

Joining the Conversation: Graduate Students' Perceptions of Writing for Publication

Sarah M. Nielsen and Tonette S. Rocco
Florida International University, USA

Abstract: The authors report on their qualitative study of eight students in a class on writing for publication and the nature of the writing process in academia. While the participants found value and purpose in writing and scholarly writing, they had great difficulty with criticism and using feedback in constructive ways.

A distinguished speech communication scholar once commented that "an article published in a major journal early in a career could be worth about \$25,000 in pay and benefits. [It] can mean a better job [and] higher pay with increased retirement and other benefits" (Phillips, 1982, p. 95).

Twenty years later, this statement is just as astounding. Effective writing is an essential skill—now more than ever. The advent of instant worldwide communication has heightened the need for individuals who can access, analyze, and produce clear written communication. Thus, the importance of providing writing instruction in colleges and universities is essential. Requiring students to write papers to a "publishable" standard acquaints students with the scholarly writing process (Shaw, 1999), training them in the conventions, formats, and unique rhetorical styles of their disciplines (Jeske, 1985). Many inside and outside of academia lament the quality and substance of writing (Rankin, 1998). Journal editors observe numerous grammatical and structural errors and frequently find a clear thesis absent in manuscripts (Judy, 1982; O'Donnell, 1982).

However, graduate school training rarely includes the specifics of the publication process (Jackson, Nelson, Heggins, Baatz & Schuh, 1999). Few graduate programs teach scholarly writing, and little professional input or support for effective graduate writing exists (Rose & McClafferty, 2001). These doctoral students become faculty members lacking fully developed research and writing skills and the ability to pass on these skills to the next generation of doctoral students (Witt, 1995). The curious shortage of course offerings seems partially to be based on several assumptions and problems. First, academics because of their advanced degrees are assumed to be accomplished writers. (Moxley, 1992). Second, the perception is students receive support for their writing as a by-product of their coursework. Third, simply by being graduate students, they should already know the writing process (Gaillet, 1996; Hernandez, 1985). If not, professors attribute writing flaws to the student rather than institutional deficiencies (Sullivan, 1994). Problems are that non-English educators perceive writing instruction as belonging to the English department rather than across the curriculum. Faculty find their attempts at critiquing and grading writing far too time-consuming to be worth the effort (Loux & Stoddart, 1993; Resnick, 1987). And the same poor writing habits, chronic procrastination and writing apprehension that plague undergraduates are also indicative of graduate students (Bloom, 1981). Additionally, graduate students' lack of knowledge about writing confounds the problem (Berquist, 1983).

In their own scholarly writing class, Caffarella and Barnett (1997) found that of three elements of the writing process—content, process, and critique—the critiquing element was most influential in understanding students' writing process and facilitating a final, publishable product. The limited research that exists on the critiquing process and scholarly writing is found in composition and the humanities, reinforcing the notion that writing instruction necessarily belongs in these disciplines. The purpose of this study was to understand the nature of the writing

process for graduate students. These research questions guided our inquiry: (a) What are students' perceptions of the writing process? (b) Do students think learning to write better has value in their careers? (c) How do graduate students learn the writing process? (d) In what ways is a course in writing for publication valuable in terms of personal and professional growth?

Method

On the first day, in the Writing for Publication course at a large urban institution recently rated Carnegie Research Intensive, the co-researchers (a doctoral candidate and instructor) described the study, requesting that students participate. A letter of introduction, a consent form, an outline and timeline of the study were handed out. Questions were answered and eight graduate students agreed to participate by signing the consent form. The data were collected during one school term from multiple sources—a survey, an interview, writing samples, artifacts from class, and field notes—and made up the data used for analysis. The 21-question survey of students' past and present attitudes about the writing process, answered electronically, was modeled after similar attitude surveys and/ or interview questions by Emig and King (1977), Ketter and Pool (2001), and Lavelle and Zuercher (2001). Of the eight students who initially agreed to participate, seven completed the survey questions, five were interviewed, and three completed the course; none resulted in publication. The five who dropped the course had issues or problems with registration, their topics, family, and/ or health. One student who did not participate in the study published his article.

We began with the assumptions that (a) students would find writing a valuable skill, and scholarly writing a difficult, time-intensive process; and (b) the manuscript critique would be used constructively and inspire students to produce polished writing. Instruments were developed based on these assumptions. The data supported the former but not the latter assumption. While the participants found value and purpose in writing and scholarly writing, they had great difficulty with criticism and using feedback in constructive ways.

