'So maybe I'm not such an imposter':

Becoming an academic after a life as a practitioner

Alison Hardy[a]* Rowena Murray[b], Morag Thow[c] and Michelle Smith[d]

[a]School of Social Sciences, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, England.

[b]School of Education and Social Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Ayr, Scotland.

[c]Department of Physiotherapy, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, Scotland.

[d]School of Health and Life Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Lanarkshire, Scotland.

*Corresponding Author

Biographical notes on contributors
Alison Hardy is Senior Lecturer at Nottingham Trent University. Her research focuses on values in education. Twitter: @Alison_Hardy.

Rowena Murray is Professor in the School of Education and Social Sciences at the University of the West of Scotland and a Principal Fellow of Advance Higher Education. Her research focuses on academic writing. ORCID: 0000-0002-3209-9290. Facebook: Rowena Murray Writing Group. Twitter: @murray_rowena.

Dr Morag Thow was a lecturer at Glasgow Caledonian University for 26 years. Her research focused on cardiovascular health and the benefits of exercise.

Michelle Smith is a Teaching Fellow in Sport Psychology at the University of the West of Scotland and a BASES Probationary Sport and Exercise Scientist in Psychology Support. Her research focuses on practitioner development, judgement and decision making. Twitter: @MichelleSmithMS.

'So maybe I'm not such an imposter':

Becoming an academic after a life as a practitioner

Abstract

The practitioner-academic transition can be a challenge. There are often tensions and difficulties involved in identity change, key aspects of which are writing, publishing, and maintaining the writing habit. In order to support this transition, the writing meeting framework, originally designed to support academic writers in changing and maintaining their writing behaviours, was trialled and evaluated with early career academics who were previously teachers in schools or colleges. We aimed to investigate whether the framework could support former practitioners in changing and maintaining their writing behaviours. Six participants met regularly in pairs to set writing goals and check on progress. Participants were interviewed, and transcripts analysed using self-determination theory to understand what happened in the meetings and whether the framework helped participants to write, keep writing and feel part of a network. Our analysis explored the extent to which it met three psychological needs (competence, relatedness and autonomy). We found evidence that it did, but with varying degrees. We also found that relationships between pairs were important, and that a beneficial writing meeting required a mutualistic relationship. Findings suggest that the framework can, in certain conditions, help former practitioners to maintain change in their writing behaviour so as to be able to perform an aspect of academic work that can be particularly challenging for them during the practitioner-academic transition.

Key words: writing, identity, barriers, peer relationships.

Word count: 6981

Introduction

Becoming an academic after a career as a teacher can be a challenge. A key aspect of this transition is writing and publishing and maintaining the writing habit. There are many approaches for supporting academic writing: writer's groups (Aitchison and Guerin, 2014; Elbow, 1998), writing retreats (Grant, 2006; Moore, 2003; Murray, 2015), writing courses (Boice, 1987; Belcher, 2019) and books (Hartley, 2008; Huff, 1999; Silvia, 2007; Thomson and Kamler, 2013). Murray and Thow (2014) developed a framework for supporting writers in changing writing behaviours: the writing meeting. Their British Academy-funded study reported on the design, implementation and evaluation of the writing meeting framework, which was based on the Transtheoretical Model (TTM). The TTM was originally developed to understand behaviour change for smoking cessation (Prochaska and DiClemente, 1983). It has since been adapted and used to understand and support change processes in many other behaviours, including academic writing (Murray and Thow 2014). The writing meeting complements other approaches by focusing on the individual's values and behaviours that influence writing behaviours.

Drawing on this established theory, the writing meeting involves using a template to structure discussions about writing. Pairs of writers take turns in being prompter and writer: the prompter uses the template to ask the writer questions; then they swap roles. They use these questions to focus on their motivation to write:

(1) Defining which stage of change the person is at in their writing;
(2) Identifying the benefits of writing and drawbacks of not writing using a 'decisional balance;'
(3) Identifying barriers to writing and ways of overcoming them;
(4) Setting writing goals;
(5) Anticipating barriers to achieving these goals and considering how to overcome them;
(6) Actions needed to achieve the goals.

