PART 1. HOW FACULTY WRITE

Part I examines current research on factors that encourage faculty writing. Factors studied in this section include composing styles of experienced faculty writers, the effects of writing near others and in support groups, and the impact of digital publishing on composing.

In Chapter 1, "Planning, Tinkering, and Writing to Learn: A Model of Planning and Discovery as Composing Styles for Professional Academic Writers," Dana Driscoll examines three distinct composing styles of expert writers engaged in writing for publication: "Discoverers" who embrace writing to learn and write their way into understanding, "Planners" whose composing process is more linear and planned, and "Hybrids" who use both planning and discovery in their writing process.

Driscoll's overview offers a useful look at other group interventions such as in Chapter 2, "Faculty Presence, Influence, and Authority in Interdisciplinary, Multi-Level Writing Groups." In their chapter, Aileen R. Taft, Rebecca Day Babcock, and Maximillien Vis III examine the experiences of faculty who participate in multi-level interdisciplinary writing groups and compare two iterations of such groups. From narrative research, they compare the interactions with the authority of the participants, outcome, stability, and effectiveness of the writing groups to understand how faculty writers experience participation and how presence in a group affects faculty writing.

Chapter 3, "Faculty Writers as Proximal Writers: Why Faculty Write Near Other Writers" develops this idea of social connection in writing further. Jackie Grutsch McKinney looks at self-reported faculty preference for social versus isolated writing. Drawing on data from a national survey of those with proximal writing experiences, Grutsch McKinney captures how and why some faculty writers report they use proximal writing.

In Chapter 4, "People Keep Knocking (or, I Have Answered 50 Emails Today): Balancing Work and Research as a WPA," Jaclyn Wells and Lars Söderlund dig deeper into a past dataset of 20 rhetoric and composition writers to isolate the role administration plays on disciplinary faculty writing practice. While earlier chapters focused on faculty in general, this chapter examines specific factors that make publishing difficult as a writing program professional and offers strategies for administrators as writers. Supporting faculty writers, as noted earlier in this introduction, often falls to rhetoric and composition faculty through extensions of administrative roles to help students, and this chapter offers a valuable contribution in considering how to support faculty writing administrators as writers.

Concluding Part I, Chapter 5, "Complicating the Techno-Afterglow: Pursuing Compositional Equity and Making Labor Visible in Digital Scholarly Production" by Paul Muhlhauser and Jenna Sheffield, turns to the invisible labor inherent in writing for born-digital disciplinary publications and how faculty writing practices differ when writing for hypertext publication. Muhlhauser and Sheffield explore scholars' decisions to participate in digital scholarship and the "resort to print" (i.e., traditional publishing) mentality that exists in the rhetoric and composition field stemming from unfair evaluations and appreciation of labor processes, ultimately arguing for compositional equity: an understanding and appreciation for the different labors that comprise digital and traditional scholarship.