13

EXPERIENCING OURSELVES AS WRITERS

An Exploration of How Faculty Writers Move from Dispositions to Identities

William P. Banks and Kerri B. Flinchbaugh

In working with faculty writers over the last decade, we have found that many have sought out popular texts on "how to write" in order to increase their productivity or help them be "better" at writing. Texts like Elbow's famous *Writing Without Teachers* (1973) (and later *Writing with Power* [Elbow 1981]) continue to make the list of those texts that would-be writers turn to for help or inspiration, as do more recent favorites like Anne Lamott's *Bird by Bird* (1994) and Natalie Goldberg's (2005) *Writing Down the Bones.* When we read these texts, as well as many of the research-based texts discussed later in this chapter and throughout this book, we see accomplished writers talking to others whom they address as *fellow writers.* But if these folks saw themselves as writers, would they be turning to these books in the first place?

In the context of this collection, we might ask the question, "Do faculty really see themselves as writers?" Would seeing themselves as writers help them increase productivity? The work we have done with faculty—both teachers of writing intensive courses across the disciplines and faculty working on specific projects for publication—has suggested time and again that these faculty do not see themselves primarily as *writers* but as teachers/professors and researchers. Scholars may be intensely curious about the world and conduct any number of studies or experiments that grow from that curiosity and still not see themselves as writers. Teachers can read voraciously and share their learning with a room full of students or their colleagues and not see themselves as writers. For us, seeing oneself as a writer is a key element to being successful in planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing your research, to conquering the many stumbling blocks suggested in the research on faculty writers.

DOI: 10.7330/9780874219029.c013

In this chapter, we will attempt to examine several texts that, while not incorrect or misguided in their inquiry or advice, tend to be written about/for a presumed subject—the writer—who may not exist in large numbers on our campuses. The University Writing Program at East Carolina University, following the ideas established in previous scholarship and writing guides, has attempted a number of projects with faculty in order to help them to be more productive writers and teachers of writing. Despite our best efforts in conducting workshops, projects, institutes, and interventions, we found that they seemed to have little impact with increasing faculty writing productivity—until we revised them to shift the focus toward helping faculty to identify as writers. Using the Professional Writers Program (PWP) and the Writing Across the Curriculum Academy (WAC Academy) as examples, we showcase how two specific interventions at our university have been revised in order to help faculty more effectively make a shift in their self-perceptions from "researchers who write" or "teachers who write" to "writer-researchers" and "writer-teachers." Ultimately, we argue against the idea that any single project or initiative can effect the types of change we value in faculty writer productivity.

BEYOND DISPOSITIONS: REFIGURING FACULTY ETHOS

In many of the texts used to encourage writers, we have seen a marked focus on observable dispositions (physical activities). Underlying these texts is the assumption that by embodying different behaviors, we may come to be something different as well. These sorts of dispositions are most readily apparent in the advice we've seen from writing gurus, some of which has been studied by Boice (1994; 1996). For example, Brande's (1934, 58) *Becoming a Writer* encourages readers to change their writing habits, for in doing so, "you will find yourself getting your results far more quickly and with less 'backwash.'" Another solution may be simply to get up early and start writing: "what you are actually doing is training yourself," writes Brande, "in the twilight zone between sleep and the full waking state, simply to *write*" (66). Elbow (1973, 3) encourages writers to "do freewriting exercises regularly. At least three times a week," but for those who are "serious about wanting to improve [their] writing," Elbow tells them, "the most useful thing [they] can do is to keep a freewriting diary" (9). Essential to these endeavors is to "start writing and keep writing" (25). Meanwhile, Lamott (1994, 16-17) encourages the writers in her workshops to give themselves "short assignments," to "write down as much as [they] can see through a one-inch picture frame." And, in perhaps one of our favorite visual metaphors for silencing those voices that stop our writing, Lamott suggests that we "close [our] eyes and get quiet for a minute, until the chatter starts up. Then isolate one of the voices and imagine the person speaking as a mouse. Pick it up by the tail and drop it into a mason jar. Then isolate another voice, pick it up by the tail, drop it in the jar. And so on" (27).

We hear these ideas and we enjoy them as writing teachers and faculty developers. In fact, in professional development events, we frequently quote from Elbow and Lamott, or provide copies of their texts in order to help reluctant or timid faculty to understand where their blocks may be coming from or what behaviors can help them move past the blocks. But we also recognize that the texts may resonate with us because we already think of ourselves as writers; in short, we see ourselves as the writers that Elbow and Lamott invoke in their language. And as writing teachers, we have found these texts useful because they buttress the identities we want student-writers to take on. Faculty writers, who come from a host of disciplines and often share stories of frustration with writing, seem different to us, which is why we have turned to scholars like Robert Boice in order to help us rethink our work with faculty in the professional development we offer.