Those who have been writing regularly, without lengthy gaps, are in the action or maintenance stage of change, and the aim is to continue in these stages. The decisional balance prompts the writer to explore how important their writing is to them, a first step

in prioritising writing. Goal setting prompts the writer to define realistic, achievable goals, and reviewing achievements of goals builds the writer's confidence in being able to continue and achieve future writing goals. Anticipating barriers prompts the writer to predict when there are likely to be conflicting demands and to create strategies to minimise or cope with them. At the end of the meeting the writers set a date for a follow up meeting when they will 'check-in' with each other on their writing progress and repeat the process. For more details on the application of this approach to academics' writing, see Murray and Thow (2014). The adapted writing meeting framework used in this study is available at https://bit.ly/3f6DfpT.

While Murray and Thow showed that the writing meeting framework can have benefit for staff with experience of academic writing, the aim of this study was to see if it could help practitioner-academics with little or no experience of academic writing. Furthermore, an underexplored aspect of the TTM in their study was the growth in writers' self-efficacy and whether this maintains new writing behaviours. Self-efficacy is a theory for defining levels of confidence in achieving a specific task, which in this context could mean completing a writing project (Bandura, 2010). Therefore, in order to explore whether the writing meeting had an impact beyond a specific writing project we used a theoretical lens that explains sustained behaviour change – self-determination theory (SDT) – to analyse behaviour change and psychological needs.

Behaviour change and psychological needs

Researchers have become progressively interested in developing a theoretical lens to enhance understanding of human behaviour change in various domains. For example, motivation – consistently defined as intensity, direction, and persistence in human behaviour (Vallerand, 2004) – has been the focus of many studies (e.g. Pelletier et al., 2002; Martinek, 2019) that offer evidence for using motivation as a means of predicting behavioural outcome responses, such as enhanced performance and persistence in tasks (Deci and Ryan, 2008).

SDT – a macro-theory of human motivation (Deci and Ryan, 1985) – offers an insightful perspective on the variations of human motivation, namely, extrinsic and

intrinsic motivation. SDT proposes a continuum that reflects each motivated state in relation to human behaviour. For example, at one end of the continuum is intrinsic motivation, which refers to participation in an activity (e.g., writing) for personal satisfaction. In writing, intrinsically motivated behaviour is said to be present when the writer is engaging freely to fulfil his or her own satisfaction. In the centre of the continuum is extrinsic motivation which refers to participation in an activity (e.g. editing) due to an external force or reward (e.g. university targets). At the other end of the continuum lies amotivation. A writer may be described as amotivated if they display neither extrinsically nor intrinsically motivated behaviours towards a task.

Organismic integration theory (OIT) – a mini-theory embedded within SDT – proposes that an individual can move along the continuum from one motivated state to another through a process of internalisation. SDT theorists propose that this internalisation process can be facilitated through the satisfaction of an individual's innate psychological need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy can be associated with an individual's perception of choice and the need to feel in control of self. Competence reflects the need to feel effective when engaging in a task, which, in turn, nurtures feelings of efficacy for that task. Relatedness reflects the yearning to belong, to feel connected to respected others (e.g. writing buddies). To satisfy these three psychological needs, research suggests that consideration should be given to the interpersonal environment that an individual operates within, but more specifically, how those in a leading role (e.g. the writing buddy), may influence and support these needs (Balaguer et al. 2012; Pelletier & Sharp 2009). Mageau and Vallerand (2003) recommend a motivational model of leader behaviour, proposing seven behaviours that may be helpful in nurturing these needs.

The aim of this study was to explore how the writing meeting framework might support the practitioner-academic transition, to see if it could sustain or increase writing behaviour by applying the theoretical lens of SDT and Mageau and Vallerand's (2003) motivational model. The research team searched for evidence of the seven behaviours occurring during writing meetings, in order to understand how these behaviours might meet the need for autonomy, competence and relatedness in relation to early career academics' writing.

Context

The context for this research was an Institute of Education in a post-92 university in England, where most academics had been teachers before joining the university. Their role was to use their practitioner experience to educate future teachers. Moving to higher education prompts a shift from identifying and/or being identified as practitioners to 'teacher-educators'. This shift can include identifying as academics. For many, research and publication were not significant motivations for becoming academics; however, external and internal influences, and policy changes have created an expectation for them to engage in research and writing. Partly in response to this context, one of the researchers established writing retreats as a mainstream intervention (Murray and Newton, 2009) to support herself and colleagues in the Institute.

