INTRODUCTION

Christine Tulley
The University of Findlay

I first became acquainted with Jaci and Lars and their research on faculty writing practices at the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication. I was attending to present research on a forthcoming book on disciplinary writing (*How Writing Faculty Write*, 2018) and, when looking in the program for conference sessions to attend, my heart sank when I saw the title of a presentation by Jaci and Lars. Both of our nearly identically titled sessions focused specifically on interview research with faculty writers. I confided to my colleague (Kristine Blair, author of the Afterword) that I planned to check out their session and see if I had been scooped. I remember feeling intensely frustrated that someone else discovered faculty writing as a disciplinary subfield, which up until then had only attracted a very small handful of rhetoric and composition researchers. Faculty writing was an unexplored corner. At the presentation, I realized that not only did we both do early-stage interview research, but we also worked in two totally different spaces. I studied the writing practices of "rock stars" of rhetoric and composition, while Jaci and Lars surveyed authors at various levels of seniority in disciplinary publications. Due to our shared interest, we discovered that these projects prompted more questions about faculty writing. *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* is a result of those conversations about faculty writing that the three of us have had for the past several years.

In the process of planning this collection, we realized we remain fascinated by questions about writing that historically have remained elusive: Do writing studies-trained faculty use disciplinary knowledge to support their own writing processes? Do we teach other faculty (and future faculty) writers these techniques? What small- and large-scale efforts could we use at our own universities to support graduate student writers to develop into faculty writers? What about faculty writers in other disciplines? How could we argue for these efforts using emerging disciplinary research? What methodologies are most useful for studying graduate student and faculty writing? In short, just as Jaci, Lars, and I relied on our early projects to uncover what strategies lead to success in rhetoric and composition publications, we also wanted to find out how writing studies research interventions could impact graduate student and faculty writing productivity.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2025.2555.1.3

As a developing subdiscipline of writing studies, faculty writing has only generated sporadic interest from rhetoric and composition researchers over the years. One early look at faculty writing through the lens of writing studies that prompted my study in faculty writing was Maxine Hairston's 1986 piece in *Rhetoric Review* titled "When Writing Teachers Don't Write: Speculations about Probable Causes and Possible Cures." Drawing on personal experience as a faculty writer, Hairston describes her own reasons for not writing:

> I was convinced that I would never be able to write the book, that I would have to admit that I was a fraud and return the publisher's money. I pulled out of that spell only when I had completed the first chapter by forcing myself to stay at the typewriter every day until I had written five pages. (p. 65)

Hairston uses her personal experience to offer advice that has since been enshrined in higher education faculty development guidebooks, such as the importance of entry points and collaboration in faculty writing. I still assign this article in graduate writing courses for advice like "[procrastination] lulls are necessary for incubation or reflection" (a principle I describe in *How Writing Faculty Write*) and "writing just takes a long time" (emphasizing that developed writing is recursive and has many stages) (p. 65).

Hairston's (1986) advice is echoed frequently through popular, more recent academic writing advice guides, such as Paul Silvia's (2017) *How to Write a Lot* and Wendy Belcher's (2009) *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks.* As academic lore, these frequently reinforced faculty writing techniques serve as collective "experience that has been expressed, circulated, imitated, sustained and confirmed by repetition, achieving canonical status as 'common sense' through its range of cultural distribution and its staying power" (Phelps, 1991, p. 869). For faculty writers and those who support them, lore is often reassuring and often useful. At the same time, as Johnson (2017) notes, guidebooks and composition scholarship built on lore provide "a temptingly clear vision of the scholarly writing game" (p. 63) but a limited and often conflicting picture of faculty writing processes because they often rely on single narratives of individual faculty writers as evidence.