Boice has listed several types of "interventions" in the work of faculty he understood as "procrastinators" or "blockers," interventions that share traits with the advice offered by Elbow and Lamott. In *Procrastination and Blocking: A Novel Practical Approach*, Boice (1996, 87-88) offers "ten fundamental rules of efficacy that proved most effective" at helping extreme procrastinators and blockers toward greater fluency. Some of those include

- *Waiting*—for Boice, "[w]aiting helps writers (and teachers) develop patience and direction for writing by tempering rushing."
- *Starting even if the writer isn't "ready"* as this "coaches writers in systematic ways of finding imagination and confidence."
- *Working in short regular bursts*, which is about "maintaining a regular habit of brief sessions."
- *Stopping* as a "means [of] halting in [a] timely fashion" so that the writer doesn't overdo it at a single sitting.

These and the other pieces of advice that he offers, are part of a larger problem that research demonstrates is common among blocked or procrastinating writers: a fear of letting go. Each of these interventions

encourages writers to "let go," to allow for the process of writing to work itself out, for habits of mind and body to develop so that subsequent writing events are more productive and meaningful, less agonizing or frustrating. After all, faculty "who wait until they are ready and undistracted tend to do very little writing" (Boice 1990, 15). These are extremely useful suggestions/observations, and we often provide them to faculty and students alike, but in such contexts as one-and-done professional development events, they can appear to faculty as somewhat hollow or simply palliative. Like maxims, they sound good and true, but can be difficult to implement in one's own life. The faculty listen, but they don't *experience* these changes; in fact, they can't in the limited space of the one- to two-hour workshop. What was missing in our workshops and professional development events was the constitutive and reflective space that faculty needed to embody a new writerly *ethos*.

Our work with faculty writers in various contexts has encouraged us toward a different sort of intervention, one based not so much in dispositions as one based on a rhetorical refiguration of writerly identity. Specifically, grounded in work that rhetorical scholars have done on *ethos*, we see ways of rethinking "dispositions" in terms of identity formations and change. Likewise, we believe in being "up front" about this desire to shift identities: rather than engage faculty in activities intended to change their behaviors and identities and not make that clear, we see this as an opportunity to talk with faculty about why they do or do not see themselves as writers. While theories of identity and subjectivity remain complex and vexed, we think that *ethos* provides a space for valuing the complexity of identities and subjectivities available to contemporary faculty as well as a way for discussing our "selves" such that faculty can more easily see and experience some of the choices available to them. Such a shift moves faculty from hearing/reading about successful writers and writing strategies toward an embodiment of those ideas, an experiential method for effective change.

One reason we do not use the discourse of identity is that we do not want to be stuck—even we the writers of this piece, who see ourselves as writers—as thinking in terms of fixity or exclusion, which is part of the baggage that term brings with it. Instead, consider the language that Elbow and Sorcinelli (2006, 19) use to describe the faculty that they invite to their Writing Place: "Professors write things. If they don't write things, they don't get to be professors. Yet few professors experience themselves as 'writers.'" Experience themselves—not "are" writers, but "experience themselves" as writers. This subtle but meaningful distinction aligns with our own thinking: college faculty *are* writers (the action)—that's unavoidable. From syllabi to letters of recommendation to exams or reports, even those faculty who are not actively publishing scholarship in refereed journals are still involved with writing. Yet that fact does not necessarily make faculty more prolific as publishing writers. One problem with identity discourses, of course, is that they function based on categorical fixity, in this case the either/or-ness that is bound up in our cultural imagination with the idea of the writer. Brodkey (1996, 59) notes that we often carry around an image of the writer like the one even she, an accomplished scholar and writer, is vexed by "when I picture writing, I often see a solitary writer alone in a cold garret working into the small hours of the morning by the thin light of a candle. It seems a curious image to conjure, for I am absent from this scene in which the writer is an Author and the writing is Literature."

Tellingly, it does not matter that Brodkey herself is excluded from such a romantic image, as are most faculty writers, writers whose "day jobs" are usually more about instruction, committee work, and research/data gathering than pondering deep thoughts in a picturesque tower. Excluded or not, we can carry that image with us. If only we had more time, more uninterrupted time, fewer distractions—then we, too, could be a writer. This image of the writer, and its persistence, hurts those writers who cannot identify in such a way, operating as J. K. Rowling's (1997, 213) fictional Mirror of Erised: it shows us an image we want to see rather than one that actually exists, and as Dumbledore tells Harry Potter, people "have wasted away before it . . . not knowing if what it shows is real or even possible."

Ethos provides a language and theory for disrupting simple identity categories with faculty and helping them to think of how we "experience" or "perform" particular selves at particular moments for particular outcomes. In short, *ethos* is a rhetorical self, a self we choose based on current exigencies. Typically, when writing and rhetoric teachers think about *ethos,* they see it as the presentation of self in the text, the textual evidence of "good character" (*arête*), "good sense" (*phronesis*), and "good will" (*eunoia*) (Kinneavy and Warshauer 1984, 171–190). Writers establish these traits in academic discourse through how they handle the history of a topic, how they treat their source materials, how they create bridges between what the readers know and what the writers know, how they use appropriate language, etc. But, historically, *ethos* has also had other connotations, growing out of a tradition that links thought/self with speech/action. For classical rhetors, it wasn't simply that one put on a mask (persona) or pretended, as an actor might, but that in such performances, the doer might also experience a shift in self-perception.