The challenge of the practitioner-academic transition is well established (Izadinia 2014; Maguire 2000), and there are interventions to help (Roberts and Weston, 2014). However, Sharp et al. (2014) and others (Roberts and Weston 2014) have 'othered' teacher-educators by positioning them as objects of study, in the sense that the intervention was 'done to' the teacher-educators by academics. Roberts and Weston concluded that 'technical' workshops are 'not as effective as embedding a responsive programme of support with peer support at its core, over a sustained time' (p. 713). This study responds to their call for sustained support and evaluates whether Murray and Thow's framework can be used to help teacher-educators find their own solutions to changing and maintaining writing habits.

The study

The Writing Meeting Framework

The researcher was introduced to Murray and Thow's (2014) framework at a training event run by Murray and Thow. Initially, the researcher used the framework to support her own writing, then progressed to use it with a colleague – pseudonym for this study, Amanda. The researcher then introduced the framework to colleagues in the Institute of Education where she worked.

Following university ethical approval, six academics (five women and one man) were invited to take part in the study; they were an opportunistic sample, selected because they were known to the researcher, and were known to have current writing projects. Five had regularly attended departmental writing retreats facilitated by the researcher. The sixth had a writing project to complete. All worked in the Institute and knew each other. They had all been practitioners in other educational settings. Five taught on Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programmes and one on education studies programmes.

All participants were given Murray and Thow's (2014) paper to read before a group meeting. The researcher introduced participants to the framework, with an overview of theoretical concepts, focusing on the writing meeting process and template. Participants were paired based on the researcher's knowledge of their work. Those who were friends and those who taught together were not paired up, so as to establish a new relationship focussed on writing rather than teaching. After this introductory meeting there were follow-up meetings, and the researcher informally asked participants over the following weeks how the meetings were going.

Data collection

All participants provided written consent before the interviews took place and gave verbal permission at the start of the interview for it to be recorded and made available to the research team. Among the research team pseudonyms were used for participants; only the interviewer knew participants' names. Audio files were stored on the university's password protected, cloud-based storage facility.

The interview questions were piloted with two academics in the department: Amanda who had taken part in the writing meetings, the other who had not. After the first pilot, the phrasing of some questions was changed. The second pilot was recorded and listened to by the research team, and subsequently the order and focus of some questions were changed. Murray and Thow advised on the focus of some questions and added questions about self-efficacy.

Each participant was interviewed once for about 30 minutes between October 2018 and January 2019. The interviews were recorded and followed our agreed interview

protocol. One-to-one interviews were conducted between participants and the researcher who had facilitated the writing meetings at [anonymised] University. Each participant was asked 13 open-ended questions, grouped into three sections:

- Questions 1 to 7 explored their experiences of the writing meetings and what impact (if any) the meetings had on their writing.
- Questions 8 to 12 focussed on the impact of the writing meetings on them and their writing habits.
- The last question was about their identity as a writer and academic.

Analysis

Following guidelines proposed by Braun, Clarke and Weate (2016), a reflexive thematic analysis (TA) was conducted on the data set using a behaviour change framework, while drawing on the principles of abductive reasoning. TA allowed the research team to search for patterns and identify themes in relation to the aim of the study. The behaviour change framework was initially informed by self-determination theory – a macro-theory of human motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2008) – and focused on how the writing meeting nurtured participants' psychological need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

To add depth to the analysis, and to understand the role of the writing 'buddy', the analysis was also informed by the work of Mageau and Vallerand's (2003) motivational model, which focuses on the behaviours of an individual in command (i.e. the writing buddy) and the creation of an autonomy-supportive environment. To guide this analysis, and to make it specific to academic writing, we adapted the seven behaviours proposed by Mageau and Vallerand: (1) provide as much choice to the writer as possible, within specific limits and rules; (2) provide a meaningful rationale for writing tasks, limits and rules; (3) inquire about and acknowledge other writers' feelings and perspectives; (4) allow opportunities for the writer to take initiative and do independent work; (5) avoid overt control, guilt-inducing criticisms, controlling statements and rewards; (6) avoid controlling behaviours; and (7) prevent ego-involvement from taking place.

