

Chalmers University, Sweden

Keith Comer

University of Queensland, Australia

Jennifer Clement

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Erik Brogt and Camilla Obel

Postgraduate writing for publication workshops: preparation for the past or for the future?

Abstract:

This article demonstrates the potential for postgraduate writing for publication workshops to foster increased research outputs alongside improved writing abilities. The authors explore some consequences of a national research evaluation framework of universities in New Zealand, and discuss how postgraduate student feedback led to the piloting of publication workshops. The approaches and successes of these workshops are explored. In arguing for support for such workshops with respect to their demonstrated benefits for participants in New Zealand and elsewhere, the authors also note the need to focus greater attention on the future employment of postgraduates.

Biographical notes:

Keith Comer is a senior lecturer in academic writing at Chalmers University in Gothenburg, Sweden (moving to a new position at Victoria University of Wellington in late 2013). Jennifer Clement is a lecturer in English at the University of Queensland in Brisbane, Australia. Both Erik Brogt, a lecturer with the Academic Development Group, and Camilla Obel, a senior lecturer in Sociology, are at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand.

Keywords:

Writing – Postgraduate writing – Writing workshops – Writing for publication

Introduction

Universities in New Zealand and elsewhere are recognizing that developing the writing skills of their postgraduates is increasingly vital. Written and oral communication skills have received attention in a range of engagement and destinations surveys, 'generic' skills seminars, workshops, non-credit programmes, and even credit-bearing postgraduate courses at some institutions. Much of this effort has been concentrated on thesis and dissertation writing, particularly with respect to fostering timely completions within limited enrolment periods.¹ Yet effectively preparing postgraduates to write for publication has received less attention, although this area may be even more crucial for both their professional careers and their universities' academic standing.

Context

New Zealand's post-2000 adoption of a nationally competitive approach to higher education research funding has, as elsewhere, involved a metrics based evaluation of research outputs and postgraduate completions. The Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) model evaluates NZ universities via three measures: 60 percent is based on assessments of the research quality of university staff, 25 percent on postgraduate research completions, and 15 percent on the basis of external research funding each university has attracted. Disciplines wherein academics and the postgraduates they supervise are involved in joint research projects, such as engineering and the physical and natural sciences, are likely to employ co-authorship of articles submitted to academic journals and typically produce more 'outputs' along with shorter average degree completion periods (Smart 2007; Sampson & Comer 2010). Conversely, disciplines in which academics and the postgraduates they supervise are typically involved in autonomous research, for example the humanities and some social sciences, often see fewer outputs and longer degree completion periods. As elsewhere, postgraduate students in New Zealand perceive heightened pressures on academic publication and outputs (Crane 77). Two central questions develop from these contexts: first, how should support for increased levels of academic publication by postgraduates be provided, and second, what are the consequences of greater emphasis on such publication.

Increasing postgraduate outputs in academic publications

Various approaches to fostering increased academic publication outputs have involved the use of writing workshops, writing groups, and professional mentoring. Dankoski et al. have noted that while research studies in this area have generally involved relatively small numbers of academic staff, all of these approaches have typically improved publication rates for participants 'at least two-fold' (2012: 47). Contemporary writing workshops have typically developed from the model begun at the University of Iowa in the 1930s, which was patterned after John Dewey's reinterpretation of the manual arts training movement and designed to foster communities wherein all participants engage in similar projects (Gere 1987; Myers

2006). Following these antecedents, the term ‘workshop’ is associated here with a multiple-session gathering of writers engaged in a common (though not necessarily identical) activity. Such workshops are participant-centred rather than content driven, in that the writing goals of those involved are vital to the design of and implementation of the curricula and the interactions of the participants. The use of writing groups as part of publication workshops has been well established with respect to both academic staff (Lee & Boud 2003; Silvia 2007; Kapp, Albertyn & Frick 2011) and postgraduates (Cuthbert & Spark 2008; Aitchison 2009; Belcher 2009; Cuthbert, Spark & Burke 2009; Nolon & Rocco 2009).

Although the frequency of meetings and overall duration of publication workshops or retreats may be relevant with some groups, it appears that the productive formation of and actions carried out by workshop participants are generally flexible. For example, high-intensity workshops of three days (Burgoine, Hopkins, Rech & Zapata, 2011) or retreats of three or five days (Jackson 2009; Grant & Knowles 2000; Grant 2006) targeting the composition of a single article for participants have been demonstrated to be productive, as have 12 meetings over as many weeks (Belcher 2009), nine meetings across nine months (Cuthbert & Spark 2008), and so forth. Similarly, group sizes for publication workshops vary, though most tend to involve between 10 and 20 participants. Yet while there appears to be no fixed upward boundary, we are unlikely to see MOOC-scale publication workshops in the near future, given the need for active instructor support of participants engaged in emotionally high-stakes activities (Palmer & Major 2008; Murray & Newton 2008; Nolan & Rocco 2009). While there appears to be value in the use of workshops organized under general disciplinary fields of study (Reisman, Hansen & Rastegar 2006; Cuthbert & Spark, 2008; Belcher, 2009), such workshops have proven to be effective with multi-disciplinary groups of participants as well (Grant 2006; Cuthbert, Spark & Burke 2009; Catterall, Ross, Aitchison & Burgin 2011).

