

An Academic Writing Program as Displacement Space: New Stories and New Positions

Rick Fisher¹, Cynthia Brock¹, Kate Muir Welsh² & Gabriel P. Swarts³

¹ University of Wyoming | USA

² Exploratorium | USA

³ Baldwin Wallace University | USA

Abstract: This qualitative study examined recounted experiences of nine faculty Academic Writing Fellows who participated in a year-long writing initiative that sought to foster productive academic writing practices. The initiative (including weekly writing groups, national writing mentors in each Fellow's discipline, and two weekend writing retreats) was designed to encourage habits and attitudes for successful academic writing through a community-based approach. Using Positioning Theory as an analytical lens, this study explored Fellows' enactment of *rights* and *duties* and their evolving identities as academic writers. Our analyses indicate that the program functioned as a *displacement space* that allowed Fellows to explore their self-positioning as writers and to re-story themselves in productive ways. We argue that both spatial and temporal displacement contributed to participants' opportunities for meaningful repositioning.

Keywords: academic writing groups, faculty development, models of writing, positioning theory



Fisher, R., Brock, C. H., Welsh, K., Muir, & Swarts, G. P.. (2023). An academic writing program as displacement space: New stories and new positions. *Journal of Writing Research*, 15(2), 167-197. DOI: 10.17239/jowr-2023.15.02.01

Contact: Rick Fisher, Ellbogen Center for Teaching and Learning/Department of English, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY | USA - rick.fisher@uwyo.edu. Orcid: 0000-0002-8080-2817

Copyright: This article is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported license.

"I need to be driving my writing wagon rather than being pulled by a deadline or something. ... I've gotta stop riding it, I need to start driving it."

"It seemed like everything to me with writing is like climbing Mt. Everest. It's like you get to one plateau and it's like, 'Oh, my gosh, am I there yet? Am I ever gonna finish?' You don't like it and so you go back down the mountain, then you have to climb back up again."

Faculty comments after completing a yearlong, college-wide Academic Writing Fellows Program

The quotations above shed light on the struggles of many faculty members to feel in control of their scholarly writing. These quotations also illuminate the spatial orientations that often underpin academics' pathways towards growth as successful writers. The ways that faculty members come to sustain themselves as writers and scholars are part of larger storylines of disciplinarity (Prior, 1998) and disciplinary literacies (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010). The continuing importance of publication for promotion and tenure processes (Franks, 2018; McGrail, et al., 2006; Wilson, 2001)—and continuing disparities in faculty advancement (Alexander & Shaver, 2020)—make the issue of scholarly writing development even more worthy of investigation. And, because these faculty experiences are both deeply personal *and* deeply embedded in institutional contexts, they are a prime site for theoretical explorations of the sociocultural complexities of writers' development.

To our knowledge no previous studies have used Positioning Theory to explore advanced scholarly writers. Yet, Positioning Theory enables close attention to narratives, rights, duties, and positions related to individuals' interactive and qualitative experiences within spaces of faculty writing development. Additionally, notions of prolepsis (i.e., projecting the future into the present; Cole, 1996) and displacement spaces (i.e., spaces from which we re-examine our lived realities; Vaisburd, 1998) further help explain how academic writers take up new positions for themselves.

In the study described here, we explored the recounted experiences (gathered at the end of the program) provided by participants in a college-wide Academic Writing Fellows (AWF) initiative. These recounts reveal the rights and duties that fellows assumed and enacted as they reconstructed their positions as academic writers across the year in the program. In this study, we wanted to know how program participants positioned themselves (relative to self, others, and the AWF experience) as well as how those positionings and larger storylines shaped Fellows' development as writers. By drawing on Positioning Theory, our work informs other social constructivist, mediated views of writing activity—specifically other works that

have drawn on notions of space and (re)location to help explain the development of advanced scholarly writers.

1. Positioning Theory, Displacement Spaces, and Other Locations for Writers' Growth

Over the last three decades, Positioning Theory has evolved as a theoretical framework for exploring and explaining how people construct, and are constructed through, discourse (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Van Langenhove, 1999). PT emerged partially as an alternative to structural and role-based theories, which Davies, Harré, and others saw as too static (see, e.g., Davies & Harré, 1990). Harré (2011) provides one succinct overview of Positioning Theory's key components:

A cluster of rights and duties recognized in a certain social milieu has been called a *position*. The corresponding act by which a person claims certain rights and opts for certain duties, or has them thrust on a certain social actor, is the act of *positioning*. Sometimes, positioning is a deliberate act of which the actors are aware—more often it crystallizes out of the background of social practices within which people are embedded. The system of concepts and hypotheses as to the principle with which they are applied is known as *Positioning Theory*. (p. ix)

This definition draws attention to three key precepts of Positioning Theory: positions, acts, and storylines (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Van Langenhove, 1999). *Storylines*, as social and discursive practices within which people are embedded that inform actions, are ways in which social processes are typically enacted in different cultural contexts. Actors in storylines can discursively and interactionally position themselves and/or others as well as be positioned by others. Positions serve as dynamic and evolving clusters of *rights* and *duties* that people in developing storylines perform (or reject) in varied and unique ways. *Positions* are fluid, dynamic, and always in the process of being constructed. Finally, *acts* (including speech acts) refer to the social meaning of actions attributed to actors in developing storylines that shape who can say or do what, in what ways, to and with whom, when and where, under what conditions, drawing on what material and social resources (past, present, and implicated for future) (Green, et al., 2020).

The interactive negotiation of rights and duties, then, is a central concern in Positioning Theory because it is through these negotiations that individuals discursively construct meanings in their social worlds. In speech acts, participants assign, resist, and accept rights and duties in relationship to the positions and storylines they seek to inhabit (McVee et al., 2019; Van Langenhove, 2017). We see this process as related to Gee's (2015) notion of big-D Discourse, in which constellations of doing, being, interacting, and communicating "enact specifically socially recognized identities engaged in specific socially recognized activities" (p.

171). Thus, as writers critique, analyze, and discuss their evolving selves as writers, they negotiate new rights and duties with respect to their evolving positions as academic writers in their institutions.

This iterative process of negotiation can be both unsettling and transformative. Thus, in our work, we also draw on the notion of *displacement space*. Building from the work of artist and filmmaker Enie Vaisburd (1998), the concept of displacement space describes places individuals move into (by force or choice) that allow them to “see” things differently. Within displacement spaces, individuals have the opportunity for conceptual and/or personal growth by critiquing, questioning, and challenging existing beliefs and practices and considering alternatives (Fisher & Calkins, 2006). Displacement spaces can serve as temporary “locations” within broader storylines that can shape and inform the evolution of those storylines. A related concept, *prolepsis* (Cole, 1996; John-Steiner, 2000), also contributes to our understanding of Fellows’ temporal displacement as academic writers: de Luna (2017) suggests that prolepsis, as a form of projecting the future into the present, serves the narrative purpose of enabling a storyline “to acquire meaning and directionality vis-a-vis a future scenario already presented” (p. 283).

Though PT has not been extensively used in studies of academic writing, previous writing scholars have drawn upon literal and figurative ‘locations’ for insight into the sociocultural development of academic writers. Penney et al. (2015), for example, situated their study of female participants in an academic writing group in work/family border theory (Clark, 2000); this theory helped reveal the complexity participants felt when navigating across physical, temporal, and psychological domains of their lives. Beasy et al. (2020) drew on Spaces of Wellbeing Theory to understand the value of doctoral Write-In sessions, and their findings pointed to the way that these formalized activities created spaces that supported writers’ “ontological security” (p. 1099). Badenhorst et al. (2016) explored a doctoral writing group as a bridge between writers’ senses of *there* (“home as familiar space”; p. 5) and *here* (a place of “new, amorphous, unstructured” expectations; p. 5); for these scholars, the spatial metaphor offered an opportunity to recognize the “range of different ‘heres’ and ‘theres’ [that] have to do with [the writers’] different selves” (p. 19).