All interviews were transcribed verbatim, and read and re-read by the research team, while listening to the audio recordings checked for accuracy. Codes were developed to

represent aspects of the data that related to the nurturing of each of the three psychological needs. For example, when a participant referred to 'having something to contribute,' the code 'feeling competent to share' was generated. Themes and sub-themes were labelled to represent how the writing meeting helped to nurture each need. For example, the sub-theme 'don't have to be an expert but still have something to contribute' was defined as nurturing participants' feelings of competence.

Competence

This theme is about acknowledgement, non-controlling feedback and initiative-taking (e.g. goal setting and having perspectives heard and acknowledged).

'Don't have to be an expert but [I] still have something to contribute.'

Participants claimed that opportunities to share (e.g. writing ideas) with their writing buddy facilitated feelings of competence. For example, one participant reflected on the benefit of sharing: 'they help you reflect on the fact that you're actually better at [writing] than you think you are.' When asked how this happened, the participant explained:

> When you're talking to somebody else and they're saying 'I'm struggling
> with this', and you say have you tried this… I've tried that or I've managed
> to do this, you think actually, I do have more to offer academic writing than
> I thought. So maybe I'm not such an imposter.

Participants recognized that sharing writing tips and ideas with a buddy was a contribution of knowledge, a mutualistic process (discussed later in this paper) where they could offer support. Niemiec, Ryan, Pelletier and Ryan (2009) suggest that when an individual has opportunities to input into an activity (e.g. writing ideas) they are likely to experience feelings of autonomy for that activity. Sharing with a buddy allowed participants to develop self-belief in their ability to contribute 'something,' while developing confidence in their ability to complete challenging writing tasks. For example, one participant explained how she overcame a writing challenge:

> …an element of self-belief came through because you recognize those
> points where I felt like this when I was writing something else, are similar to

now – so I'm struggling to write something today but I also struggled to write something when I was doing my thesis, …and I really struggled to write something when I first wrote a textbook, …and you can start to track back.

When asked how she knew she could overcome these difficulties, she replied:

The writing buddy process draws to your attention, those moments … it's the conversation you remember.… I remember the moments talking to my buddy about the challenges and I suppose I can recall them now because I verbalized them to someone else … you start to see patterns, where you don't do that if you're just having the conversation internally with yourself. … I'm more likely to persevere cause I think 'oh I have been here before'.

Participants noted that verbalizing writing challenges and/or barriers to their buddy made those challenges tangible, allowing them to remember how they overcame the challenge in the past, while drawing upon this experience when moving forward with similar encounters. Drawing upon performance accomplishment, as in the preceding example, has been consistently linked to the development of self-efficacy – the self-belief that an individual has in his/her ability to complete a task (Bandura, 1977). Here, the participant made a cognitive appraisal of her ability to fulfil a writing task based on previous writing experiences. This is an important turn because, as Ayllon, Alsina and Colomer (2019) argue, an individual's perceived self-efficacy influences the level of performance on a task, the effort they contribute to a task and the level of perseverance they devote to a task.

Sharing goals gives you [the writer] a 'buzz' when you achieve.
According to Bandura (1977), an individual's self-efficacy can also be nurtured through verbal persuasion, and this was evident in this study, when one participant described the benefits of discussing writing progress with her buddy:

Sandra was able to function as a bit of a mirror – she reflected back to me what I was saying … especially at the beginning when it was quite negative, it helped me to recast that negativity into something more positive…. She was able to say 'so how can you do this? What practical things can you do?

Especially around time management. What practical things can you do to buy yourself more time to be able to write?'

Here, the writer is being led, through verbal suggestion, into believing they can cope successfully with what might have overwhelmed them in past writing experiences. Providing sincere, positive feedback that acknowledges an individual's problem can nurture autonomous motivation (Stone, Deci & Ryan, 2009). For example, asking open questions, like 'what practical things can you do?' can invite supportive dialogue between the writer and the buddy, where they can explore options from the writer's perspective. Opportunities like this, where writers are encouraged to share their perspectives, can nurture feelings of autonomy on decisions to move forward in their current situations (Stone, Deci and Ryan, 2009).

Participants acknowledged the role of the buddy in helping them to feel competent in predicting what was possible in a writing session. For example, one reflected on how they used to set writing goals prior to the writing meetings:

I think when I first started and came to the writing buddy thing, I was no good at judging. I was like 'yeah I'll have that written by that date', and actually, that's… impossible, even if I did it every day until then [laughs].