Implementing postgraduate writing for publication workshops at a New Zealand university

The results of repeated university-wide postgraduate experience questionnaires indicated various gaps with regard to support for postgraduate writing and publication (Sampson & Comer, 2008; Sampson & Comer 2009; Sampson, Comer & Brogt 2011). Many postgraduates in the humanities and social sciences indicated that supervisor or departmental support for external publication of their research was sparse. Postgraduates in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines reported higher levels of supervisor engagement with their scholarship and frequent co-authoring of research manuscripts. Yet they also indicated that publication expectations and timetables were demanding, noting their degree pathways would benefit from additional writing support. After reviewing this institutional research and the related scholarship in academic development, the authors decided to pilot trial workshops to support postgraduate writing for academic publication. These workshops were intentionally pragmatic in design and focus. An initial workshop developed with assistance from a College of Arts teaching and

learning grant was targeted towards postgraduates in the humanities and social sciences.

Originally, this was also designed to align with the general structure and schedule of community outreach courses for the general public. A number of these were organised as writing workshops (for example, with respect to personal essays, nonfiction by NZ migrants, life stories and the like). Although such courses would not provide postgraduate academic credit for participants, neither were they subject to the higher costs of enrolling in university courses. With respect to the continuation of these workshops, this was an important factor, especially since doctoral programmes of study in New Zealand typically do not allow enrolment in or cover the costs involved with for credit courses. Our approach could have allowed for the article writing workshop to be sustained after its initial trial through the lower tuition costs required for community outreach classes. In order to offer participants recognized disciplinary expertise, three teachers were involved in this initial workshop. One was an academic developer with extensive experience in English and writing programmes, another was an academic from the humanities, and the third was an academic from the social sciences.

In teaching this first workshop, we believed that a curriculum involving weekly meetings over a semester-length period would best serve local postgraduate students in the targeted disciplines. This approach was not based on standard teaching periods. Rather, it was an attempt to balance anticipated workload requirements for participants with ongoing postgraduate student activities, both for masters students (who might be enrolled in for credit courses) and doctoral candidates (who would be expected to continue making progress on their dissertations). Having reviewed a range of options offered elsewhere that varied from short, intense seminars or retreats to semester length formal courses, we decided to employ a modified version of Belcher's 12-week approach (2009a, 2009b).² Moving step-by-step from 'Week 1 – Designing Your Plan for Writing', to 'Week 2 – Starting Your Article' and 'Week 3 – Advancing Your Argument', and so forth, the model advocated in Belcher's text (which is also partly a workbook) is, as she notes in reflecting on ten years of her teaching it, 'rigorously pragmatic' (2009a).

By adopting Belcher's framework for our first workshop, which was expressively designed to support humanities and social science postgraduates, our curricular changes were minimal. In reordering the weekly sequence to meet the anticipated needs of our participants more effectively, we emphasized identifying target publications and focusing research for those intended audiences earlier in the workshop (moving Belcher's themes for these areas from weeks four and five to weeks two and three, respectively). As readers and quasi-reviewers, we recognised the disparity between the manuscripts that participants brought to the workshop early in the process. While one manuscript would actually be sent out for review before the end of the sessions (and subsequently accepted for publication), others required revisions extending beyond the 12-week workshop. Consequently, we gave more attention to Belcher's 'Week X – Responding to Journal Decisions' in later weeks and made her 'Week 12 – Sending Your Article!' a section that most participants would have to work with some weeks after the formal end of the workshop. We also used

grant funds to purchase copies of Belcher's *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks* for all participants, and working with this text helped reassure them that the process was sound and had been effective elsewhere.³ In addition, we made a range of supplemental readings available online. While some of these were academic journal articles concerning aspects of writing for publication, a number of them were decidedly more informal and intended to provide a more conversational approach to various points of interest. These included two series of articles from *Inside Higher Ed*, Rockquemore's 'Support for Summer Writers' (2010) and Hoelscher & Werder's 'Faculty Writing Group'. (A complete listing of the texts and links made available to participants is presented in note 6, below.)