As our title suggests, we seek to expand development of the subfield of faculty writing by offering a first look at disciplinary grounded research interventions with faculty and advanced graduate student writers. Many calls to study faculty writing from inside writing studies exist (Johnson, 2017; Tulley, 2018; Wells & Söderlund, 2018) and a given tenet in rhetoric and composition is that writing teachers should be writers (for just a few, see Gebhardt, 1977; Hairston, 1986; Murray, 1968; Reid, 2009). Yet it's somewhat surprising that although we have used a variety of methods, including those with an empirical framework,

to study student writing from a movement stemming 60 years ago (Schriver, 1989), we haven't given our own faculty writing processes the same attention from this standpoint, with a smattering of exceptions (Geller & Eodice, 2013; Tulley, 2018; Wells & Söderlund, 2018). To date, one of the most cited faculty writing research studies comes from outside the discipline—psychologist Robert Boice's 1990 *Professors as Writers*, where he advocates using a daily writing practice to avoid writing blocks, based on interventions with faculty writers.

Acknowledging both the value of the individual faculty writer experience and culture of lore around faculty writing, we solicited chapters for the collection with a tacit understanding that using advice guide lore or relying on individual writers' narratives as data points offers valuable contributions to understand what other research methods might generate. Faculty and graduate student research interventions such as Micciche and Guy's chapter on "Writing Support for Faculty of Color" and Lam's "Intentional Institutional Support for Future Faculty: A Focus on Grant and Professional Materials" build a more complete picture of how we develop, support, and research faculty writers through the lens of writing studies research. Mark Dressman, Sarah McCarthey, and Paul Prior, drawing on the work of Gieryn (1999) pointed out in a 2009 editors' introduction in *Research in the Teaching of English* that "English studies at large [including rhetoric and composition] benefits from blurred boundaries and ongoing negotiations between scholarship vs. creative writing; quantitative vs. qualitative research … and, of course, that most basic border of Disciplinarity—disciplinary knowledge vs. everyday belief and culture" (Dressman, McCarthey, & Prior, 2009, p. 133). *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* operates within this space of border negotiation related to how we study faculty writing within the discipline. Rather than serving in opposition to circulated lore on faculty writing across higher education, *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* offers a way to further develop our inquiry into the emerging disciplinary subfield of faculty writing studies by recognizing the wide range of methodologies, both inside and outside writing studies, used to construct knowledge about graduate student and faculty writers from rhetoric and writing studies scholars and beyond. We ask that readers absorb the collection as a first constellation of approaches that move beyond lore-based approaches to faculty and graduate student writing research interventions. Because faculty writing studies is still in its infancy as a subdiscipline within rhetoric and composition, chapters should be conceived as "first looks" at the various spaces where faculty writing is taught, shared, supported, and circulated: graduate school, faculty writing groups and persons who teach others about faculty writing, writing program administrators, center for teaching excellence directors, dissertation chairs, and writing coaches.

"Interventions" here might be defined as actions taken to understand faculty writing processes and to improve a faculty writer's experience during the writing process, as they identify as a faculty writer (versus a teacher or researcher), or as they undertake new writing tasks and the academic decision-making process while writing. Methods to "verify" the effectiveness of actions range from the survey research of Muhlhauser and Sheffield that examines the invisible labor of writing for born-digital journals in rhetoric and composition to Driscoll's case studies of faculty writers as "Discoverers" and "Planners," bridging the gap between single narratives about faculty writing and empirical study. In her landmark essay "Theory Building in Rhetoric and Composition: The Role of Empirical Scholarship," Schriver (1989) points out that within writing studies, empirical research is dialectical in nature and complements and enriches disciplinary study, noting, "As with other kinds of knowledge-making, empirical knowledge is a product of a dialectic which takes place among a speaker, an interpretive community or social group in which the speaker is trying to contribute, and the historical, political, material, ideological, and situational context in which the speaker is working" (p. 272). As such, Schriver suggests that though we rely on a variety of methods to capture verifiable truth, rhetoric and writing studies scholars understand better than most that "empirical work is a complex rhetorical act in that we use evidence to convince each other of the plausibility of assertions about experience" (p. 273).