Swearingen (1984, 115), for example, argues that our current concept of *ethos* as primarily interior demonstrates a tragic misreading of the classical concept: our "modern concept of *ethos,* to the extent that it emphasizes candid self-expression, is a post-Romantic paradigm of an inward-looking, reflective self . . . a derivative of the Cartesian subject." Similarly, by bringing psychoanalytic theories to rhetoric, Alcorn (1984, 5) has suggested that *selves* are "an effect of learning": our "selves do not emerge as they choose to do things with rhetoric," but instead they "are the effects of rhetoric, a sort of epiphenomena constituted by an interplay of social, political, and linguistic forces. There is no inner entity, the self, that chooses its character. Instead, the self reflects the particular character of larger social forces that determine its nature and movement."

If we understand *ethos* as the ability of the individual to "put on" certain kinds of self, or certain identities, at certain times, and for certain effects, while simultaneously recognizing that those "put ons" also impact how these individuals come to understand themselves, then we can begin to think of *ethos* as a productive lens for helping faculty to disrupt certain debilitating notions of the writer that function in our collective imaginations. Like the doctor at our medical school who, despite having published over three hundred articles and chapters in scholarly journals and books, still thinks of himself as a "bad writer," many faculty persist in the notion that they are not writers (which seems always to imply "good writers"); this construct prevents them from thinking of their writing in positive and empowering ways. In the professional development projects that we have developed at our university, we have wanted to find ways to help faculty "come to experience themselves" as writers. Rather than simply *being* a writer or *not being* a writer, faculty in these projects are approached in ways that encourage them to adopt "writer" as one of their *ethoi,* or roles, or identities (Castells 1996, 6). In their research on programs similar to the ones we discuss below, Grant and Knowles (2000, 8) have found the same need as we, to move faculty toward embracing a sense of self as writers:

> This other struggle has to do with the kinds of imaginative spaces women can find for themselves in their subject positions as academics. More than simply a talent or caprice of the individual, imagining is understood here to be a socially constructed capacity to *be,* a form of subjectivity which hails us and offers us a way to act. To be able to imagine ourselves as a writer (in our mind's eye), and to find pleasure in and attachment to being this writer, is crucial to "be(com)ing" a writer. Marking the word in this way underscores the potentially transformative relationship between what we do and how we understand ourselves.

As faculty begin to adopt this *ethos*, they make the move from researchers or teachers who have to write (to get jobs, gain promotion and/or tenure, secure external grants, etc.) toward writer-researchers and writer-teachers, and perhaps, eventually, to faculty who can embrace themselves as writers.

PROFESSIONAL WRITING PROGRAM

More than a decade ago, the Brody School of Medicine's Academic and Faculty Development Program and East Carolina University's Writing Program collaborated to develop a project for offering discipline-specific writing and publication support, faculty development, and space to discuss writing. We began this program because we realized, despite the compelling reasons to publish the medical research being conducted, publication outputs at the university were only around 25 percent. Although innovations in research and education in schools of medicine and the venues from which they can be disseminated are consistently increasing, not submitting these innovations for publication is more commonplace than one may expect (Simpson, McLaughlin, and Schiedermayer 2000, 62). Many good ideas are simply not being shared. Common obstacles for writing and publication include writing-related anxiety (Lee and Boud 2003, 187), a lack of confidence about writing for scholarly publication (Berger 1990, 69), a lack of time and momentum (Boice and Jones 1984, 568), or trouble selecting a topic of wide appeal (Steinert et al. 2008, 281). Scholarly writing, however, is a critical skill for doctors in academic medicine. While change is constant in the way physicians practice medicine, teach classes, and engage in research, the written word remains the primary mode for communicating that research to others, a reality that affects the partnership between Brody School of Medicine and the University Writing Program.

In order to support writing in the health sciences, Brody started a series of medical writing workshops run by the Director of the University Writing Program, who was also a tenured faculty member of the English Department. Likewise, the UWP provided a medical writing consultant to work one-on-one with faculty that evolved into what is now the Professional Writing Program (PWP). Much like Elbow and Sorcinelli (2006), we quickly shifted from simply offering workshops to offering space, but in this case, the space was primarily an opportunity for faculty with a project to work with a highly-trained writing consultant. Many writers, especially academics early in their writing careers, lack confidence in their ability and find professional support and encouragement to be helpful (Baldwin and Chandler 2002, 9). The PWP is open to any faculty members engaged in research and writing at any stage of the writing process, meeting with them to discuss specific projects with the goal of not only improving that piece of writing but also improving the writer's overall skills.