We looked at the data from four perspectives: the system, meaning the university and the larger urban community; the faculty member/ researcher, Dr Rocco; the student/ researcher, Ms. Nielsen; and individual students. Following the heuristic research process (Moustakas, 1990), this study involved personal exploration of the qualities and relationships concerned with the research questions. One researcher searched all data sources for themes and patterns relevant to the research questions. We examined the survey and interview data by question, searching for common perceptions, examining emergent themes, and then comparing analyses to ensure consistency. Open coding following the procedures of grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) produced three themes: (a) writing philosophy, defined as the nature of one's understanding of writing; (b) writing process, or knowledge of a series of actions leading to a final product; and (c) understanding writing, defined as the ability to understand one's own writing habits, strengths, and weaknesses. Each theme revealed three to five key points and was validated against current data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These three themes are discussed below.

Discussion

Writing Philosophy

Four key points will be discussed: communication, standards, experience, and process.

Communication. Writing is a method of communicating ideas and sharing knowledge. As one student asserted, "Writing has enabled mankind to communicate over great distances and [is] a precursor to the rapid spread of knowledge... help[ing] to permanently record historical facts,

independent of oral traditions." On a practical level, it allows us to "navigate the society in which we live," as it "allows the author to put out ideas, values and theories to larger groups of people [who] accept or reject these ideas as they see fit." The participants saw writing as a powerful medium for transmission of ideas, allowing knowledge to evolve. This echoes Applebee (1984), who argued that the permanence of the written word and the explicitness required in effective writing makes writing a powerful vehicle for shaping thought.

Standards. The permanence of ideas makes the standard for written communication higher. As one student wrote, "Writing is the best mechanism I know to express ourselves in a lasting or permanent way." For another, the "thought process [involved in writing] takes lots of energy" compared to speaking. When writing is an indisputable record of their ideas, it requires a higher standard of perseverance, clear articulation of ideas, and greater attention to salient features such as clarity, accuracy, and organization.

Experience. Writing is a deeply personal experience, "a pure form of self-expression" and a place where "the imagination runs wild, like a stallion, always seeking new pastures and boldly going where none has ventured before. It is my life, my work, my dreams." So personal is this experience that writing involves creating and re-creating the self, the result of an exchange between the self and external forces that act to construct experience (Ketter & Pool, 2001). Another student noted, "when you write, you are the person who makes things happen; you can do many things that are not possible in real life." Indeed, in graduate courses for publication in education, students experience empowerment (Rippenberger (1998) and create their scholarly identities (Rose & McClafferty, 2001). However, negative reactions to one's writing can cause a person to question his/her ability as a writer and as an academic (Caffarella & Barnett, 1997).

Process. Graduate students viewed their attempts at scholarly writing as learning the methods of academic discourse, or "a conversation with other scholars and before you can join a conversation, you follow protocol." Simple rules like finding a concept, thesis or hypothesis, impact and conclusion were helpful to students. A majority would recommend that others take a class in scholarly writing; one even said it should be a requirement, while another added that two courses should be offered—a foundational and an advanced scholarly writing class.

Writing Process

Three key points are discussed: pre-writing techniques, critiquing, and standards.

Pre-writing techniques. Most participants regularly incorporate pre-writing techniques. One student considers the first three stages of the writing process—prewriting, drafting, and sharing—as "one of the most efficient ways of starting writing." Students used a variety of pre-writing strategies such as outlining, creating graphic organizers, webbing, drawing pictures, and making separate cards with main and supporting ideas. Some plan to incorporate the topic and treatment outlines, which were modeled in the course. Research has shown that these techniques are effective: students who plan and draft produce higher quality writing than minimal drafting or none at all (Torrance, Thomas, & Robinson, 2000). Further, the two thirds of college students who outline found it allows for flexibility, recursivity, and discovery of ideas (Walvoord, 1995).

Critiquing. The process of providing students with consistent, detailed, and critically constructive feedback during writing is not only an important dimension of writing (Ketter & Pool, 2001), but crucial in producing a well-written piece. As one student wrote, "Feedback and critique is very helpful . . . to gather ideas and a wealth of information from the perspective of others." Specific areas students focused on were areas of weakness for some: word choice, clarity, and supporting details. However, all concluded that the process of giving and receiving

assistance to polish the writing was essential: "good writing doesn't happen by luck; effort and rewrites seem to be the only guarantee of a quality work product." Caffarella and Barnett (1997), who found that this critiquing step was of most value, concluded that initial apprehension about feedback decreased, though not completely, over time, as self-confidence and growth increased.