As editors of the collection, we understand that faculty writers are individuals and exist in all types of social and gendered spaces with socioeconomic challenges within the context of higher education, making human writing notoriously difficult to study. The chapters within this collection represent the difficulty in capturing faculty writing success. Does success equal publication? More time spent writing? Faculty satisfaction with writing? Ease in transition from graduate student writer to faculty writer? If empirical data is evidence-backed data, we broadly define interventions in this collection as empirical using Schriver's (1989) disciplinary description. Through the methods of interviews, surveys, observations of audio recording of writing groups, and random sampling of questionnaires, research featured in this collection contributes to a broad scope of data points suggesting how we might understand faculty writing and how interventions with future faculty and faculty writers affect how faculty writing operates within higher education. *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* provides some initial answers to (a) how we might go about studying faculty (and future faculty writing); (b) what support writers need to write; (c) what successful writing looks like for the writers themselves in the context of a specific intervention; and (d) what disciplinary factors improve, complicate, or hinder writing production. This collection, we

hope, is just one of the first about how writing studies scholars research faculty writing. As Dressman, McCarthy, and Prior (2009) suggest, "an expansive, complex, and diverse field offers the greatest possibility of progress of improving our ability to understand and shape the expansive, complex, and diverse literate work of [faculty] people" (p. 135, insertion mine). Empirical research, even when perhaps more broadly defined within the discipline of rhetoric and composition, enriches our understanding of faculty writing and offers a more nuanced discussion of how writing studies specialists can help ourselves and our colleagues with scholarly writing.

Beyond its contribution to the scope of research conducted with future faculty and faculty writers, we encourage readers to consider this collection as a call to turn our disciplinary attention to faculty writing within higher education. The importance of taking ownership of faculty writing practices as rhetoric and composition scholars cannot be overstated for our future position as a discipline within the university. Though rhetoric and composition has made some headway in developing graduate programs and undergraduate writing majors, the majority of the students we teach are in first-year and service writing courses. Studying faculty writing and engaging in data-driven study offers us another avenue to remake our role as writing scholars providing support within a university. More practically, faculty writing support offers a strategic support opportunity that first-year writing does not. Like many of the authors here, I've used my own interest in faculty writing to strategically improve my position and that of my discipline within the university. Offering to run technical support for tenure and promotion for a course release led me to make a case for offering faculty writing groups to support scholarship efforts. I tied data on faculty writing groups to faculty retention rates, showing the cost savings of investing in another course release—for me, a semester spent on this effort was more than worth it. The more faculty who earned tenure under my guidance about scholarly publication, the more I set myself up as the expert on faculty writing in my university. This expertise led to permission for me to design and develop the Master of Arts in Rhetoric and Writing program at my university, with the explicit goals of developing future faculty members as writers and sending graduates with strong academic writing foundations to doctoral programs. Other colleagues I know have similarly tied a focus on faculty writing to the financial interests of the university—for example, getting a course release to assist grant writers and improving grant acceptance rates, improving tenure track placement of doctoral candidates through writing workshops, or running workshops for scientists to publish results from expensive labs. Research from this collection can be used to make a similar case for support efforts for specific populations of faculty writers, argue for faculty writing centers, design graduate mentoring and

programs to support future faculty, and enhance tools we already widely use, such as faculty writing groups and retreats.