Lee and Boud (2003), in their study of institutional supports for research writing, argue that “academic development is crucially about the making and remaking of academic identities” (p. 189), and they further argue for the need to “conceptualize academic development as a ‘local practice’ that has little chance for success “if it is isolated from the ‘normal’ academic practice or from the particular setting in which people operate” (p. 188). Simultaneously, however, they described writing groups as “privileged” “micro-environments” that operated outside of everyday life where “there is little space for new activities and new ways of being with each other” (p. 196). Allen’s (2019) study of graduate-student and faculty writing groups in Japan

also took up the issue of normalization but suggests that writing groups—especially as sites separate from everyday life—helped participants to integrate writing into “normal practice” (p. 446).

The notion of ‘normal’ space seems especially important to us because normalization carries with it a sense of customary rights and duties. These previous studies, with their spatial metaphors and frameworks, illuminate one complexity of sociocultural development of writers. That is, on one hand, spaces “too far” from normal may allow access to new rights and storylines that do not transfer back to everyday life, while spaces “too close” to existing rights and duties may not allow writers enough distance to imagine and try out new storylines. One of the few recent writing researchers to draw on PT in her work, Falconer (2019) captures well the relationship of existing discursive norms to interactive positioning through rights and duties:

With each speech act (whether spoken or written), we locate ourselves as well as others within larger communities and contexts, claiming rights to participate and placing expectations on others for how they will respond to our participation (Harrè & Moghaddam, 2003). We author selves (Ivanic, 1998) through performativity of perceived discursive norms and, over time, develop an identity as an insider through our embodiment of those norms. (p. 12)

This description reinforces positioning as a form of locating oneself (in relation to others) through the enactment of rights and duties. Whereas Falconer suggests that those positioning acts accrue into (insider) identities, we instead focus in this article on Positioning Theory’s notion of *storylines*, which we see as social, dynamic shared frames for being and enacting selves.¹ Put more directly, we take the view that studying the ongoing interactive negotiation of rights and duties can provide insight into the ways that individuals take up, inhabit, and resist storylines that direct their actions in the world.

1.1 Scholarly Writing Support: Existing Storylines

In the case of scholarly writing, many university faculty members will have acquired storylines (during graduate school, through popular culture, from institutional promotion and tenure documents, and elsewhere) that suggest certain rights and duties regarding the function of writing in their academic lives. Some academics may bring positive storylines, while others may have negative or ambivalent frames that guide their perspectives about scholarly writing. We assume, too, that academic writers will be participants in multiple and at times contradictory storylines about their writing activity (Prior, 1998); this is especially true in a time of neoliberal policies that prioritize writing productivity and efficiency over writers’ wellbeing (Beasey et. al, 2020).

Over time, positioning with and by others may offer new rights and duties, allowing scholars to rewrite or re-prioritize certain elements of the storylines to guide their actions--especially in relationship to teaching, service, research, and other duties that are institutionally and interactively placed upon them. McGrail et al.'s (2006) meta-analysis, covering 20 years of scholarship, indicates that faculty writing support programs can improve both productivity rates as well as confidence and teamwork. Yet, Sword (2017) found that only 15% of the scholars she interviewed learned to write in their disciplines through formal training; the other 85% reported primarily informal (47%) or semi-formal (38%) settings.

Writing across the Curriculum scholars Eodice and Geller (2013) have reported an increasing desire among faculty writers for writing communities for themselves. Eodice and Geller contrast supportive writing approaches against a competitive, Social Darwinist attitude (i.e., an individualistic, "only the smartest survive" mentality) that has often underpinned institutional and disciplinary attitudes about journal publication (Boice, 1990). Pushing back against this Social Darwinist storyline, Geller and Eodice argue for programs that can allow faculty to "maintain their autonomy, dignity, and individual professional goals, without ignoring the very real demands on their time and intellectual capital" (p. 6). Alexander and Shaver (2020), drawing on other research, note that supportive programs for faculty as writers can increase motivation and confidence, decrease feelings of anxiety and isolation, and increase the quality and quantity of academic writers' work. And Muller (2014) argues that faculty are "thirsty for" writing support that can allow them to "live as writers in community" (p. 38).

This existing research suggests multiple, competing storylines that impact scholars' views of themselves as writers--and that there is not a singular pathway by which faculty come to view themselves as writers. By adopting a Positioning Theory framework, we extend previous research to draw attention to the ways that improving faculty writing involves not only changing *practices* but also shifting the available stories and positions made possible by writers' acts within the program space.

1.2 Context: The AWF Model

The Academic Writing Fellows model at Rocky Mountain University (RMU, a pseudonym) was initiated by three colleagues (including the first two authors on this paper), who share complementary expertise in literacy and composition. Based on their understanding of writing as situated literate activity (Bazerman, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Street, 1984) they sought to develop a local support model for faculty that would encourage participants to appropriate the norms, dispositions, and positions of successful academic writers through a community-based approach to writing (Wenger, 1998). Support for this project also came from a new dean of

the RMU College of Education, who sought to increase the research quality and productivity of faculty within the college.

In brief, the program was designed to engage up to ten fellows per year in a year-long supported writing community. Fellows submitted applications to participate and signed a contract agreeing to key program components. The major components—like writing programs described elsewhere (e.g., Eodice & Cramer, 2001; Felton et al. 2009; Schick et al., 2011)—were intentionally developed around three major pillars.

Accountability. Accountability for writing was embedded across program components. At the program level, fellows were responsible for providing evidence that they had submitted two scholarly pieces by the end of the program year. (The number and type of products was initially determined by the dean: one manuscript for publication in a top-tier journal and one practitioner-journal piece, book proposal, or grant application.) Accountability was also an informal component within ongoing writing groups, at which fellows reported weekly progress to their group members.

Community. The program model included two key elements designed to promote a sense of community. One was a set of two weekend retreats (one early in the program year, and one near the program midpoint). Retreats included book reading (in advance of each retreat) and discussion, time blocks dedicated to writing, expert-led workshops and discussion, and community mealtimes. Second, weekly writing groups were envisioned by the facilitators as a further site for community-building. Each writing group comprised three to four fellows working around collaboratively developed group guidelines and an accountability log; depending on each group's preference, writing groups took form as spaces for focused writing time, for sharing of goals and progress, and/or for feedback on current projects. Two of the program facilitators participated in a writing group as writers alongside the fellows.

Mentorship. Local mentors were assigned to the fellows and served as informants regarding institutional policies and resources as well as additional sympathetic points of contact. National mentors (who received an honorarium from the program) were self-selected by fellows (based on varying criteria, including their knowledge as journal editors/reviewers, extensive success in publishing beyond traditional article formats, or recognized expertise within a sub-field in which the fellow hoped to publish). The writing groups also allowed fellows to serve as informal mentors to one another as well, providing advice based on their previous experience as academic writers.

As suggested in the descriptions above, the program integrated three primary, cross-cutting components in support of these three pillars: (1) small ongoing writing groups that met weekly throughout the year; (2) two weekend writing retreats; and (3) access to local and national mentors. The formal end-of-program report also provided a hard accountability deadline. Rather than assuming these components would provide accountability, community, and mentorship for each fellow in the same ways, we instead assumed that these components would provide fellows differential pathways, based in part on past and current positioning, to develop as writers.