When asked what had changed, she replied:

I became… more realistic and there's an element of your buddy, not calling you out because that sounds bad, but they reflect back to you – 'come on, is that really realistic? And how are you going to do that? And when is the next time you're going to write?' That practical side of things is very important.

Research suggests that positive, non-controlling feedback, as in the example above, is effective in the development of competence and motivation to pursue one's goals (Garcia, Carcedo & Castano, 2019). When a writer receives this non-judgmental feedback from a buddy, they are more likely to set higher and accurate goals to match their perception of competence for the writing task:

I got… more realistic…. I could say realistically, hand on heart, that's three days' work, that's going to take me a day, that's going to take me an evening – I could work it out.

Relatedness

The writing meetings provided a space for relationships and emotional connections to develop between these pairs of writers. There was evidence of three of the seven behaviours: non-controlling feedback, avoiding controlling behaviours and preventing ego-involvement. However, there were also examples of the opposite: controlling behaviours when prompters gave advice, and ego-behaviours.

Somebody else cares about your writing and values your writing

The relationship between two writers was key and developed over the duration of the meetings. One participant felt the meeting was quite formal initially, because she had not previously worked with her buddy. However, the relationships developed from the first meeting:

I felt quite close to my buddy after the first meeting. It was someone I didn't know overly well…. But we discussed some stuff that was quite fundamental. And actually, when expressing those [fundamental feelings] aloud to somebody else, they are quite emotive, and you do feel quite supportive of each other.

For some, the meetings were both friendly and formal. The opportunity to share goals and success with someone else was 'great' and reduced the common feeling of isolation when writing: '[it] feels like your buddy is your cheerleader and is supporting you to achieve your goals'. This sharing was helpful, and participants felt they became part of a 'wider network where writing is important and valued'.

During writing meetings participants shared their motivations and barriers, and for one participant this was 'emotional and made them feel supportive of each other'. This emotional connection led another to 'feel frustrated for [my] buddy due to her time

constraints'. One participant felt uncomfortable because the conversation put them in emotional territory that they were not expecting:

> In some respects, it was a little bit uncomfortable. It wasn't the talking about myself that was uncomfortable, it was… doing the other role. You end up in some emotional territory and perhaps I wasn't quite expecting that.

For many, sharing their goals helped them to feel less isolated, and as the relationship evolved over the meetings the connection between them grew:

> One of the big things is feeling that somebody else cares about… and values your writing. I felt really frustrated for Helen about her times, every time the barrier was, 'I haven't got time to do it' … it felt really unfair.

My buddy was … a mirror and able to reflect back to me what I was saying

According to Mageau and Vallerand's (2003) model, those in a coaching role should provide non-controlling feedback, and this was evident in the data. Two participants commented that their buddy reflected their words back to them as a 'mirror' and a 'sounding board.' The types of feedback given were commented on, including direct feedback about a piece of writing and a conversation that involved 'sharing progress and discussing why they did/didn't achieve goals'.

Confusion between prompting and *giving feedback* suggests that participants were unaware or had forgotten that their role was to reflect the writer's comments and feelings, rather than suggest how they might overcome barriers: 'I felt like I was giving them more tips and advice'. This was an important component of Murray and Thow's framework and of Mageau and Vallerand's (2003) motivational model: the prompter should avoid controlling behaviour. Participants did not expect the prompter to be controlling or formal: 'questions from [your] buddy are caring and sensitive' and 'non-judgmental'; 'peer-supportive experience makes it feel like no one is checking but you are self-checking'. These comments suggest that participants perceived that control was held by the writer, which suggests internal motivation to achieve their goals.

The idea that neither writer was more prolific than the other was important for the writing meeting's success. Ego-involvement occurs when self-esteem is threatened,

when a person compares themselves to others or tries to prove themselves by attempting to achieve a goal they did not set for themselves (Mageau and Vallerand 2003). The intention was that the writing meetings would be mutualistically beneficial. This behaviour was not a theme in the data, but the idea of an equal relationship was present:

> We did feel a co-ownership of each other's success. You end up feeling as invested in that person's writing as you are in your own, you kind of want to be their champion.

Two participants compared themselves and their writing behaviours to their buddies', but in different ways. Christine thought her role was to give advice ('I was giving her tips, such as don't look at emails') and felt pleased that her buddy had taken on board her advice, because this meant she was having an impact. Christine then explained that she felt she was not receiving the same level of support and advice from her buddy, and for Christine this was a negative aspect of the whole process:

> I suppose I felt like I wasn't sure what I got out of the meetings from somebody who perhaps wrote more than me on this, [who could] try to help me with the next stage.