Examining developing research on graduate student and faculty writers also benefits faculty writers within rhetoric and composition. The field of rhetoric and composition is multi-disciplinary and multi-modal, and faculty writers within it are unlike faculty writers in any other discipline. While productivity in faculty writing is crucial in most disciplines to extend knowledge and attain tenure, promotion, grant dollars, and career mobility, it is crucial in the discipline of rhetoric and composition, where our scholarship is tied to administration and the teaching of writing and often unrecognized in tenure decisions (Tulley, 2018). Producing scholarship remains crucial despite heavy teaching and administrative loads. At the same time, our faculty writing processes extend beyond print scholarly articles as we recognize audio, video, and image as texts, and make scholarly arguments using these mediums in journals such as *Kairos* and *Computers and Composition*. We often call upon other disciplines such as psychology, literature, and digital humanities to make arguments. And of course, we study writing and teach others to write. All of these unique disciplinary markers complicate how faculty writing is understood and valued within our own discipline. Goggin (2000) points out that publishing scholarship is a hallmark of rhetoric and composition as a discipline. Connecting our disciplinary grounding in writing studies with the types of writing we do and the genres we value as writing studies continues to develop is essential. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, published research of faculty writing practices by disciplinary specialists contributes to a culture where faculty writing isn't hidden behind a closed office door. Unlike other disciplines such as nursing that actively study their own faculty writing habits (Woodward & Hirsch, 2023), most composition faculty know more about first-year students with us for one semester than we do about the writing habits of our faculty colleagues whom we've worked with for years. As overlapping racial tensions (Settles et al., 2021) and the COVID-19 pandemic (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2020) have illustrated, faculty writers, particularly those who do not fit the traditional faculty writing model, are struggling and need support. *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* offers a starting point for additional research and data-driven arguments for faculty writing support, and a look at current faculty writing culture within higher education.

Jaci, Lars, and I have been fortunate to be counted among early explorers of faculty writing practices. Yet it should be noted that exploring this area is a privilege that we are keenly aware of. We are all white, abled, middle-class faculty with stable tenured positions. We have job security and decent incomes that permit us to have the luxury to spend time conducting research. We've all served as writing program or center administrators where we are often in positions to make decisions

about some of the most vulnerable populations in our universities: contingent faculty, non-native speakers of English, first-generation college students. At the same time, all three of us experience pressures of academic parenthood, where caregiving collides with teaching responsibilities, year-round administrative work (often poorly compensated in release time), eldercare, and—most importantly for this collection—time to write. All of us took academic positions that have brought us stability in the academy but also have presented logistical and financial challenges for childcare, even with supportive partners, because like many academics we moved far from family support. As faculty writers composing this collection, we've experienced a variety of personal circumstances that slowed down our completion of this collection including illness, new children, death of close family members, job changes, and sending children to college. Thus, we've experienced firsthand the writing challenges faced by graduate students and faculty described within the chapters of *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies*. We are faculty writers who can benefit from the strategies within these pages to support our own writing processes.

We also recognize the term *faculty* itself is privileged. This collection offers specific examples of research-based interventions with future faculty and faculty writers primarily in doctoral, tenure-track, and tenured spaces, because the penalties of not producing scholarship are highest for those seeking tenure-track jobs, those pursuing tenure and promotion, and those searching for career mobility and leadership roles. Yet the collection also serves as an invitation for other writing scholars not only to develop additional research into faculty writing support but also to diversify the population of researchers able to conduct it. Researchers using this collection might consider collaborating with co-authors from various backgrounds and studying other faculty writers within the academy, including non-tenure track lecturers, faculty with primarily administrative loads, faculty writers in libraries or centers, faculty with heavy teaching loads, contingent faculty, community college faculty, postdoctoral researchers, struggling ABD ("all but dissertation") students, and writers from a range of diverse identities. We look forward to future opportunities for extending Micciche and Guy's research from this collection.

This volume is organized by juxtaposing two corresponding sides to faculty writing support: research examining faculty writing practices in a variety of contexts to understand *how* faculty write and research on *how to support* faculty writing practice across career advancement tasks such as writing for publication, cover letters for new opportunities, and arguments for funding. In *Part I: How Faculty Write*, we open with a collection of studies of faculty writing that examine composing processes, participation in writing groups, and decision-making in selecting outlets for publication. *Part II: How to Support Faculty Writers* turns from research

on faculty writing habits, processes, motivations, and decision-making to rhetoric and writing based interventions both inside and outside the university structure that seek to support faculty in these areas. Current dean, former department chair, and experienced journal editor Kristine Blair synthesizes both sides of faculty writing study in the Afterword, where she suggests future directions and the role of rhetoric and composition in emerging research.