As a final note about program design: An overarching goal of the AWF model is cultural change, meaning not only short-term, individual increases in productivity but longer-term change in fellows' thinking and actions as scholarly writers. The development of local leaders was seen as an important connecting bridge between individual change and broader cultural change: leaders recruited from the Year 1 Fellows group now serve both as in-the-moment and year-to-year collaborators to suggest changes to improve the AWF program each year, provide expert knowledge, and support program logistics.

1.3 Research Questions

Positioning Theory pushed our focus from program features towards a deeper study of the ways that fellows interacted with one another among shifting positions and storylines. The following questions focus our analysis of for this project:

1. How do participants position themselves as academic writers--relative to self, others, and the AWF program experience?
2. How do participants' positionings influence their development as academic writers?

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Nine faculty members participated in the initial year of the Academic Writing Fellows program, and all nine agreed to participate in the IRB-approved research project. To reduce identifiability, we do not describe each participant individually. Individual participants are referred to throughout this article with gender-neutral pseudonyms and the gender-neutral pronoun 'they' to further mask identities.

Participants included both pre-tenure scholars (four) and associate professors (five); we identified two as mid-career scholars, two as pre-tenure faculty recently hired to RMU, and two as advanced/recently graduated doctoral students (two). The other three participants had been at RMU over 15 years. Participant expertise included fields of educational leadership, elementary education, special education,

counselor education, and math, science, social studies, and literacy education. Two participants were writers of English as a second or additional language.

2.2 Data Collection

We used Critical Incident Analysis--previously identified as a tool for organizational learning (Davis, 2006) and a technique for solving practical problems (Kempainen, 2000)--for soliciting narrated experiences from participants. We adapted Francis's (1997) critical incident analysis activity as a primary form of gathering information about participants' experiences. Based on her analysis, we believed this method would help reveal participants' positioning acts through reflection.

As part of the required end-of-program report, each Fellow was asked to write a narrative response guided by these instructions:

1. Brainstorm a list of memorable experiences/events that occurred during your participation in the Academic Writing Fellows Initiative.
2. Select ONE or TWO of those experiences/events, which you think captures a moment or two of your greatest success, growth, or engagement in the initiative.
3. In no more than 1500 words, please provide a description of the critical incident(s). In other words, what happened? Explain what is illuminated through this/these critical incident(s): What was meaningful about this incident? and/or How does this incident demonstrate your success/growth through the Fellows initiative?

To follow up on these narratives, we also conducted a semi-structured interview with each participant (typically of 45-60 minutes, conducted within nine months of the Year 1 endpoint), framed by these guiding questions:

1. What do you see as the "major components" of the fellows program?
2. What do you see as key strengths/drawbacks of the components you identified in Q1?
3. What was the single most meaningful moment for you during this program? What does this moment illustrate about your success or growth because of your participation in the fellows program?

As an additional clarification, we treat the written and oral narratives we gathered as *reconstructions* that provide insight into participants' autobiographical accounts of participants' actions and beliefs. Rather than focusing on their discursive, in-the-moment positioning *during* interviews, we focused instead on the participants' accountive positioning (i.e., their *retellings* of program interactions; see McVee et al., 2019; Zelle, 2009) as the key site for our attention.

As Van Langenhove & Harrè (1999) indicate, both time and space are important to positioning, even though "the distinction between past, present, and future does

not go over neatly into psychological time, partly because the social and psychological past is not fixed. The social future can influence the social past" (p. 15). As McVee et al. (2019) add,

Positions may be adopted in the present based on an individual's remembered past or their perception of the future. While time often appears to be linear, when analyzing episodes of positioning that include narrative, we want to emphasize that discourse is often recursive. (p. 7.4)

These perspectives encouraged us to attend to issues of time and space, even while recognizing that these dimensions cannot be neatly mapped onto geographic or chronological coordinates.

2.3 Analytical Approach

Analysis included extensive, iterative, and collaborative interaction with the end-of-program narratives and interviews. We also collected but did not analyze other artifacts including Fellows' pre/post goal sheets; assessment of retreats; self-assessment of progress after each retreat; writing group records; end-of-year progress/completion reports; evidence of each participants' end-of-program submissions; slides from a group presentation to the university Deans and Directors Council; records of program support from administrators; presentation at a college-level research conference, and presentation to other faculty within the RMU College of Education. These additional contextual materials helped us further understand the experience of participants; however, they are ancillary in this article to the two major data sets: end-of-program written narratives and transcripts of interviews with each participant.

The authors recursively revisited the critical incidents, focusing on bringing layered understanding of the events as well as participants' positionings. Iterative discussion, memoing, and revision of initial coding helped us identify themes for further analysis (Saldaña, 2015). Although our approach shares many of the assumptions of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014), our efforts ultimately led us toward a set of related assertions (Saldaña, 2015) rather than toward a fully articulated theory.

First-cycle coding focused on positioning events, in length from a phrase to several sentences, as the unit of analysis. We defined a positioning event as a single incident centered around a central topic or issue. Across all year-end reports and interview transcripts, we identified and coded 244 positioning events.

For each positioning event, we assigned codes related to the focus of positioning: self, other, and/or program (see Table 1 for our codebook, which includes the code, code label, code description, and a data-based example of the code). Our decision to include "program" as a positioning agent goes against some current thinking in Positioning Theory; Slocum-Bradley (2009), for example, has

emphasized her view that only humans have agency to position others. Participant comments in our study, however, strongly suggested that they sometimes saw non-human program elements (writing blocks, for example) as intermediating tools that influenced the way they acted and understood themselves as writers.

Given the messiness and mutuality of positioning (Zelle, 2009), we sometimes assigned multiple codes to a single segment. In other words, participants sometimes seemed to be claiming a new self-position while also expressing a position relative to the program or to others. Instances of multiple coding are illustrated in Appendix A, which shows our coding for one partial transcript and reveals the ways that positioning indexed both the participant (self) and other participants (other) or program components (program). Collaborative, iterative cross-checking of coding allowed us to reach 100% agreement (Smagorinsky, 2008).

Table 1 Codebook of Positionings

Code & Label	Description & Data Example
Positioning relative to program (PP)	A position taken up in relationship to a felt sense of force implied by the program's major components Example: "[Our writing group has] been, you know, sharing our accountability with each other. So I think that's an affordance is [sic] that it keeps us on track."
Positioning relative to others (PO)	A position primarily oriented towards others seen as social actors within the program Example: "I don't think as a college we communicate very well with each other."
Positioning relative to self (PS)	A position that is primarily self-referential, oriented towards one (or more) perceived positions taken by the participant in relationship to the program Example: "I'm not sure the process work with [a retreat speaker] really changed the way that I do things but solidified more the thinking that I already had. So it wasn't like a left turn for me."

During second-cycle analysis, we increasingly recognized that the implicit and explicit (re)assignment of rights and duties served as key moments when positions were being renegotiated; themes among participants' positioning events led us to consider how participants' sense of responsibility for action, change, and support was a key factor in their individual and collective experiences of the program. Attention to these moments allowed us to better understand *how* the participants

reoriented themselves to existing storylines, and began to create new storylines, about themselves as writers, colleagues, and scholars.

3. Findings

Findings are presented in two major sections. In the first major subsection, we look broadly—across data sources—to show how participants negotiated rights and duties as they recounted their experiences in the program. In the second major subsection, we circle back to unpack three vignettes that more deeply illustrate the ways participants enacted rights and duties as they positioned and repositioned themselves as academic writers.