As research in the field demonstrates, expectations for postgraduate students' writing abilities are frequently at odds with their own perspectives, their understanding of academic publication, and their supervisors' perceptions of students' skills and approaches to publication (Caffarella & Barnett 2000; Nolan & Rocco 2009; Storch & Tapper 2009; Burgoine, Hopkins, Rech & Zapata 2011; Micciche 2011; Ondrusek 2012). Supervisors, particularly those in the STEM disciplines, often see postgraduates as manning the 'research engine room' (Sampson & Comer 2010), and their expectations for ongoing publications require a marked shift in the work and writing processes of their students. Traditionally, social science and humanities postgraduates may have had less publication pressure, but changes in that regard are underway, both in terms of follow-on employer expectations and dissertation alternatives that can include academic articles or other publications. Further, all postgraduate pathways require a shift from focusing on 'internal' audiences for their work – tutors, lecturers, and supervisors – to targeting external readers, such as thesis examiners, dissertation opponents, academic journal reviewers, and so forth. Yet with increasing research demands on academics and limited degree completion timeframes for their students, many current postgraduates are expected to publish more than their predecessors but have fewer opportunities to 'work into' this process. Therefore, one of our goals was to employ a step-by-step approach specifically intended to ameliorate and demystify the process of academic publication (Cuthbert & Spark 2008; Cameron, Nairn & Higgins 2009; Nolan & Rocco 2009). This concern became even more important to address as a consequence of natural events preceding our first workshop.

Originally scheduled for September to November 2010, the initial workshop was postponed three times because of major earthquakes, and was finally offered nearly a year later than first planned.⁴ One consequence of these earthquakes was the suspension and subsequent closure of the university's entire community outreach programme. Although funding for the first workshop had been awarded by the College of Arts separately, and the second workshop would be offered as a centrally funded pilot for the College of Science, the elimination of the option for funding via community outreach enrolment would contribute to making the sustainability of these workshops problematic. This reflects the often tenuous position occupied by such workshops in the academy, whether offered for academic staff or for postgraduates (Catterall, Ross, Aitchison & Burgin 2011).

Recruitment for the initial College of Arts workshop, designed for participants from the humanities and social sciences, faced both internal and external challenges. Earthquake-related issues included residential housing challenges for many postgraduates and their supervisors, along with their difficulties in accessing research materials from damaged libraries and interruptions of action research for ongoing thesis and dissertation projects. Additionally, a non-credit workshop requiring an ongoing commitment was viewed with some hesitation. More importantly, we failed to anticipate the degree to which some supervisors would object to this workshop, viewing any academic engagement outside of thesis and dissertation writing as a distraction that could adversely affect timely degree completions by their students. Despite college and departmental support, such concerns resulted in the withdrawals of three postgraduates from the workshop the week it was to begin. For any subsequent workshops, we decided that prospective participants would be required to obtain their supervisors' consent prior to applying for a place.

By the time the humanities and social sciences workshop began, participants were keen for some sense of normalcy. The peer learning environment at the heart of the workshop experience provided both an academic space and sharing environment that promoted collegiality and supported the development of writing skills (Topping, Smith, Swanson & Elliott 2000; Fergie, Beek, McKenna & Creme 2011; Kapp, Albertyn & Frick 2011). With such workshops, setting matters. In terms of meeting spaces, workshops should be offered in rooms with the potential for tables to be moved and lecterns to be avoided. Despite the pressure on teaching and meeting spaces following extensive earthquake damages to university buildings, we were fortunate in that both colleges involved provided space for the workshops in their central college conference rooms. Normally the gathering places for deans, department heads, and committees, this provided participants with a clear indication of the potential these workshops were seen to offer by college management. For this first workshop, we also used some of our grant funding to provide for light refreshments (coffee, tea, biscuits, cookies and fruit), which served to enhance the atmosphere for all participants.

In August 2011, 13 postgraduate students began the humanities and social sciences workshop (medical issues would occasion one further withdrawal). Their fields of study included anthropology, English, geography, history, media and communications, philosophy and sociology. Participants worked with a range of texts they wanted to revise for publication, including article drafts, conference papers, completed masters theses, and draft or completed dissertation chapters. The modified version of Belcher's approach was well received, and workshop participants undertook their roles as peer reviewers with dedication and interest.

One particularly useful addition to that curriculum involved the participation of external experts towards the conclusion of the workshop. While all of us teaching had prior experience as academic journal reviewers and/or editors, we believed it would be beneficial for participants to meet with 'outside' reviewers and editors. For this first workshop we used nearly half of our grant to fund the travel of two academics from other New Zealand universities: one an editor and the other a reviewer from separate and highly ranked academic journals. This approach reinforced a number of

points that participants had first encountered in Belcher's text or supplementary readings, and which we had subsequently discussed in workshop sessions. These 'external' visitors provided overviews of their roles and the processes involved in publication with their journals, discussed reviewers' comments and revision processes involved in resubmitting manuscripts, and offered an extensive question-and-answer period for workshop participants. At one point, our visiting editor discussed the possibility of increasing the rejection rate in order to advance on one of the 'quality' metrics by which the journal was ranked. This enabled workshop participants to explore some of the complexities involved in journal standings in combination with acceptance and rejection rates. Just as guest speakers in case-study contexts often serve to illuminate principles and practices being learned, these visitors made some of the external audiences involved in academic publication visible and present.