HOW TO USE FACULTY WRITING SUPPORT: EMERGING RESEARCH FROM RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION STUDIES

This overview offers a variety of interventions illustrated by emerging writing studies research. As a developing field, we offer several ways readers might use the various essays in this collection as researchers of faculty (and future faculty) writing practice, as writing program or center professionals, as faculty developers, and as faculty writers ourselves.

Researchers of Graduate Student and Faculty Writing Practice

Those seeking to study doctoral student or faculty writing practices will find that essays in the collection offer methodological models and calls for action. Finding explicit methodologies to study faculty writers is a challenging task, and one I describe in *How Writing Faculty Write* (2018), where I discuss how I modified *Paris Review* style interviews with literary writers to ask established rhetoric and composition disciplinary leaders about their writing practices. Researchers might look to Driscoll's mixed methods of studying "expert writers" using direct observation of the writing process, participant writing journals, and regular interviews with participants, as well as writing analytics through the use of Google Documents and Google Draftback and Lam's codes for analysis in Chapter 8.

Writing Program Administrators, Writing Center Directors, and Writing Across the Curriculum Professionals

As both a writing program administrator and writing center director, I had the opportunity to support faculty writers in various ways. While most administrative practices focus on supporting undergraduate student writing in first-year writing courses, undergraduate writing majors, and writing intensive courses outside of English, there is a rich body of literature from rhetoric and composition scholars on supporting the teachers of those courses in the teaching of writing (see Geller and Eodice's 2013 *Working with Faculty Writers* for several

examples). The essays by Wells and Söderlund and Muhlhauser and Sheffield featured in this collection offer a look at how to support those teachers of writing as writers themselves in time management and journal selection for scholarly output. Quynn and Willuz's chapter on faculty writers as collaborators offers a useful model for administrators seeking to enact other models of faculty writing support beyond a pedagogical framework.

Faculty Developers

Because faculty writing support is developing as a viable administrative area for rhetoric and composition faculty due our "uniquely valuable preparation for faculty development" with training in supporting teaching assistants, writing curriculum, and designing faculty training (Artze-Vega et al., 2013, p. 164), several chapters in this collection illustrate how writing studies practices can be taken to the broader faculty and graduate student population. For example, Hewett's chapter on faculty writing needs that go unmet in the university structure is useful for identifying where specific interventions might be most productive. Grutsch McKinney's chapter describes a practice of proximal writing that might be useful for designing writing spaces that foster this connection. These models can also be used to make arguments for faculty writing support by showing a successful pattern of intervention. Blair's Afterword offers suggestions about the role of research-based practice in supporting faculty and offers some avenues for study by faculty developers.

Struggling Faculty/Future Faculty Writers in Rhetoric and Composition … and Beyond

Through dual lenses of faculty writing practices and interventions in faculty writing, this collection offers clear techniques to address an overarching question: What gets faculty writers to write? Graduate students might use these essays as studies into some of the challenges that come with being a faculty writer in rhetoric and composition and how to preemptively combat these challenges. The interventions offer more tools in the future faculty writer's toolbox—the ability to write resiliently through larger class sizes, more administrative work, etc.—all features of tenure-track positions in rhetoric and composition studies. For struggling faculty writers, research-based rationales for participation in a faculty writing group presented by Rifenburg and Johnson; Taft, Babcock, and Vis; and Messuri and Sharp offer multiple imaginings of what faculty writing group participation might look like. Muhlhauser and Sheffield illustrate the decision-making process behind choosing a journal for publication within rhetoric and composition while Wells and Söderlund look at time pressures on writing

for writing professionals. Driscoll's study of different avenues to write as a "Planner" or "Discoverer" (or a "Hybrid") provides a helpful framework for identifying a writing identity and working with existing writing preferences.