3.1 Overview of Participants' Positioning Relative to Self, Others, and the AWF Program

This subsection summarizes all nine participants' experiences in the AWF program: we identify the program components that participants found most impactful; we analyze how the Fellows positioned themselves, the program, and others (including overlapping positioning moves).

Table 2 Impactful AWF Program Components

Participant	Most Impactful Component	Second-Most Impactful Component
Alex	Small Weekly Writing Groups	Retreats (especially books/book discussions)
Austin	Small Weekly Writing Groups	Retreats
Dakota	Mentor	Small Weekly Writing Groups
Drew	Retreats	Small Weekly Writing Groups
Gray	Retreats	Small Weekly Writing Groups
Justice	Mentor	Small Weekly Writing Groups
Kennedy	Retreats	Mentor
Tate	Small Weekly Writing Groups	Mentor
Taylor	Mentor	Retreats

Most Impactful Components of AWF for Fellows

Regarding the program components participants found most impactful (see Table 2), two trends are noteworthy.

First, no single component of the AWF program stood out as most impactful to all participants; rather, three components were chosen first equally among the nine Fellows. We find this important because it suggests that major program components played differential roles in participants' enactment and expansion of possible storylines about themselves as writers across the year.

Second, the three Fellows (Alex, Austin, and Tate) who identified small weekly writing groups as most impactful were in the same group; each member of this group discussed how important and positive their writing group was to them. The fourth member of this writing group, Drew, identified it as the second-most impactful program component. This suggests that when writing groups work well, they can be quite powerful. As further analysis shows, however, the process of group formation and interaction may be especially sensitive to the storylines that fellows bring with them into the writing groups. The other writing groups were Justice, Gray, and Taylor in a second group and Dakota and Kennedy joined by one of the program facilitators in the third group.

Table 3 Fellows' Positioning Relative to Self, Program and Others

Fellow	A. Positioning	B. Positioning	C. Positioning	D. Overlapping
Alex*	6	1	4	9
Drew	3	3	2	11
Tate	3	2	0	13
Taylor*	3	1	0	4
Justice	1	6	0	6
Gray*	1	4	0	15
Austin	4	4	6	18
Kennedy	8	3	6	14
Dakota	3	2	3	7

* **Note.** The positioning patterns of these three fellows are explored more extensively in the second section of the results. These three participants were chosen in part because their expression of rights and duties helps emphasize the range of possible positionings taken up in the participants' recounts.

Fellows' Positionings of Themselves, the Program, and Others

Table 3 provides an overview of the distribution of participant positioning events. The table indicates how many segments were coded for each form of positioning. Since many segments included Fellows' positioning of self, program, or other vis-à-vis self, program, or other (e.g., self-relative-to-program, other-relative-to-self, etc.), column D of Table 3 also indicates cases of overlapping positionings. To give one example, we coded the following segment as both Positioning Self [PS] and Positioning Program [PP]:

[T]he writing retreats at the [off-campus location] were great for coming together as a community and sharing challenges and things like that. I didn't get, you know, a lot of writing done at the writing retreat. And some people, when they think about a writing retreat, it's to go somewhere and write and write and write and write and write and write and write and write. But when I first went to the first one, I was thinking that it would be a lot of, I would get a lot of writing done but I wasn't upset that I didn't because the time together as the writing community, going back to what I said, I think it was your first question or something, that sense of having the writing community and being, you know, making it feel that writing is not so isolating anymore was just as powerful as having lots of time to write by myself. And maybe more powerful.

In this segment, Drew primarily describes the impact of program retreats on their writing practice. Drew positions this program component in relationship to an existing storyline (i.e., retreats are places for individual writing), then positions themselves as adaptable (not upset that the retreat did not fit expectations) and positively impacted by the unexpected focus on community building. Rather than asserting a right to private writing time, Drew instead takes up a position in which they realize the power of communal aspects of writing.

Self-positioning. We noted three different ways that Fellows positioned themselves. First, two Fellows (Drew & Tate) positioned themselves primarily by *reflecting* on their writing practices, including establishing writing routines, choosing journals that worked best for their papers, studying the writing of exemplar articles, and expressing felt duties to change their way of thinking about writing. For example, Drew stated that they make their "...writing time sacred," by setting "...up intentional [writing] routines," establishing "...clear writing goals," and track[ing] conversations that are going on in [their] writing group."

Second, five Fellows (Alex, Justice, Austin, Kennedy, & Dakota) positioned themselves as *examiners* of their evolving academic writing positions. Alex and Austin, for example, both examined tensions they experienced between balancing time for academic writing with other demands of their respective positions, thus

revealing felt tensions between academic writing and other duties. For example, Alex stated, “I have serious challenges to overcome in terms of how I prioritize my time...mostly because I love to teach.” Similarly, Dakota and Kennedy also examined struggles to see themselves differently. Dakota talked of an increasing confidence as an academic writer, stating “I need to develop those [writing] skills, and [mentor] feedback was valuable.” Similarly, Kennedy talked of facing self-doubt as an academic writer, noting “I’m struggling with my own self-concept as a writer.”

Finally, two Fellows were nearly at polar ends of a rights/duties continuum relative to self-positioning: Gray positioned herself primarily in terms of responsibility to the components of the AWF Initiative stating, for example, “[The AWF program is] a responsibility.... Everyone’s investing time in this. We need to be doing it [the work of the AWF program] ...and that’s the good faith or the responsibility part of it.” Taylor, on the other hand, positioned herself relative to ways that they benefited from the AWF program (and the ways the program might be adjusted to benefit them). For example, with respect to writing groups, Taylor said, “If you could group yourself along the lines of say similar research agenda...That’ll give me more buy-in and more power to, yeah, [say] let’s go to a [writing] meeting.” Thus, whereas Gray recounted experience in terms of their *duties* to others in the program, Taylor focused more extensively on their *right* to place expectations onto others.

Positioning of the AWF program. Most program-related positioning focused on perceived strengths and weaknesses. Strengths included perceptions that the program was useful in addressing academic writers’ needs; the small weekly writing groups were valuable; accountability was an important component (mentioned twice); and AWF helped to foster a culture of academic writing within the college (mentioned twice). For example, Drew asserted that the Academic Writing Fellows program “facilitated opportunities for me to be more accountable to myself,” and Gray explained, “[The Academic Writing Fellows] was created for us to...become more productive...[and to] lift up the...college, right?” Finally, Tate unequivocally stated that the small writing groups were the most important aspect of AWF: “...[T]he most important thing about [AWF] is having a writing group...[H]aving a safe place that you belong and being with a group of people that is your family.”

Critiques focused on Fellows’ views that more scaffolding was needed around clarifying the accountability aspect of AWF; setting up and maintaining small weekly writing groups; guiding interactions with national mentors; choosing books about writing that would better meet Fellows’ individual needs as writers; and refining the structure and function of the two writing retreats. In sum, every participant offered concrete suggestions for improving AWF; some of those suggestions were stated directly in terms of positioning. For example, Dakota and another Fellow reported

feeling like “leftovers” when it came to their membership in a writing group for the year (because some writing groups had formed prior to the formal beginning of the program). Overall, however, participants’ positionings relative to the program generally indicate that Fellows saw themselves as agentive – even in terms of having rights and duties to indicate how they would improve the program.