During writing consultations, writers engage in conversation about their processes, strengths, weaknesses, and experiences with writing and publication. Grounded in research on writing, the consultant emphasizes the importance of equal and interactive discourse, the awareness that knowledge is a result of such discourse, and the notion that writers gain agency and voice by negotiating a "middle space" between their own experience and the expectations of the discourse community (Wallace and Ewald 2000, 87). We work with writers to assist them in navigating through the process of moving from research to writing, writing to revision, and revision to publication, providing methods to make what is "messy" in our minds "neat" in our writing (Elbow 2000, 87). One goal of this "middle space," of course, is to bring out the self-as-writer so that it merges with the self-as-researcher and the self-as-teacher that tend to dominate faculty self-perceptions (Alcorn 1984, 5). Because just as many unproductive or beginning academics experience a disconnect between their image of writing and accomplishing their writing goals or tasks, bridging that gap helps facilitate productivity (Eodice and Cramer 2001, 118).

Since 2007, the PWP has conducted over 240 writing consultations with individual writers. During the 2010–2011 academic year, the writing consultant held eighty-nine writing consultations. Forty-five of the consultations involved articles for professional journals while five were grant proposals. The remainder consisted of abstracts, book chapters, case studies, article proposals, or resumes. In a recent survey of these writers, we found that 93 percent of those who had writing consultations with the PWP had succeeded in their publication efforts. The remaining 7 percent were still waiting for a reply from the journal, leaving no fruitless publication efforts. In a separate satisfaction survey, writers refer to the PWP as "an excellent and valuable program" and "a valuable resource," citing the appreciation of "palatable suggestions."

Given this program's youth, it's hard to make large claims about its success in helping the faculty to rethink their senses of self-as-writers. However, early response is quite positive: of those faculty who have worked with the writing consultant more than once, there has been a marked change in how they approach the consultation sessions, with the faculty writers taking a more active part in the conversation, coming with larger chunks of text written, and exhibiting greater confidence in themselves as writers and researchers. Several writers, in fact, claim they have "turned a corner" in their thinking about themselves as writers and about writing more generally. One writer, for example, wrote very little for a couple of years and suffered multiple rejections on manuscripts, rejections that he saw as indicative of his inability to write. After his first article from the PWP was published, his confidence grew dramatically, and he approached his next couple of projects with greater investment. Now, this writer publishes one or two articles per year and relies less and less on the writing consultant.

WAC ACADEMY

The WAC Academy is a six-week institute held each spring; we invite ten instructors of writing intensive (WI) courses from across the university to meet once a week to discuss topics related to writing instruction, share writing-related teaching strategies they have used successfully in helping their students become better writers and thinkers, and collaborate on demonstrations of inquiry-based projects involving writing. The academy's new slogan "Writers Teaching Writing" is a reflection of the transformative method of professional development that the academy strives to achieve.

Modeled on the National Writing Project's Summer Institute, the WAC Academy encourages participants to gain a better understanding of writing processes, assessment issues, teaching methods, and new literacy technologies. Through its activities, readings, writings, and reflections, participants develop more effective writing curricula and assignments to take into their classroom, improving students' writing abilities by improving their own teaching of writing. The Academy also aims to expand the role of WI course instructors within the university by providing opportunities beyond the Academy for its participants to provide professional development programs to other WI instructors. We want our "graduates" to consider themselves a WAC resource within their departments and disciplines. We attempt to structure the Academy to foster innovation in teaching strategies, promote practice in writing skills and processes, and enable the sharing of knowledge and skills gained.

Each Academy meeting begins and ends with time for a focused freewrite on a topic related to the week's discussion that participants keep in daybooks (Brannon et al. 2008). Daybooks also become invaluable as spaces for faculty to respond to readings, reflect on activities, sketch, doodle, even collect and archive handouts from the other participants. One activity we began using to encourage faculty to reflect on their writer selves and evoke an image of their mental model of self-as-writer also engages their artistic selves: draw your writing process. Writers are asked to consider the last formal writing project they worked on—an article, grant, syllabus, or research proposal—something that required multiple drafts. Individually, they determine the steps that went into writing the finished product, each tool, collaboration, experiment, or reading. The steps may be linear or recursive, may spiral or meander, or follow some other pattern entirely. Then, using the art supplies provided, the faculty create a visual representation of their writing processes.