Samantha talked about how she felt inadequate compared to her buddy:

> I was never 100% sure whether my buddy was happy to be buddies with me or not. I do wonder whether they thought 'I wish I had a more together buddy than you'.

These examples show different aspects of ego-behaviour that can be detrimental to an autonomy-supporting relationship. Both believe that they are not equal in some way to their writing buddy. The issue for us in thinking about using the framework with other groups, is the apparent misunderstanding of each role in the meetings and the ideal nature of the relationship, which is to be mutualistically beneficial.

Murray and Thow (2014) intended that writing targets and goals should be set by the writer not the prompter, with no agreement or approval of targets required from the prompter. Several participants in our study said they came to the meetings knowing

what their goals were going to be, but that by saying them out loud to someone else they felt more accountable, and this helped them to be realistic:

> You…recognise that when you… write down… your goals, you realise when there's too many, because sometimes you're trying to do three or four things at once. And actually, you just need to focus on the most important one.

This was observed when one participant commented that the targets set were achievable for him. No participant said their buddy set targets for them; they chose their own targets.

In summary, there is evidence that these participants were connected, and most pairs were beginning to relate to one another as writers and peers. Most were developing a mutualistically beneficial relationship through sharing goals and successes. They were beginning to recognise that talking about their goals with a peer was important, and when they achieved goals the buddy's role was to support, not to give controlling feedback (Mageau and Vallerand, 2003). For some, there was also an emotional connection as they talked about barriers to their writing; however, not everyone felt comfortable with the emotional aspect of the relationship. There was evidence of ego-behaviour through giving advice or feeling inadequate, both of which could limit the sustainability of these behaviour changes.

Autonomy

Autonomy relates to feeling in control and being able to make a choice (Deci and Ryan, 2008). Mageau and Vallerand (2003) argue that to support autonomy, those who take on a coaching role should provide a rationale and 'limits and rules' for tasks. We looked for participants rationalising and making choices in two areas: when they decided to engage with the writing meeting process and during their writing meetings.

Reasons given for taking part had two facets: (1) trust in the researcher and, (2) the need to write. Five participants had previously attended writing retreats facilitated by the

interviewer, and some mentioned how this existing relationship and prior experience gave them a reason to come to the lunchtime meeting to hear about the writing meeting:

> You [the interviewer] had introduced writing retreats to me. I'd found them useful so, when you… started talking enthusiastically about this idea of writing [meetings], I went along thinking, that sounds good.

For another participant, the rationale included their need to write: 'I was just curious, ... having been to a writing retreat, and being aware… that I need to do some writing, I thought it would be sensible'.

With regard to justifying their need to write and to change their writing behaviour, participants talked about features of the writing meeting process: identifying the benefits of writing and drawbacks of not writing. The template used in the meetings gave the writers space to record their rationale for writing. Participants commented on the benefit of this, and how it helped them beyond the writing meeting:

> It's that bigger picture thinking, particularly when you're writing something that's long term or something's really tricky… it is helpful to go back to, there's a bigger overall reason for me doing this.

One drawback of not writing that Julie defined at the start, was that she would not meet appraisal targets but as the writing meetings progressed, her rationale became more personal: the consequence of not writing was 'missing an opportunity for an output [which] caused a personal frustration'. For others the rationale for writing did not change because of the writing meetings, but was re-instated during them, which helped them change and maintain their writing habits: 'It made me remember that I was talking about being an advocate of the subject, and that I needed to write stuff in order to do that'.

The writing meeting process gave participants different opportunities to make choices: they could choose to take part in the process or not, when to write, and how to change their writing behaviour. At the start, some found it frustrating that they had made the choice to use the writing meetings to support them but could not find time to meet:

> It was… difficult to get similar days that we were available. So first of all, you're all excited, only to go 'Not that week, not that week, not that week'. So that was… frustrating.

Once participants started the process, they found that they were making choices about changing their behaviours. One participant felt able to make choices to minimise other aspects of her academic life so that she could write:

> Sometimes teaching can fill every hour of the day. But if you are… more ruthless, and go … these writing hours are not going to be my home, … weekends and evenings, they are going to be within my working week. If you are brave enough to go, right, I've got this amount of time to plan that because I've got an hour there for writing … you start to be … more … ruthless … because you've got something else that you also value as much.

