in the interviews to ascertain their revision trajectory, including number of major revisions, and asked them to share all revision documents with me. I also asked them to member-check my understanding of their revision processes.

To develop Figure 5.4, I used Microsoft Office's "draft compare" feature, submitting the original manuscript that they had submitted with the final published piece. This generated a third document where all the changes were tracked. I coded these changes using Saldaña's open coding method and took the top 20 of these for the graphic. Methods of revision were coded in interviews; interviews revealed nine core methods of revision; I selected the top three to share in the chapter.

**Chapter 6:** One of the series of questions I asked all scholars was about why they wrote, why they pursued publication, and what benefits they got out of their experience. I took these responses and open coded them across both novices and experts (Saldaña, 2015) to explore major themes. As with other chapters, answers offered by at least 30 percent of participants were included in the discussion.

**Chapter 7:** Mindsets have a rich history of research in psychology but not in writing studies, and thus, remain undertheorized in writing for publication. I asked all writers about their experiences with failure and struggle, in the context of both drafting and pre-publication as well as revision/blind peer review. In order to code the responses in both sets of interviews, I used definitions and a coding glossary that I had developed with Roger Powell (Driscoll & Powell, 2016) that was focused on mindsets in graduate writers. I used this coding glossary to code all interviews and expert writer journals for mindsets using a priori coding (Saldaña, 2015). From that coding, I developed Table 7.1.

In my interviews, I directly asked both emerging and expert scholars about their experience with imposter syndrome and how those experiences had changed with their publication experience. I also asked about writing anxiety and how they experienced and overcame it. I coded their responses, which allowed me to count and generate the lists from the emerging scholars (Table 7.2). These questions demonstrated a high number of code co-occurrences between imposter syndrome and anxiety; hence why I present these topics together.

In the interviews, I asked participants how people wrote and how they developed goals. From these questions, I developed a matrix table of each participant and the strategies they used. This allowed me to develop table 8.1, which included counting and calculating the percentage of strategies used by each group.

I also specifically asked the two neurodiverse emerging scholars extra questions to have a clear sense of how their own experiences differed from the conventional wisdom in typical writing for publication books. These experiences were coded using priori coding (Saldaña, 2015).

**Chapter 8:** For analysis of this chapter, I did several rounds of open coding, first noting any sections or areas of either expert or emerging scholar interviews

that discussed their time management, goal setting, or academic productivity experiences. I took this data, and coded it by theme, counting the major ways that people were managing their time. This allowed me to produce Table 8.2. I again used my 30% rule for reporting on results with one exception - the two neurodiverse writers indicated using flexible schedules, which I included and discussed as an important and under-represented viewpoint.

**Chapter 9:** All emerging and expert scholars were asked questions about how others are involved in their processes. For the experts, this came through three data sources—their journals (where they often discussed conversations or writing groups), their drafts (which they shared often with comments from collaborators), and from their interviews. Likewise, emerging scholars shared feedback from peers and mentors and discussed their writing groups, mentoring, and support. I coded each instance where any kind of social interaction was mentioned—my goal was to see how many participants drew on which kinds of social support. These were compiled into Table 9.1. From Table 9.1, I pulled out relevant quotes and examples that were representative and compelling.