Processes vary, often demonstrating through metaphor how writers, writing, and discipline interconnect. Some have represented themselves as a chef in a kitchen, baking composition pie. Others have been cross-sections of a cell—nucleus, cytoplasm, and membrane—deconstructing and then coming back together to evolve into a species. Some are geometric shapes that progress in a straight line while others are a frantic funnel. But among all the stick figures, Ferris wheels, bulls' eyes, arrows, music notes, question marks, and gold stars is the resemblance of what happens in each of us from the time we are tasked with a writing project until we are finished. And these drawings are the starting points for our conversations about who we are as writers. In pairs or as a whole group, we discuss the pieces that compose our processes, how our processes compare, the nature of process depending on genre, context, and exigency, and what our processes say about ourselves as writers and thinkers. Our drawings are an opportunity for us to reflect on the social and psychological influences that affect our writing lives—the obstacles, motivators, and rituals—and in some beginning ways, we come to see ourselves as we are, as a member of a community of academic writers (Dunn 2001; Geller 2005, 5–24). Surrounded by others who are actively researching, writing, and learning, we are encouraged to see ourselves as writers who are also researching, teaching, learning, and contributing. Once faculty are able to identify this part of themselves in this group, their experience may be similar to that of Grant and Knowles (2000, 16), who "found the experience [of the faculty writing group] resonated beyond itself, so that when we sat alone later to write there was still sometimes a sense of being with the group." They also underscore the idea that "writer" is an *ethos* we choose and refigure depending on context and exigency.

Activities like drawing our writing processes are just one aspect of the academy as the bulk of each week is spent engaging in the participants' inquiry presentations and in discussing and writing about research and scholarship on writing across the curriculum. Inquiry presentations provide an important space for discussion and exploration of a writing issue, writing idea, or writing activity participants have done or are considering doing with their students. We encourage them to use this time to get feedback from their colleagues, examine the inquiry from different points of view, harvest ideas for this activity or others, and share their own thoughts. Likewise, the other faculty serve as respondents, which offers them space to write, reflect on, and discuss different aspects of teaching writing. The WAC Academy provides an opportunity for faculty to push out from their different disciplinary mindsets and see how writing functions across disciplines. Each meeting closes with time to write and reflect on the meeting and explore any questions that may linger or be emerging in the writer's mind with another focused freewrite. With each focused freewrite, we work to build our "freewrite muscles" (Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006, 21), muscles that can assist us best at times when we are stuck or confused, and ones that let us exercise the voice that is unique to us. As Boice (1990, 21) has noted, writers who have opportunities to understand and practice writing "build the confidence to face writing problems as understandable, manageable problems."

In order to encourage the participants to "experience themselves as writers," we also ask them to take an aspect of what they've learned, connect it to their own classroom practice, and write an article for publication either in our own WAC Newsletter or another venue. We encourage faculty at our institution to share their insights about teaching writing in their disciplines in journals that value such contributions, journals such as *Across the Disciplines*; *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*; *Research in Higher Education*; *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society*; or *Radical Teacher*. We offer our assistance and support at any point in the process. With these pieces of writing, and based on what we've learned about faculty writers in the PWP, we hope faculty will see their writing intensive courses and their teaching as spaces for making knowledge, and we hope they will come to see the WAC Newsletter as a space for sharing that knowledge with their colleagues. For faculty who have not seen pedagogical inquiry as a professional option, this alone opens doors for them as writers. Again and again, we work with faculty who have been conditioned not to see pedagogical inquiry as research or scholarship, which seems truly problematic for faculty writers; if we want them to see *writer* as part of their identities, we should not so quickly close off inquiry around and writing about what often makes up the largest portion of our work: teaching. With the WAC Academy, we encourage faculty to invest in sharing their disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge with audiences they may not have considered writing to before (e.g., graduate students who are just starting out, early-career faculty), as well as faculty like themselves (e.g., those interested in teaching and learning and writing). As we point out in the Academy, we all struggle to be effective teachers: we need more discourse and discussion, not less.

While the WAC Academy focuses primarily on how faculty across the disciplines can more effectively teach writing intensive courses, rather than on how faculty can become stronger writers, the faculty who have participated have helped us to see the obstacles that often stand between faculty and productive writing habits, obstacles that come through in how they teach and understand writing. Faculty routinely share their own "rigid rules" for writing—for themselves and for their students—as well as the "inflexible plans" they have adopted over the years, strategies that have led to writer's block and apprehension (Rose 1980; Daly 1985; Daly and Miller 1975). Through the WAC Academy, we have been able to get these on the table, demonstrate that they are not as idiosyncratic as writers might think, and find methods for overcoming them. By focusing initially on students and teaching, the faculty have found ways to approach their own anxieties about writing. This refiguring of faculty perceptions of student writers, coupled with their experiences in the WAC Academy, provides the foundation for individual transformations; working together, we enjoy time, space, and a supportive and engaged cohort of peers to accomplish this work.