There was also the choice to feel more confident about being able to write and overcoming internal barriers to writing:

> I think it's given me a strategy – it's no good… saying 'I've not got the time. I don't have the knowledge. I don't know how to do that'. It's made me say, 'okay, what you going do about it? What's your first step on that ladder? When are you going to achieve it by?'

However, some felt that although they set targets and allocated time to write, they could not fulfil their goal: 'I'm aware that it's better if I commit to small chunks, [of] writing regularly. But … don't always do that.… I put it in my diary, but … I'll still not do it'. Even with the choice to write, not all participants did so.

Conclusions

This study showed that three psychological needs – competence, relatedness and autonomy – can be met by using an adapted form of Murray and Thow's (2014) writing meeting framework. Participants exhibited some of the seven behaviours proposed by Mageau and Vallerand (2003), in varying degrees, and there was evidence of a shift

from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation.

Murray and Thow drew on the TTM when designing their framework, and self-efficacy is a component of TTM, but self-efficacy theory focuses on specific situations and tasks, whereas this study investigated the impact of writing meetings beyond a specific writing project. Therefore, we chose to use SDT to assess whether the writing meeting framework could support sustained behaviour change. This is an original approach to the study of academic writing.

There was evidence of mutualistic relationships when, for example, a participant talked about their peer being a mirror. Mirroring could help with the process of internalisation and the development of autonomy. Participants' use of the term 'writing buddy' signals a more mutualistic role, suggesting less distinction between the role of 'prompter' and 'writer.' However, some participants expected their buddy to provide them with solutions, and when this happens, the writing process can become externalised (e.g. relying on direction from their buddy). This expectation could also thwart a participant's need for autonomy in their writing – an important function for sustaining writing beyond the writing meeting. This could have occurred when a participant's self-efficacy was low, prompting them to search for advice or guidance. Disparity surrounding the purpose of the writing meetings and relationships could also thwart the psychological needs of participants. When introducing the framework in future we suggest that the nature and purpose of the relationship between the two writers be explained and time given to discuss this before writers are paired. It may be useful to highlight to future participants that one purpose of the writing meeting is to develop their own self-efficacy.

This study has shown that mutualistic relationships occur, but future research could investigate how these relationships develop. In writing meetings, participants take the role of 'interviewer' (prompter) and 'interviewee' (writer). Maintaining these roles can be challenging, particularly as they interchange during each meeting. Future research could explore how to maintain these roles, which are important for sustaining writing.

Finally, the title of this paper, 'So maybe I'm not such an imposter' – a quote from one of the participants – suggests that the writing meeting framework can, in certain

conditions, help former practitioners to maintain change in their writing behaviour so as to be able to perform an aspect of academic work that can be a particularly challenging part of practitioner-academic transition.

Acknowledgement

References

Aitchison, C., & Guerin, C. (Eds.) (2014). *Writing groups for doctoral education and beyond: Innovations in practice and theory*. London: Routledge.

Ayllon, S., Alsina, A., & Colomer, J. (2019). Teachers' involvement and students' self-efficacy: Keys to achievement in higher education. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(5). doi: 10.137/journal.pone.0216865.

Balaguer, I., Gonzalez, L., Fabra, P., Castillo, I., Mercé, J., & Duda, J.L. (2012). Coaches' interpersonal style, basic psychological needs and the well-being of young soccer players: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *30*(15), 1619-1629.

Bandura, A. (2010). Self-Efficacy. In I.B. Weiner & W.E. Craighead (Eds.) *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Doi: 10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0836.

Belcher, W.L. (2019). *Writing your article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic success*, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boice, R. (1987). A program for facilitating scholarly writing. *Higher Education Research and Development, 6*(1), 9-20.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using thematic analysis in sport and exercise research. In B. Smith & A. Sparkes (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 191-205). London: Routledge.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, *49*(3), 182-185.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour.* New York: Plenum Press.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fortune, F., Ennals, P., Bhopti, A., Neilson, C., Darzins, S., & Bruce, C. (2016). Bridging identity 'chasms': Occupational therapy academics' reflections on the journey towards scholarship. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *21*(3), 313-325. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2016.1141289.