Standards. Feedback is essential to ensure writing adheres to a publishable standard. One student wrote, "Through feedback from potential readers, writers discover how well they have communicated their ideas and whether their readers need more information concerning the topic, [thus] producing revision and a sense of ownership." For participants, the ability to give as well as to receive feedback took on new meaning in this class, as they wrote not as students but as scholars, and read not as classmates but as journal editors. One admitted that he "never paid much attention to the process of typing, errors and editing each paragraph or section" until he took the scholarly writing course. Another remarked that giving and getting feedback helps students' future writing abilities: "The opportunity for rewriting enables the student to internalize the feedback and put it into practice." Figgins and Burbach (1989) also found that one of the most valuable areas of growth was feedback—both giving and receiving.

Understanding Writing

Five areas will be discussed: adaptability, resistance, constraints, mistakes, and anxiety.

Adaptability. Students alter their writing style according to the genre, professor, and/or subject, attending to grammatical rules for English classes and content for projects in other classes. Experienced writers are aware of the different styles inherent in narrative, imaginary, or informational writing, and adapt their preparation and wording accordingly. Booth (1963) calls this "rhetorical stance" a common attribute of good writers, who focus on the subject, the purpose and the audience of their writing. Good writers have greater audience awareness than poor writers (Flower & Hayes, 1981), and this awareness assists students in adapting to the purpose and style of a specific journal or publisher.

Resistance. Constructive criticism was not taken and used well by these students. Graduate students are unaccustomed to having their work criticized. First, many were not introduced to scholarly writing in their earlier academic lives, which according to Sternberg (1990) is because memorizing and regurgitating information is valued in undergraduate education, whereas discovery and judgment skills are prized late in graduate school. Second, those who possess skills important to scholarly writing rarely have the chance to demonstrate them, and may become discouraged by not being able to develop their reflective writing skills (Sternberg, 1990). Berquist (1983) concurs that original, scholarly writing is seldom stressed in lower-level courses. This explained the affective comments about criticism: many students were sensitive to being uncharacteristically subjected to criticism and the dissection of their writing. After receiving criticism about the quality of his first draft, one Ivy-league educated student who later dropped admitted, "it hurt quite a bit. But this is the first time someone has pointed it out to me." In defense of those who dropped, another student observed that students move through academia "getting a stamp of approval, and then suddenly, someone . . . says it is bad. People thought that there would be acceptance . . . based on life experience and previous education." Students saw the criticism as a "diatribe" or "bitter criticism," [and] "people will go through considerable lengths to avoid criticism." However, criticism can serve as a motivator in scholarly writing classes (Ripenberger, 1998), as it did for one student, whose competitive spirit kept him from being deterred.

Constraints. Students had more confidence in their writing ability as undergraduates than as graduate students because of constraints placed on graduate papers, which become less focused

in theme and structure, with less flexibility to be creative; the perception that graduate writing is more difficult; and time constraints of most graduate students, who juggle the demands of a full-time job, family and social lives with being a student. Even those who rated themselves higher as graduate students attributed it to maturity and practice rather than to perceived growth in writing ability. The belief that one must live up to previous academic success can inhibit writing confidence (Bloom, 1981).

Mistakes. The worst writing errors for graduate students are word- and sentence-level errors rather than structural or substantive errors. Students pointed to jargon, colloquialisms, punctuation, grammar, spelling, sentence clarity, and sentence length as the main errors in their writing and the writing of other students. Mentioned less were content-driven errors such as support, organization, or coherence that journal editors identify as recurrent writing errors (Phillips, 1982).

Anxiety. Students tend to procrastinate scholarly or high-stakes writing, recalling Bloom (1981), who found that the more important the writing, the higher the apprehension and anxiety. In interviews, "procrastinator/ing" were often mentioned with regard to academic or scholarly writing. Furthermore, most students did not meet deadlines for drafts. One said he had no problems making deadlines in other classes, but the reason for his tardiness in the scholarly writing class was "not laziness, but I put things off or procrastinate. [Deadlines] loomed large."

Implications and Recommendations

The implications are far-reaching for graduate programs, professors, and students. Though graduate students wrote 46% of articles published in one scholarly journal during a 19-year period, nine schools accounted for 59.4% of them (Blunt & Lee, 1994), suggesting that only a few schools possess a culture that promotes writing for publication. Instead, all schools should be obligated to train students in scholarly writing early, as once students successfully publish, the newly initiated gain momentum in writing fluency is not easily lost when they gain faculty appointments. Moreover, new faculty members who learned early in their careers to strike the right balance between their writing, teaching, and other collegial responsibilities exhibit high levels of publication productivity (Boice, 1992).