REVISING THE PROGRAMS

While much of our focus in the WAC Academy and the PWP involves providing time and space for writers to make connections and attempt shifts in frames of mind, we wonder if we have been making enough deliberate attempts to identify how and in what ways these times/spaces are being used by the writers and ourselves? A useful frame for identifying and discussing a possible tension that exists in both programs is offered by Geller (2005, 8). Much of our day, Geller points out, is measured in fungible time: calendars, hours, deadlines, to-do lists, and other units of temporal measurement. The tension arises when these units prevent our accessing epochal time, during which it is not a clock that defines the time but rather events and individual or social rhythms.. Fungible time, Geller notes, could be explained as, "Let's have lunch tomorrow at noon. That is my lunch hour," while epochal time would be eating when we get hungry and stopping when we are full or done eating. Within our contexts of institutional time, it is often difficult to access the epochal time that can be so valuable for not only productive writing but also for achieving the shift to writer-teacher or writer-researcher. If we successfully encourage a shift in our concerns away from the demands and duties that are a large portion of faculty life to the "fluidity and possibility of epochal time," (9) we can create a space for writers to reflect, write, connect, relate, learn, and, we hope, see themselves and each other in new ways. But how often do we make this happen within the PWP and WAC Academy? And what are some strategies that can help faculty and ourselves accept the harness and utilize this epochal time in and outside of the programs we offer?

For example, while one intention of our use of daybooks in the WAC Academy was to encourage writers to embrace epochal time in writing, reflecting, and eventually coding[1] (Brannon et al. 2008; Finley 2010), we feel it failed to function in this manner as well as it could. Daybooks, a staple in our yearly Tar River Writing Project's Summer Institute (http://www.trwp.org), provide a space for engaging epochal time in writing, which is one reason we have tried to use them in the WAC Academy. We have noticed SI participants quickly discover these possibilities in the space their daybooks provide—writing, drawing, reflecting, exploring, and discovering in them during the daylong meetings and also during their free time before and after meetings and on the weekends. But while the Summer Institute is an everyday event meeting for eight hours a day for four weeks, the WAC Academy meets only once a week for two or three hours. These time differences make the possibilities of daybook use more difficult to sustain. While participants tend to use them in our weekly meetings, they are rarely used outside of that space, in part, we believe, because they do not have sustained practice with them. While the WAC Academy carves out a lot of space in the semester, the use of the daybook (or the failure really to use them) has shown us that the Academy still does not provide the type of epochal space it needs for the faculty to make use of daybooks themselves, making them less likely to make use of the books in their classes.

Likewise, despite being built around notions of mutuality and process, we know that the one-to-one sessions typical of the PWP are invariably over-determined by fungible time (e.g., publishing and tenure deadlines). They also run the risk of asymmetry, because the writer may come to see the consultant as a "subject supposed to know" (Brooks 1991; Trimbur 1987), projecting onto the consultant more knowledge about writing than is appropriate if, as in this case, we want the faculty member to experience him/herself as a writer. It takes the faculty in the PWP a long time to invest in the writing consultant enough to trust that person; too often, the faculty member is just looking for someone to "fix" things. Since the projects being worked on tend to emerge as deadline-based writing events, the faculty writers we have worked with sometimes lack an investment in reseeing themselves or their writerly *ethoi*. Rather, they work to finish a project quickly and move on to something else. There are few writers we have seen consistently throughout the years or who have continued to seek the help of the PWP consultants after the immediate project has finished, which may also suggest that the faculty writer used this successful experience to establish a foundational identity as a writer, one who may not need a "consultation" to write. At it's worst, when the faculty writer is least invested in the process, we have seen resistance based on the fact that the consultant is not from the discipline and thus is perceived as having nothing constructive to say beyond remarks about editing and formatting.

In some ways, it is our work with groups of faculty in the WAC Academy that has shown us how problematic these issues in the PWP can be. The academy participants, working together as a group, move quickly beyond issues related to their disciplinary silos and varying levels of experience with teaching writing, finding the various types of knowledge in the room intensely helpful. These faculty are not motivated by an external deadline of any sort, and know that they have six weeks to work together to figure out new ways for teaching writing in their own courses. Their success or failure will, in many ways, be their own; there are no chairs or senior faculty in the institute who sit in positions to evaluate their work.[2] Where these faculty have tended to slow or falter, however, has been the final step: writing up their teaching for the WAC Newsletter or a pedagogical journal. In part, these faculty have lacked the immediacy of an external deadline for such a project, which the PWP faculty know all too well, or they have tended to see themselves primarily as teachers, not as writer-teachers who can and should share their best practices with other teachers.

---

[1] Coding reflects an inquiry orientation for reviewing daybooks in order to see themes emerge while the writer engages the past and the present with an eye toward what might be happening.

[2] We try not to have multiple faculty from the same department, as well, because we don't want the faculty in the Academy to feel that they have to perform for the peers whom they have to work most closely with. Occasionally, we'll have a pair of faculty from the same department apply together; they see this as a way to support each other, in which case we worry less that they will serve as judgmental eyes that prevent each other from speaking and writing candidly about topics.