Garcia, J.A., Carcedo, R.J., & Castano, J.L. (2019). The influence of feedback on competence, motivation, vitality and performance in a throwing task. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *90*(2), 172-179.

Grant, B. (2006). Writing in the company of women: Exceeding the boundaries. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(4), 483-495.

Griffiths, V., Thompson, S., & Hryniewicz, E. (2010). Developing a research profile: Mentoring and support for teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, *36*(1-2), 245-262. doi: 10.1080/19415250903457166.

Hartley, J. (2008). *Academic writing and publishing: A practical handbook*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Huff, A.S. (1999). *Writing for scholarly publication*. London: Sage.

Izadinia, M. (2014). Teacher educators' identity: A review of literature. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(4), 426-441. doi: 10.1080/02619768.2014.947025.

Mageau, G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Science*, *21*, 883-904.

Maguire, M. (2000). Inside/outside the ivory tower: Teacher education in the English academy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(2), 149-165. doi: 10.1080/135625100114812.

Martinek, D. (2019). The consequences of job-related pressure for self-determined teaching. *Social Psychology of Education*, *22*(1), 133-148.

Moore, S. (2003). Writers' retreats for academics: Exploring and increasing the motivation to write. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *27*(3), 333-342.

Murray, R. (2015). *Writing in social spaces: A social processes approach to academic writing*. London: Routledge-Society for Research into Higher Education.

Murray, R., & Newton, M. (2009). Writing retreat as structured intervention: Margin or mainstream? *Higher Education Research and Development*, *28*(5), 541-53.

Murray, R., & Thow, M. (2014). Peer-formativity: A framework for academic writing. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *33*(6), 1166-1179.

Pelletier, L.G., & Sharp, E.C. (2009). Administrative pressures and teachers' interpersonal behaviour in the classroom. *Theory and Research in Education*, *7*(2), 174-183.

Pelletier, L.G., Séguin-Lévesque, C. & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(1), 186-196.

Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51*(3), 390-395.

Roberts, A., & Weston, K. (2014). Releasing the hidden academic? Learning from teacher-educators' responses to a writing support programme. *Professional Development in Education*, 40(5), 698-716. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2013.835277.

Sharp, J.G., Hemmings, B., Kay, R., & Callinan, C. (2015). When worlds collide: Identity, culture and the lived experiences of research when 'teaching-led'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *39*(5), 612-644. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2013.858679.

Silvia, P.J. (2007). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Stone, D.N., Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2009). Beyond talk: Creating autonomous motivation through self-determination theory. *Journal of General Management*, 34(3), 75-91.

Thomson, P. & Kamler, B. (2013). *Writing for peer reviewed journals: Strategies for getting published*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Vallerand, R.J. (2004). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in sport. *Encyclopaedia of Applied Psychology*, *2*(1), 427-43.

White, E., Roberts, A., Rees, M. & Read, M. (2014). An exploration of the development of academic identity in a School of Education. *Professional Development in Education*, *40*(1), 56-70. Doi: 10.1080/19415257.2013.775661.

White, S. (2019). Teacher educators for new times? Redefining an important occupational group. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *45*(2), 200-213. Doi: 10.1080/02607476.2018.1548174.

Appendix: Interview questions

(1) Thinking back to when I introduced the writing meeting idea, what were you expecting when you came to the meeting?

(2) How did you arrange your first meeting with your buddy?

(3) Thinking about the first meeting, can you tell me what that was like and how you felt at the end of it?

(4) What were the high and low points of the meetings you had?

(5) I'm curious about the process of the meetings? How did these work for you?

(6) How important was it that you had set your goals with a buddy? Can you tell me a bit more about this?

(7) Did you make any changes/adaptations to the process given to you in the first meeting?

(8) Have your perceptions of the benefits and drawbacks of writing changed because of the meetings?

(9) Have the WMs affected your approach to your writing? (relates to step 3 – anticipating barriers to writing).

(10) Who have you talked to about the WM? Did they make any comment? Why did you talk to them about it?

(11) Thinking about what you wrote – what writing projects were linked to your WM goals? How 'well' did you progress on them?

(12) Have the WMs helped you feel more confident about achieving your writing goals? If so, in what way?

(13) Have your perceptions of yourself as a writer changed? If so, do you think it was the WM that led to this change?