Positioning of others. Whereas all nine Fellows engaged in self-positioning and positioning of the AWF program, only five Fellows engaged in the positioning of others. Moreover, the five Fellows who did engage in positioning of others did so in three ways: four Fellows (Alex, Austin, Dakota, and Kennedy) positioned their small weekly writing group members as contributing to their success as academic writers; two Fellows (Dakota and Kennedy) positioned their national writing mentors as especially valuable; and one (Drew) positioned various non-program colleagues who read and commented on papers before sending them out for external review as helpful to writing success. As one example, regarding the impact of small weekly writing group members, Austin said, “...[W]e were very accountable to each other, right? So, the accountability of showing up with something to go over when we met as a writing group was super high within our group. We really took that seriously.”

With respect to Fellows’ positioning of others, we noted that Fellows primarily saw themselves as collaborating—rather than competing—with others to foster their success. Fellows’ recounts focus more often on how other participants *positively* influenced them, especially in terms of how writing group members and writing mentors allowed them to take up different storylines about themselves as writers. For example, Dakota, who participated as a new scholar, deeply appreciated the chance to be in a writing group with Kennedy, who had also recently completed a dissertation:

I think for Kennedy and me, it was great to explore and experience [together] because each time when I shared [about my graduate project], for example, Kennedy shared [their] methodology. I was taking mixed methods research, [and Kennedy had also done] mixed methods research, so we were able to bring some new ideas and share. So that was really meaningful because that was my first time and I was, I’m just like, wow, that’s what we need when we collect our data.

The use of “we” at the end of Dakota’s statement here is important because it suggests that Dakota is placing herself within the community of people who do mixed methods research. Rather than positioning herself primarily from a new scholar learner identity, Dakota is taking up a position based within a practicing research community.

In terms of rights and duties, we were struck by how often Fellows expressed a coordination of duties rather than tension among individual rights. Even in cases

where Fellows expressed self-consciousness about their writing skills relative to others, they noted feelings of acceptance rather than judgment. Thus, in contrast to the tensions expressed when fellows positioned themselves, their positioning of others was marked by a reciprocal story of personal growth. A comment from Drew captures this collapse of duties and rights especially well: “The experience ... facilitated opportunities for me to be more accountable to myself.” The sense of coordinated opportunity and accountability expressed in this comment reflects nicely, we think, this Fellow’s sense that growth as a writer emerged within a space where personal responsibility was partially entrusted to others—where duty and right became hard to tease apart. Drew’s comment also captures a sense of leaning on others to reposition oneself. The task of (re)writing one’s available storylines resulted partially from converting duties into new rights within the type of displacement space created by the AWF program.

Overlapping positioning: Digging further into rights, duties, and storylines

As Zelle (2009) points out, self-positioning always implies the positioning of others, and the final column in Table 3 represents moments where overlapping co-positioning was most apparent. With respect to the sets of overlapping codes, we note a pattern like one that characterized many participants’ self-positioning. Specifically, overlapping positioning codes for six Fellows (Alex, Drew, Austin, Dakota, Kennedy, & Justice) revealed internalized tensions about themselves and their work as academic writers. For example, Austin positioned a writing life at odds with other areas of their scholarly work:

I am such a practitioner and a researcher, researching really practical stuff and so I want my stuff to be read by the people who need to read it. Therefore, the game of top tier publication stuff, I find to be... it doesn’t fit well with what I need. ... Sometimes that’s the right audience, but most of the time, it’s not necessarily the right audience for my work. I want it to get to the people who need to have it.

This excerpt reveals a tension between publication pressures and this Fellow’s felt obligation to practitioners as readers who need to have access to the work. The positionings taken up here are related to a much broader storyline, one that pits practical application against more abstract contributions to theory/discipline. This tension was not discussed as a direct, in-the-moment discursive opposition to anyone else in the program, but rather an ongoing struggle among two possible selves.

Another fellow’s interview illustrates a different type of internalized struggle, oriented not towards a felt obligation regarding certain types of readers but instead around a storyline of self-worth and imposterism. When asked how their small

writing group could have been more successful, Kennedy focused on a felt duty to improve as an academic writer:

I'm the outlier. I get that. ... One of the things that, that I think, I think partly it was, a large part was just my own mental blocks. ... It seemed like everything to me with writing is like climbing Mt. Everest. It's like you get to one plateau and it's like, oh, my gosh, am I there yet? Am I ever gonna finish? You don't like it and so you go back down the mountain, then you have to climb back up again and so I think, I don't know that it was the group as much as it was just me, trying to overcome my own challenges.

Throughout Kennedy's transcript are several other positioning events like this one, in which they locate themselves as not (yet) having a right to impose on others and, to some extent, not having a right to be fully successful in their academic efforts. Yet, too, there is evidence that the program has provided an opportunity for Kennedy to revise this storyline of self-doubt.

To provide a brief summary of findings based on participants positioning relative to self, others, and program: The program was seen as an agentive force, though we found that program elements were powerful in different ways among the individual participants. For example, writing groups were powerful when they "clicked," whereas retreats served for some participants as a space to set aside expectations within existing storylines. In their recounts, participants self-positioned in ways that revealed the tensions they felt among various possible positions and values, and they asserted new rights and duties among those possibilities. Participants' positioning of others was typically collaborative rather than competitive, suggesting that they saw other Fellows as supporting their engagement with new storylines.

3.2 Illustrative Vignettes: The Enactment of Rights and Duties

Our analyses of the Fellows' positioning reveals differing patterns with respect to the enactment of rights and duties and the evolution of Fellows' existing storylines as academic writers. To further illustrate the diversity of those individual pathways, we unpack the evolving storylines of three Fellows: Alex, Gray, and Taylor.

The Case of Alex: "I need to be driving my writing wagon"

Alex engaged in different kinds of overlapping positioning but primarily positioned the AWF program relative to themselves. The central issue they raised relative to this positioning involved benefits of the program alongside program components they found frustrating. For example, in describing their struggle with the program deadlines, Alex stated, "Deadlines—this was not a problem with the program. This was a problem with Alex. ... I just really struggle with meeting my own deadlines." A related issue Alex raised was the struggle with prioritizing students' needs over

their own research, scholarship, and writing. In terms of rights and duties, Alex felt a strong sense of duty to their students: "My [job description] responsibilities are 65% teaching, and so if there's an immediate need with teaching, that trumps anything else." Alex frequently mentioned tensions between time for academic writing and other aspects of their job.

The AWF program seemed to allow Alex a right to prioritize their scholarship as an academic. As a tenured, mid-career associate professor who had come into a university position after teaching at the elementary level, Alex felt a strong sense of obligation to the college students they taught, and they identified primarily as a teacher rather than as a scholar, writer, or administrator. For Alex, making a place for scholarly writing had been a long struggle, and the AWF program offered a chance for repositioning:

As we were having one of the book discussions, we were joking about what was falling off the writing wagon and it dawned on me that I've gotta stop riding it, I need to start driving it. And again, that was very, very helpful for me, for a time. I just need to keep coming back to that and remember that I need to be driving my writing wagon rather than being pulled by a deadline or something. For a long time, even with some of the grant work that I've done, I didn't feel like it was unique enough to actually share with anybody. ... [But, on a current project with a graduate student, we're] finally getting a set of messages and a very strong message, especially the more data we get, we realize, holy cow, there's something very, very powerful here that nobody's been talking about yet. That's what's been inciting me to write more. That's what's been driving me rather than, oh, yeah, you did a nice project. See if you can get an article out of it. It's like, I don't wanta get an article out of it. That's the wrong, that's the wrong motivator for me. It just seems, that's the game, and I don't wanta be playing the higher ed game. If I'm doing research, I want to publish something that's meaningful.