Both the PWP and the WAC Academy have worked well together for helping us to see faculty writers engaging with writing in different ways, ways that have shaped much of our thinking about how we want to revise both programs in order to support faculty as writers. Structurally, we are working to revise the PWP into a group-based, yearlong project with specialized writing support from the University Writing Program. While we do not plan to abandon completely the consultation sessions we offer faculty, we recognize that these do little to help with long-term fluency or to encourage faculty to resee themselves in relation to their writing. Instead, taking a note from the WAC Academy, we plan to build small, manageable writing groups that start each fall through an application-based process. We want to create a space, like the WAC Academy, where self-selection and a desire to work on projects encourages faculty writers to work together and disrupt some of the power-issues that we've found in a more tutor-based type of PWP. We have also begun to use National Writing Project–inspired "writing into the day" and "exit slips" in order to engage faculty writers metacognitively; faculty write to reflect on their writing, what they're learning about themselves as writers, and what they need to be more effective or productive writers.

Likewise, the WAC Academy, while focusing productively on helping teachers to teach writing in upper-division courses, has struggled to push faculty into seeing themselves as writers or to embrace writer as one of their identity markers. As with the PWP, we see the WAC Academy as needing more direct reflective writing and discussion meant to engage faculty in conversations about how their senses of self-as-writer and, hopefully, having an impact on how they teach writing to their students. In part, given the value our institution places on pedagogical scholarship and the scholarship of engagement, we see this move as one that faculty can invest in because the local rewards will be meaningful: pedagogical scholarship/writing counts in our university's economy of tenure, promotion, and reward.

Both the PWP and the WAC Academy have helped us to see faculty writers from different positions and in doing so, we've come to value the complexities inherent in any intervention intended to support faculty as writers and to envision more fully that "complex network of relationships" inherent in scholarly writing (Crosby 2003, 626). Simple dispositional shifts, while useful to the extent that they may produce immediate pieces of writing, do not help establish the sort of communities of writers that Grant and Knowles (2000, 15) have suggested is necessary in order to "overcome some of our deep resistances" and, ultimately, to move past some of the "pragmatic obstacles" that hamper productive writing. However, we believe that combining dispositions with reflection may lead to the sort of shifts in *ethos* that may help reluctant faculty to embrace reseeing themselves as writers-who-teach and writers-who-research. We also recognize that assessing this impact requires the sort of longitudinal study we're just now beginning in our program.

Ultimately, these shifts in self-perception and self-efficacy may translate into significant changes in behavior that can impact both institutional mission and the work of higher education. As we know, graduate school and the tenure process tend to work against the creation of a holistic person who can integrate teaching, research, and service effectively. Graduate students are consumed by the need to read and experiment, or to join successful faculty/research projects in apprenticeship positions. Likewise, new faculty worry about conducting and publishing the type of research that will impress tenure committees. In such a context, it's hard for teaching and service to gain any footing, which can be true even at small universities and liberal arts colleges with Research I aspirations. We believe that projects like WAC Academy encourage faculty to revise their ideas about "what counts" in the professional economies of higher education, not to supplant disciplinary research, but to see such inquiry as equally valid and needed. Such a shift can impact the departments in which these faculty work. While this sort of change is slow, we think it's needed, in large part because higher education should be more responsive to calls for improving instruction, not less. Our own institution prides itself on a mission of regional service and engagement; we think the WAC Academy and PWP encourage faculty to embrace this mission through the scholarship of engagement and the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) (Boyer 1990).

The most important thing we have taken away from the WAC Academy and the PWP, as well as other work with faculty-writers, is that we cannot expect a "silver bullet" approach to be successful. We do not believe any single project, activity, or workshop can effect more productive faculty writers; the variables that lead to under-production, writer's block, and poor self-efficacy are simply too numerous and complex. By working to help faculty writers refigure their relationship to writing and by embracing that change as a programmatic goal, however, one that weaves through nearly all of our workshops, events, project, academies, and programs, we believe we have a better chance of meeting faculty writers where they are so that they can begin to experience themselves as writers in divergent contexts. For if writing is the meta-discipline, as Murphy et al. (1998, 31) has argued, we should engage writing and writers as frequently and flexibly as possible, taking each opportunity we have to help faculty *see* themselves as writers. Only through changing our programmatic and professional development culture can we hope to engage a broader range of faculty and to break down some of the myths about writer/writing that get in the way of faculty productivity.

REFERENCES

Alcorn, Marshall W. 1984. "Self-Structure as a Rhetorical Device: Modern Ethos and the Divisiveness of the Self." In *Ethos: New Essays in Rhetorical and Critical Theory*, ed. James S. Baumlin and Tita F. Baumlin, 3–35. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Baldwin, Claire, and Genevieve E. Chandler. Jan-Feb 2002. "Improving faculty publication output: the role of a writing coach." *Journal of Professional Nursing* 18 (1): 8–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/jpnu.2002.30896. Medline:11859488.

Berger, Raymond M. 1990. "Getting Published: A Mentoring Program for Social Work Faculty." *Social Work* 35 (1): 69–71.