Therefore, we recommend the following: (a) course offerings in writing for publication, (b) mentoring partnerships, (c) financial assistance and writing workshops, (d) "publishable standard" papers throughout graduate school, and (e) early writing coaching and intervention.

References

- Applebee, A. (1984). Writing and reasoning. *Review of Educational Research, 54*, 577-596.
- Berquist, G. (1983, April). *From research paper to published article*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Lincoln, NE.
- Bloom, L. (1981, March). *Why graduate students can't write*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Dallas, TX.
- Blunt, A., & Lee, J. A. (1994). The contribution of graduate student research to Adult Education/AEQ, 1969-1988. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*, 125-144.
- Boice, R. (1992). Strategies for enhancing scholarly productivity. In J. Moxley (Ed). *Writing and publishing for academic authors* (pp. 15-32). New York: University Press of America.
- Booth, W. (1963). The rhetorical stance. *College Composition & Communication, 14*, 139-145.
- Caffarella, R. S. & Barnett, B. G. (1997, November). *Teaching doctoral students writing: Negotiating the borders between the world of practice and doctoral study*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the UCEA, Orlando, FL.

- Emig, J. & King, B. (1979). *Emig-King attitude scale for students*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED236630).
- Figgins, M., & Burbach, H. (1989). Preparing our students to publish: lessons learned. *Innovative Higher Education*, 14, 15-23.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *CCC*, 32, 365-387.
- Gaillet, L. (1996). *Designing a graduate seminar in academic writing*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the CCCC, Milwaukee, WI.
- Hernandez, N. (1985). *The fourth composite, R for graduate students*. (ERIC No. ED267671).
- Jackson, J., Nelson, J., Heggins, W., Baatz, C., and Schuh, J. (1999). Guidelines for writing for publication: Demystifying the process. *College and University*, 75, 11-14.
- Jeske, J. M. (1985). *Resources for graduate writing instruction*. (ERIC No. ED273975).
- Judy, S. (1982). Publishing in secondary journals. In S. Judy (Ed.) *Publishing in English Education* (pp. 14-23). Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook.
- Ketter, J., & Pool, J. (2001). Exploring the impact of a high-stakes direct writing assessment in two high school classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35, 344-393.
- Lavelle, E., & Zuercher, N. (2001). The writing approaches of university students. *Higher Education*, 42, 373-391.
- Loux, K. & Stoddart, R. (1993, April). *Denial, conflagration, pride*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the CCCC, San Diego, CA.
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moxley, J. M. (1992). *Writing and publishing for academic authors*. Lanham, MD: Univ. Press.
- O'Donnell, R. C. (1982). Writing about educational research. In S. Judy (Ed.) *Publishing in English Education* (pp. 73-81). Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook.
- Phillips, G. M. (1982). Publishing in speech communication. In S. Judy (Ed.) *Publishing in English Education* (pp. 95-111). Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook.
- Rankin, E. (1998, April 3). Changing the hollow conventions of academic writing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44:30, A64.
- Resnick, L. (1987). *Education and learning to think*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy.
- Rippenberger, S. J. (1998). Pluralizing professional scholarship. *College and University*, 74, 2-5.
- Rose, M. & McClafferty, K. A. (2001). A call for the teaching of writing in graduate education. *Educational Researcher*, 30, 27-32.
- Shaw, V. (1999). Reading, presentation and writing skills. *College Teaching*, 47, 153-157.
- Sternberg, R. (1990). Prototypes of competence and incompetence. In R. Sternberg and J. Kooligan (Eds.). *Competence considered*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sullivan, P. (1991). Writing in the graduate curriculum: literary criticism as composition. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 11, 283-299.
- Torrance, M., Thomas, G., & Robinson, E. (2000). Individual differences in undergraduate essay-writing strategies: A longitudinal study. *Higher Education*, 39, 181-200.
- Walvoord, B. (1995). Functions of outlining among 4 college students in 4 disciplines. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 29, 390-419.
- Witt, P. A. (1995). *Writing for publication: rationale, process and pitfalls*. Retrieved August 2, 2001, from Texas A & M, Web site: <http://www.rpts.tamu.edu/rpts/faculty/pubs/witt/pub8.htm>