In this passage, Alex offers the metaphor of "writing wagon" as an object potentially within their control; whereas previous obligations had dragged them into an academic "game" of publication, Alex re-positions themselves in this recount as empowered to take the reins of their writing wagon. This recount helps illuminate the ways that rights and duties were in flux as participants experienced the AWF program, as Alex seems to be re-orienting towards an internalized right to "publish something that's meaningful." Part of this re-orientation includes collapsing the distance between teaching roles and publication projects, as Alex recognizes that their teaching activities provide both data and co-authors for scholarly work. Alex seems to reconfigure the focus of publication activity--away from "the article" as duty towards an opportunity (right) to share something "meaningful" or "profound." Reimagining themselves within the storyline as "driver" rather than "rider" of the writing wagon seems to provide a way for Alex to maintain many of

the values of their existing moral order while also finding room to take on a greater identity as scholarly writer.

The Case of Gray: “It’s okay to comment on each other’s work”

Most of Gray’s overlapping positioning occurred in events where they simultaneously positioned the program and others. Gray talked extensively about intergenerational community building, AWF members’ responsibilities to the program, and the notion of community responsibility. More than any other AWF participant, Gray’s comments focused on duties, especially in terms of their felt responsibilities to others and their perceptions about others’ responsibilities to the community: “You know, ... everyone’s investing time in this [i.e., the AWF program]. We need to be doing it [academic writing]. ... Like, we need to be doing it and that’s the good faith or the responsibility part of it.”

A new faculty member at RMU, Gray had had positive research and publication experiences as a graduate student but recognized that they were still a novice scholar. For them, multiple interactions with other writers in the program helped to shape their enactment of rights and duties as an academic writer:

From the very first retreat we ever had, when I had just moved here, Drew was talking about, hey, our job description is that [research/publication] is like 25% of our work. We need to be working ten hours a week. And that just stuck with me. ... And [it’s] something that I really try to do every week. ... And I think just, this is my interpretation but, in a year and a half, I think there’s been, there have been other people that have been, even not in the program, like [a faculty member in the college] who take a cue in a way--not that they’re, they need to be cued--but like they’re hearing of us collaborating and [that person] has been involved in my writing lately. ... He’s been offering to do it so I don’t know if it’s a direct result of the program but I, I feel this general approach that it’s okay to comment on each other’s work and share it.

Here Gray acknowledges overlapping interactions within and beyond the program that, in their interpretive reconstruction, help them take up the rights and duties of scholarly work. Not only do they see Drew as helping them claim time for research and writing, but they also credit the program with generating informal conversations, even beyond the program participants, about appropriate forms of interaction with colleagues. Gray expresses these types of interaction not in terms of obligation but of permission (“it’s okay to comment on each other’s work”)—thus reinforcing our sense that rights and duties become deeply interconnected within the kind of displacement space that the AWF program made available.

The Case of Taylor: “I need to go make this time work for me”

Almost a polar opposite of Gray (who expressed a deep sense of reciprocal/reciprocated duties within the program), Taylor’s overlapping positioning comments referred primarily to their own rights as a member of the AWF group. Taylor viewed their national writing mentor as the most important component of AWF primarily because the mentor provided networking opportunities for them. As well, Taylor stated that they would have preferred to be in a writing group where all members focused on Taylor’s own area of scholarly study. In the four segments of Taylor’s overlapping positioning, they prioritized their own position as an individual scholar in relation to others or the program.

Additionally, and in contrast to the other Fellows, Taylor found less value in the program, and their actions did not reveal the same level of responsibility to the program. (For example, Taylor was the only participant who did not submit evidence of the required submissions at the end of the program.) Though Taylor did express an expectation for collaboration with others, their expectation was framed relative to what others could/might do for Taylor:

But if I have, okay, I’m working with these people [i.e., colleagues], [if a] similar interest is there, we may co-author, we may publish together. Then I have a lot more power that I need to go make this time work for me and I’ll do my part and they will do their part...

Taylor expresses here an explicit expectation that collaboration with others should produce a direct benefit to them in immediate and measurable terms: they express a right to expect that any work with a collaborator would be reciprocated in an immediate pay-off.

To us, this participant positions themselves within a moral order that values reciprocation, but in contrast to others, their expectation is bound up in more immediate notions of their own rights and others’ duties to them. Unless they could see an immediate return on their time, they did not feel a sense of duty to others. This contrast, we think, is important, for it illuminates that rights and duties can be relatively more or less foregrounded in positioning acts. Whereas others were willing to background immediate claims of their rights--often in terms of longer-term benefits to the group and to their imagined future selves—Taylor prioritized rights within a more rigid storyline focused on a more immediate self.

As a final indicator of the program as a potential displacement space, we also briefly mention the experience of another Fellow (Tate), who expressed a duty to engage effectively and mutually with their writing group because they—as a junior faculty member—found such a strong sense of acceptance: “Here I am, you know, just writing this ‘rinky dink’ stuff and, you know, they’re like, come sit at the table. ... And they actually kind of, you know, became my work family, you know, for the lack of a better term. You know, when stuff doesn’t go well, I turn to them and they

are very protective of me. And I in turn am very protective of them.” We see Tate’s story as one reflecting a reciprocal right/duty to share with others, and in this transcript and others it seems that participants view the program as a safe space for these kinds of repositioning acts.

In sum, the coding of participant recounts helps us understand how these writers worked through the process of trying out new positionings. In many cases, participants’ efforts enabled them to revise existing storylines that shaped their sense of possible rights, duties, and identities. Their willingness to enter displacement spaces offered by the program was characterized by a *coordination* of duties, in which reciprocity was a defining feature for their development. The recounts, rather than revealing contested positionings between participants (in which one person’s felt rights conflicted with those of others), we instead saw an alignment, in which the guidelines and enactment of the program provided a space in which these writers could collaboratively work towards desired future identities. The tensions that did exist in the recounts were primarily cast as internalized struggles with existing storylines and identities, and at times implied positioning by important others (such as tenure and promotion committees) outside the program.

4. Discussion: A Model of Participation

One assumption we shared, as we undertook this project, was that many scholars—even those with tenure—may lack storylines that allow them to frame their academic writing in satisfying ways. As program facilitators, we hoped that the AWF program might provide opportunities for participants to re-imagine themselves as academic writers through new scripts, by providing a space that offered not one but many opportunities for Fellows to consider new rights and duties. As researchers, we hoped to learn: how can programs like ours allow academic writers to take up new positions and storylines for themselves?

Our findings suggest that the AWF program opened a meaningful space for the repositioning of self in coordination with others. At least in AWF participants’ recounts of program participation, it seems they reclaimed agency for themselves in part by collapsing the distance between their rights and the duties they expected of others. We believe the sense of growth and change expressed by many of these Fellows reflects their entry into displacement spaces that offered them new positionings through which they could recast themselves in new or revised storylines.

Specifically, the convergent potential and reciprocal nature of rights and duties seemed to serve as a lever for Fellows’ entry into new storylines. A pervasive theme was that rights to self, program, and others were often implicit, while duties were often explicit. In their recounts, participants foregrounded the sense of obligation they felt to one another and to the program; often their expectations of others (*i.e.*, the rights they claimed for themselves) were expressed indirectly or implicitly, and

sometimes as shared responsibility (e.g., “We all show up because we all recognize the value of each other’s time.”). Additionally, participant narratives suggest that the program created standing speech acts perceived as creating both structure and flexibility. In Drew’s terms, the program fostered a type of “facilitated accountability” through clear, non-negotiable final deadlines coupled with multiple opportunities for exploration and negotiation.