Boice, Robert. 1990. *Professors as Writers: Self-Help Guide to Productive Writing.* Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Boice, Robert. 1994. *How Writers Journey to Comfort and Fluency: A Psychological Adventure.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Boice, Robert. 1996. *Procrastination and Blocking: A Novel Practical Approach.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Boice, Robert, and Ferdinand Jones. 1984. "Why Academicians Don't Write." *Journal of Higher Education* 55 (5): 567–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1981822.

Boyer E. L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brande, Dorothea. 1934. *Becoming a Writer.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Brannon, Lilian, Sally Griffin, Karen Haag, Tony Iannone, Cynthia Urbanski, and Shana Woodward. 2008. *Thinking Out Loud on Paper: The Student Daybook as a Tool to Foster Learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Brodkey, Linda. 1996. *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brooks, Jeff. 1991. "Minimalist Tutoring: Making the Student Do All the Work." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 15 (6): 1–4.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Crosby, Christina. 2003. "Writer's Block, Merit, and the Market: Working in the University of Excellence." *College English* 65 (6): 626–45. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3594274.

Daly, John A. 1985. "Writing Apprehension." In *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems*, ed. Mike Rose, 43–83. New York: Guilford Press.

Daly, John A., and Michael Miller. 1975. "The Empirical Development of an Instrument of Writing Apprehension." *Research in the Teaching of English* 9:242–9.

Dunn, Patricia A. 2001. *Talking, Sketching, Moving: Multiple Literacies in the Teaching of Writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Elbow, Peter. 1973. *Writing without Teachers.* New York: Oxford.

Elbow, Peter. 1981. *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process.* New York: Oxford.

Elbow, Peter. 2000. *Everyone Can Write: Essays toward a Hopeful Theory of Writing and Teaching Writing.* New York: Oxford.

Elbow, Peter, and Mary Deane Sorcinelli. 2006. "The Faculty Writing Place: A Room of Our Own." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 38 (6): 17–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.38.6.17-22.

Eodice, Michele, and Sharon Cramer. 2001. "Write On! A Model for Enhancing Faculty Publication." *Journal of Faculty Development* 18 (4): 113–21.

Finley, Todd. 2010. "The Importance of Student Journals and How to Respond Effectively." *Edutopia.* Last modified August 1, 2010. http://www.edutopia.org/blog/student-journals-efficient-teacher-responses.

Geller, Anne Ellen. 2005. "Tick-Tock, Next: Finding Epochal Time in the Writing Center." *Writing Center Journal* 25 (1): 5–24.

Goldberg, Natalie. 2005. *Writing down the Bones: Freeing the Writer Within.* Boston: Shambhala.

Grant, Barbara M., and Sally Knowles. 2000. "Flights of Imagination: Academic Women Be(com)ing Writers." *International Journal for Academic Development* 5 (1): 6–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/136014400410060.

Kinneavy, James L., and Susan C. Warshauer. 1984. "From Aristotle to Madison Avenue: Ethos and the Ethics of Argument." In *Ethos: New Essays in Rhetorical and Critical Theory*, ed. James S. Baumlin and Tita F. Baumlin, 171–190. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Lamott, Anne. 1994. *Bird by Bird.* New York: Anchor.

Lee, Alison, and David Boud. 2003. "Writing Groups, Change and Academic Identity: Research Development as Local Practice." *Studies in Higher Education* 28 (2): 187–200. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058109.

Murphy, James J., James Berlin, Robert J. Connors, Sharon Crowley, Richard Leo Enos, Victor J. Vitanza, Susan C. Jarratt, Nan Johnson, and Jan Swearingen. 1988. "The Politics of Historiography." *Rhetoric Review* 7 (1): 5–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07350198809388839.

Rose, Mike. 1980. "Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (4): 389–401. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/356589.

Rowling, Joanne K. 1997. *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone.* New York: Scholastic.

Simpson, Deborah E., Chris McLaughlin, and David Schiedermayer. May 2000. "Writing "blitzes" for medical educators." *Academic Medicine* 75 (5): 555. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200005000-00087. Medline:10824839.

Steinert, Yvonne, Peter J. McLeod, Stephen Liben, Linda Snell, Yvonne Steinert, Peter J. McLeod, Stephen Liben, and Linda Snell. 2008. "Writing for Publication in Medical Education: The Benefits of a Faculty Development Workshop and Peer Writing Group." *Medical Teacher* 30 (8): e280–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01421590802337120. Medline:18484455.

Swearingen, C. Jan. 1984. "Ethos: Imitation, Impersonation, and Voice." In *Ethos: New Essays in Rhetorical and Critical Theory*, ed. James S. Baumlin and Tita F. Baumlin, 115–148. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Trimbur, John. 1987. "Peer Tutoring: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Writing Center Journal* 7 (2): 21–8.

Wallace, David L., and Helen R. Ewald. 2000. *Mutuality in the Rhetoric and Composition Classroom.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.