I close with a final word to those who support faculty writers outside of writing studies: our close colleagues in psychology studying writing behaviors, productivity specialists in business looking at efficiency, librarians who collaborate with faculty writers, scholarly publishers who support faculty writers through the editorial process, and more. Though rhetoric and composition faculty increasingly have taken on faculty development positions due to our intertwined interests of faculty and graduate student support, writing studies research, and the disciplinary link between the teaching of writing and writing (Artze-Vega, 2013), faculty writing studies is, in essence, interdisciplinary. Consider how many interventions across disciplines it took me to write this introduction: conversations with Jaci and Lars as co-editors and disciplinary colleagues, a reading of this draft from a faculty developer outside writing studies in higher education, a chat over coffee with a psychologist about why some of the interventions worked (which led to me writing this very paragraph), editorial feedback received from the WAC Clearinghouse, and a research appointment with a librarian. While an emerging subfield in rhetoric and composition, faculty writing studies will naturally grow (and has grown) in other communities studying academic writers from other angles: behavioral scientists, scholarly publishers, even universities themselves. Our disciplinary contributions might overlap and borrow from these areas, but research from writing studies is essential to understanding best practices in supporting faculty writers in the writing process. We hope *Faculty Writing Support: Emerging Research from Rhetoric and Composition Studies* prompts new research in this area.

REFERENCES

Artze-Vega, I., Bowdon, M., Emmons, K., Eodice, M., Hess, S. K., Lamonica, C. C., & Nelms, G. (2013). Privileging pedagogy: Composition, rhetoric, and faculty development. *College Composition and Communication*, *65*(1), 162–184. https://doi.org/10.2307/43490807

Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402276

Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. New Forums Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (2020). On the verge of burnout: Covid-19's impact on faculty well-being and career plans. *Chronicle Connect*. https://connect.chronicle.com/rs/931-EKA-218/images/Covid%26FacultyCareerPaths_Fidelity_ResearchBrief_v3%281%29.pdf%0d

Dressman, M., McCarthey, S., & Prior, P. (2009). Editors' introduction: Literate practices: Theory, method, and disciplinary boundary work. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *44*(2), 133–135. https://doi.org/10.2307/27784354

Gebhardt, R. C. (1977). Balancing theory with practice in the training of writing teachers. *College Composition and Communication*, *28*(2), 134–140. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/356098.pdf

Geller, A. E., & Eodice, M. (2013). *Working with faculty writers*. Utah State University Press.

Gieryn, T. F. (1999). *Cultural boundaries of science: Credibility on the line*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226824420

Goggin, M. (2000). Authoring a discipline: Scholarly journals and the post-World War II Emergence of rhetoric and composition. Routledge.

Hairston, M. (1986). When writing teachers don't write: Speculations about probable causes and possible cures. *Rhetoric Review*, *5*(1), 62–70. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/466020.pdf

Johnson, K. (2017). Writing by the book, writing beyond the book. *Composition Studies*, *45*(2), 55–72. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26402783

Micciche, L. R., & Carr, A. D. (2011). Toward graduate-level writing instruction. *College Composition and Communication*, *62*(3), 477–501. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27917909

Murray, D. M. (1968). *A writer teaches writing: A practical method of teaching composition*. Houghton Mifflin.

Phelps, L. W. (1991). Practical wisdom and the geography of knowledge in composition. *College English, 53*(8), 863–885.

Reid, E. S. (2009). Teaching writing teachers writing: Difficulty, exploration, and critical reflection. *College Composition and Communication*, *61*(2), 376.

Schriver, K. A. (1989). Theory building in rhetoric and composition: The role of empirical scholarship. *Rhetoric Review*, *7*(2), 272–288. https://unwrite.org/rhet-readings/theory-building-in-rhetoric-and-composition-karen-a-schrivner/

Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2021). Epistemic exclusion: Scholar(ly) devaluation that marginalizes faculty of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 14*(4), 493507. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174

Silvia, P. J. (2017). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/11537-000

Tulley, C. E. (2018). *How writing faculty write: Strategies for process, product, and productivity*. Utah State University Press.

Wells, J. M., & Söderlund, L. (2018). Preparing graduate students for academic publishing: Results from a study of published rhetoric and composition scholars. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, *18*(1), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-4216994

Woodward, K. F., & Hirsch, A. (2023). Discipline-specific writing support in graduate nursing. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, *62*(4), 253–256. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20230104-01