We suggest that two types of displacement are revealed in participant recounts of the program experience—spatial and temporal:

1. The program provided real and imagined opportunities for **spatial** displacement. Retreats, writing groups, and new relationships and interactions allowed participants to occupy positions and storylines that may not have seemed available to Fellows in their everyday, collegial lives. Many participants, for example, found writing groups to be especially powerful sites for working through rights, duties, identities, and storylines in their evolving development as academic writers. In the words of one participant, the writing group offered “social thinking” that allowed the participation to reposition themselves as a writer.² Further, there was a strong sense of reciprocity throughout the narratives—a willingness to be displaced together. Participants typically positioned other program members (often when discussing writing groups and retreats) in friendly terms, describing each other primarily in terms of rights freely shared: what was expected (and given) were support, commitment, acceptance, and models for inspiration and action. Rather than contested and rejected re-positionings, the narratives focused on a type of self-in-others storyline, in which the fellows jointly worked to explore and test new identities displaced from everyday life. Importantly, when there were explicit statements of rejection of existing positions, those were often directed towards program “outsiders” who were seen as threatening fellows’ goals of renewed writerly identities.
2. Construction of a future self was a key feature of many of the Fellows’ recounts. We think this proleptic action seems to be a type of temporal displacement that complemented the spatial displacement described above. Future-oriented visions of the participants’ selves as academic writers played a central role in the ways they enacted rights and duties throughout the year in the AWF initiative, creating the opportunity for displacing existing positionings to take on possible positions in revised storylines. When describing their present selves, the fellows positioned themselves around duties of labor, personal growth, and service to others. Some also expressed an obligation and desire to synthesize the experience into a meaningful whole. Similarly, taking ownership of the program experience was framed as both right and duty. In relationship to a future self, participants described the program experience, interactions, and components

as with reference to duties (owed to their future selves) of durability, impact, and balance. In the AWF participants' narratives, the future self often served as a mediating device, one that guided participants' construction of the program experience.

4.1 Implications

Moving from theory to application, we were reassured to find that many of the positionings we analyzed indicated that the program was seen as a positive, impactful experience by nearly all Year 1 participants. In terms of their existing orientations to rights and duties, the participants positioned themselves as willing to collapse the distance between their rights and others' duties, reciprocally working to craft and pursue new stories about themselves as writers. The participant recounts also suggest that the four major program components (mentors, writing groups, retreats, and accountability expectations) offered participants different opportunities for displacement, with enough flexibility regarding rights and duties that participants could navigate their own pathways within the program structure. The participants' perception of a malleable structure further suggests they engaged in the program as a displacement space that opened access to new storylines about themselves as writers.

In terms of direct application to other programs like this academic writing fellowship, our analysis suggests two possible improvements:

1. *Displacement* may serve as a fruitful way to understand, plan, and effect writers' development. At least in our analysis, Fellows' growth occurred in spaces that allowed them to reorient their positioning relative to existing storylines. In fact, focusing on displacement may be more important than developing the goal of "community." While "community" carries with it (we think) a notion of stable ongoing relationships, a better goal may be encouraging program participants to take up new positions as excellent academic writers *alongside* other interactive storylines they may find compelling.
2. Writers should be explicitly positioned to see themselves as reciprocal participants, having rights as well as duties to others. Reciprocity seemed to be a key component for allowing the participants to displace themselves while retaining a sense of safety as they explored new positions. Facilitators of experiences like AWF can play a role throughout the program by reaffirming that participants should expect certain rights (e.g., the right to work with a national mentor in their field of expertise, the right to attend two writing retreats, etc.). However, facilitators should also articulate participants' duties (e.g., participating as supportive and thoughtful community members in weekly small writing groups, maintaining ongoing and open communication with

national mentors, etc.) as an essential component of their engagement in the program.

These suggestions for application invite us to return to the larger theoretical picture. In this analysis, Positioning Theory encouraged us to attend closely to writers' storylines, rights, and duties. In that exploration, we found that participants described their program experience around opportunities for repositioning, specifically in ways that allowed them to try on new storylines for themselves as academic writers (and in relationship to rights and duties imposed on them by other salient storylines). This displacement was both spatial and temporal: physical distance from everyday life created space for conceptual and personal growth by allowing participants to critique and question their existing beliefs and practices. This growth was enhanced by a sense of reciprocity, in which participants mutually supported one another. And, this growth was facilitated by participants' opportunities to project themselves (temporally) into future selves characterized by new rights and duties.

Echoing perspectives from previous scholars, our research re-affirms the value of spatial metaphors for studying writing. The distance between "here" and "there" (Badenhorst et al., 2016) and "privileged" and "everyday" spaces (Lee & Baud, 2003; Allen, 2019) are complicated and deserving of further study. By drawing attention to the ways that rights and duties are taken up as writers locate themselves in time and space, Positioning Theory complements and extends this previous research, in part by emphasizing the way that creating displacement spaces may serve as a powerful approach to the sociocultural development of advanced academic writers.

Finally, of course, our research does not answer the important question of whether the new storylines participants engaged in during our program will have enduring impact. Do these writers re-enter everyday space with the confidence to assert new rights and duties as academic writers? How much will previous positionings (related to storylines about good teaching, collegiality, work-life balance, etc.) moderate the rights and duties these writers took on within the displaced space of the AWF program? These are questions we cannot yet answer, but we hope other scholars will take them up in future studies of the impact of writing programs in academic (and other professional and disciplinary) settings.

Notes

1. Harre and Moghaddam (2005) define a position as "a cluster of rights and duties to perform certain actions ... in a highly mobile and dynamic way" (p. 5-6). Within Positioning Theory, the concept of identity is characterized, at least in Slocum-Bradley's (2009) definition, as the relatively more stable, less mutable characteristics that interlocutors bring into social contexts. Thus we see the concept of 'position' as similar but not identical to various definitions of identity that have been explored in other writing research (e.g.,

Ivanic, 1998). We recognize that our decision to use “position” limits our ability to contribute directly to the important and multiple perspectives on writerly identity that currently circulate among writing scholars.

2. Notably, participant descriptions for others outside the program were more ambivalent. For example, participants positioned the national mentors they selected as outsiders to the program; the rights and duties they felt towards these individuals were typically quite different than the expectations they had of other fellows they positioned as “inside” the program. Some fellows struggled to overcome feeling intimidated by the outside mentor, for example, or they felt they were imposing on the mentor by asking for that person’s time. In terms of our emerging spatial framework for understanding the impacts of writing programs, we think this sense of interiority/exteriority deserves follow-up attention.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants for their time and willingness to be interviewed, and we thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their careful and constructive guidance on this manuscript.

References

- Alexander, K. P., & Shaver, L. (2020). Disrupting the numbers: The impact of a women’s faculty writing program on associate professors. *College Composition and Communication*, 72(1), 58-86.
- Allen, T. J. (2019). Facilitating graduate student and faculty member writing groups: Experiences from a university in Japan. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(3), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1574721>
- Badenhorst, C. M., McLeod, H., Vaandering, D., Li, X., Joy, R., Penney, S., Picket, Sarah, & Hesson, Jackie. (2016). The journey between there and here: Stories of a faculty writing group. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 39(1), 1-26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.39.1.09>
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Beasy, K., Emery, S., Dyer, L., Coleman, B., Bywaters, D., Garrad, T., Crawford, J., Swarts, K., & Jahangiri, S. (2020). Writing together to foster wellbeing: Doctoral writing groups as spaces of wellbeing. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(6), 1091–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1713732>
- Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. New Forums Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.

- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Harvard University Press.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x>
- Davis, P.J. (2006). Critical incident technique: A learning intervention for organizational problem solving. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 13(6), 13-16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1477280610645877>
- de Luna, B.I. (2017). The end into the beginning. Prolepsis and the reconstruction of the collective past. *Culture & Psychology*, 23(2), 280-294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X17695761>
- Eodice, M. & Cramer, S. (2001). Write On! A model for enhancing faculty publication. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 18(4), 113-121.
- Falconer, H. M. (2019). "I think when I speak, I don't sound like that": The influence of social positioning on rhetorical skill development in science. *Written Communication*, 36(1), 9-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318804819>
- Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M.J. (2010). Disciplinary literacies across content areas: Supporting secondary reading through functional language analysis. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(7), 587-597. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.53.7.6>
- Felton, P., Moore, J. L., & Strickland, M. (2009). Faculty writing residencies: Supporting scholarly writing and teaching. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 1, 39-55.
- Fisher, R. R., & Calkins, K. (2016). *Interpreting the Frameworks: Faculty Constructions of Research and the Researching Student* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming. Libraries).
- Francis, D. (1997). Critical incident analysis: A strategy for developing reflective practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, 3(2), 169-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354060970030201>
- Franks, A. M. (2018) Design and evaluation of a longitudinal faculty development program to advance scholarly writing among pharmacy practice faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 82(6), 654-659. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe6556>
- Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315722511>
- Geller, A.E., & Eodice, M. (2013). *Working with faculty writers*. Utah State University Press.
- Green, J., Brock, C. H., Baker, W. D., & Harris, P. (2020). Positioning theory: Analyzing learning and identity development in discourse. In N.S. Nasir, C. Lee, R. Pea, & M. McKinney de Royston (Eds.), *Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning* (pp. 119-140). Routledge.

- Harré, R. (2011). Foreword. In M. B. McVee, C. H. Brock, & J. A. Glazier (Eds.), *Sociocultural positioning in literacy* (pp. ix-xi). Hampton Press.
- Harré R., & Moghaddam, F. M. (Eds.) (2003). Introduction: The self and others in traditional psychology and in positioning theory. In R. Harré R., & F. Moghaddam (Eds.), *The self and others* (pp. 1-11). Praeger.
- Harré, R. & Van Langenhove, L. (1999) *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Blackwell.
- John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative collaboration*. Oxford University Press.
- Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. John Benjamins.
- Kemppainen, J.K. (2000). The critical incident technique and nursing care quality research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(5), 1264-71.
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01597.x>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- Lee, A., & Boud, D. (2003). Writing groups, change and academic identity: Research development as local practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 187–200.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058109>
- McGrail, M. R. Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006) Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 25(1), 19-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053>
- McVee, M. B., Haq, K. S., Barrett, S., Silvestri, K. N., & Shanahan, L. E. (2019). The positioning theory diamond as analytical tool to examine multimodal social interaction in an engineering club. *Papers on Social Representations*, (28),1, 7.1-7.23. <http://psr.iscte-iul.pt/index.php/PSR/index>
- McVee, M. B., Silvestri, K. N., Barrett, S., & Haq, K. S. (2019). Positioning theory. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, M. Sailors, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of literacy* (pp. 381-400). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315110592-23>
- Muller, E. L. (2014). Developing the faculty as a writing community. *Academe*, 100(6), 34–38. www.jstor.org/stable/24643011
- Penney, S., Young, G., Badenhorst, C., Goodnough, K., Hesson, J., Joy, R., McLeod, H., Pickett, S., Stordy, M., Vaandering, D., & Pelech, S. (2015). Faculty writing groups: A support for women balancing family and career on the academic tightrope. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education; Toronto*, 45(4), 457–479. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v45i4.184396>
- Prior, P. A. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistorical account of literate activity in the academy*. Routledge.
- Salda a, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

- Schick, K., Hunter, C., Gray, L., Poe, N., & Santos, K. (2011). Writing in action: Scholarly writing groups as faculty development. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 3, 43-63.
- Slocum-Bradley, (2009). The positioning diamond: A trans-disciplinary framework for discourse analysis. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 40(1), 79-107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2009.00418.x>
- Smagorinsky, P. (2008). The methods section as conceptual epicenter in constructing social science research reports. *Written Communication*, 25, 389-411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308317815>
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sword, H. (2017). *Air & light & time & space*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674977617>
- Vaisburd, E. (Producer). (1998). *What I've learned since I've turned forty* (Motion picture, available from Northwest Film Artists and presented at Texas Woman's University). [Reference used by permission of the artist].
- Van Langenove, L. (2017). Varieties of moral orders and the dual structure of society: A perspective from positioning theory. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 2(9). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2017.00009>
- Van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harré & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning Theory* (pp. 14-31). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932>
- Wertsch, J. (1993) *Voices of the mind: Sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, R. (2001, January 5). A higher bar for earning tenure. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12-A14.
- Zelle, G. (2009). *Exploring the application of positioning theory to the analysis of organisational change*. Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference. Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management.

Appendix A: Sample of coding (from Kennedy's interview)

Transcript lines	Transcript	Code(s)	Descriptive phrase
69-87.5	P: So I appreciated, from the very beginning, I appreciated the application process. While it was irritating, because application processes always are, it made it, it made it a real, it leant credibility and validity to what you were doing because it became this is real, this isn't. Just a, we're doing this fun thing and come and join us if you want. So I appreciated that actually.	PP	Application process validates the program
87.5-96	And I appreciated the opportunity as new faculty and some folks called me adjunct. Other folks called me, I don't even know what my title was anymore. Professional lecturer, I couldn't, professional lecturer, whatever. It didn't, but it didn't matter that I wasn't in a permanent position there. That I was still considered, I was still considered being part of the committee, or the group and I really appreciated that because, because you could've very easily said, you know, well, she's not gonna be there more than a year, maybe two so it's not worth it. But it really was worth it and I appreciate that. So that, even that beginning process. And then I appreciated, I'm not gonna remember everything. I'm so sorry I: Don't worry. Just whatever, whatever stands out to you. That's what we wanta know. Yeah	PP/PS	Appreciates being treated as equal by others (even though she wasn't permanent/TT)
97-100.5	P: You know, it was really nice going out to the loft. At first, I was really grumpy about the loft. I thought there's no internet so we're just gonna be sitting there. Why are we going out where there's no internet service?	PP	Initially suspecting retreat would be boring without internet

<p>100.5-115</p>	<p>And I don't know that a lot of writing happened there, at least in my regard, but what happened was collegiality and getting to know, getting to know other faculty members and other writers and getting to know Austin better. I just love Austin. They're all sweet but Austin, Austin's female so we can say those kinds of things. They were all great to work with. Got to know Austin and was able to, was afforded other [unclear] working with Austin [unclear] because of academic writing fellows. I had an office next door to her but I rarely said hi because I knew that she was buried all the time. So that was really, really nice. I'm trying to think...</p> <p>I: Let me, can I refresh your memory a little bit?</p> <p>P: Yes, please do.</p> <p>I: In addition to the two writing retreats, we had, I think, one in September and one in January.</p>	<p>PP/PO</p>	<p>Coming to appreciate retreat for creating opportunities to get to know others/build community (ex: Austin)</p>
<p>116-121.5</p>	<p>P: Right. The weekly writing mentors meetings were really helpful. I, in retrospect, I think I probably didn't take advantage of them as well as I needed to. I think that was my own little psyche thing, just my own little emotional breaks: Why are you doing this? You can't do this.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Feeling she didn't take full advantage of mentors because of her own self-doubt</p>