Teaching evaluations of the humanities and social sciences workshop were highly positive, but more important than Likert scale scores and means were the written comments regarding participants' experiences and self-reflections. Feedback from participants repeatedly noted the value of peer review, the ability to engage with feedback from reviewers more productively, improvements in self-confidence with respect to writing, clearer understanding of the processes involved in submitting and revising manuscripts for academic journals, and greater interest in submitting articles for academic publication. These reflect similar benefits noted with publication workshops for academic staff (Kapp, Albertyn & Frick 2011; Dankoski et al. 2012) and postgraduates (Cuthbert & Spark 2008; Fergie, Beek, McKenna & Creme 2011).

With respect to the pragmatic aims of the humanities and social sciences workshop, the status of some manuscripts submitted for publication remains to be finalized. However, of the 12 masters or doctoral students who participated in at least three-quarters of the sessions for this workshop in 2011, by March 2013, 7 had directly related articles already published or accepted for publication later that year. Two other participants have had manuscripts rejected from their original target journals, although one of those used the text revised in the workshop as the basis for a successful conference proposal and presentation. At least one other participant's manuscript has been revised following reviewers' comments and awaits the results of resubmission.⁵

The College of Science requested a similar workshop, albeit aimed solely at doctoral students, rather than the masters-doctoral mix in the College of Arts. The workshop for Science mirrored the workshop for Arts, though it became necessary to supplement Belcher's text, which deals primarily with the structure, format and writing style of manuscripts in the humanities and social sciences, with a text more suitable for science writing. As with literature review and dissertation writing, the number of book-length texts in support of science writing for publication is growing (see endnote 3 for alternatives). We opted for Sterken's (2011) *Scientific Writing for Young Astronomers: A collection of papers on scientific writing* (part 1 and part 2). These two edited collections are based on the proceedings of three-day workshops held in 2008 and 2009 under the aegis of *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (the leading European journal in astronomy), and provide a thorough and comprehensive introduction to manuscript writing, the editorial process and professional ethics in

science publication. Available via our library's research database access, these formed the principal texts for the more science-specific aspects of the workshop, though the overall structure for sessions followed Belcher's book. Since disciplinary and journal practices can vary considerably, we recommended that those undertaking similar workshops employ readings that help foster connections between participants, their research fields, and their workshop materials.

In early 2012, 15 PhD students in the sciences began a second publication workshop. In contrast to the participants in the previous workshop, nearly all of these postgraduates were engaged in research groups rather than solitary projects, including four who were being supervised by the same academic. Besides their different fields of study – astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, geophysics, and psychology – they were a highly diverse and international group, having come to New Zealand to study from ten nations spread across the world. Consequently, occasionally ESL issues required more attention in this workshop. These included working with participants on the nature of critical engagement and argument in academic discourse (Wang & Li 2008, 2011), and, as discussed by Woodward-Kron (2007), additional support for individual tutorials through the university's academic skills centre.

As practiced with the initial workshop, science postgraduates also had a session with academics serving as editors and reviewers from various scholarly journals. Although all of these contributors came from the participants' own university, comments and feedback on this meeting echoed that from the previous version with 'external' academics. If local 'outside' editors and reviewers are available from a neighbouring university or institution, there may be some additional advantages from their visits. However, academics serving as editors and reviewers from the same university provide similar benefits when visiting these workshops, partly owing to a heightened receptiveness towards 'guest experts'. Following both workshops, participants requested that this session be placed earlier in the curriculum. The recognition of audience and reviewers' expectations is crucial in targeting and focusing manuscripts for publication. Consequently, we agree that offering these sessions with 'external' editors and reviewers earlier in publication workshops could help advance the awareness of postgraduate writers in this regard.

Although none of the postgraduates in the humanities and social sciences workshop was then engaged in co-authorship with their supervisors or research groups, all but two of the science workshop participants were working with manuscripts intended for co-authored publication. This occasioned some energetic conversations on the nature of co-authorship and the order of authors and assignment of credit in publications. Nearly half of the science participants had been part of at least one co-authored article prior to beginning the workshop, and their work with or observations of responses to reviewers' comments in revising manuscripts helped their peers contextualize the process.

In the first ten months since the conclusion of the workshop for 15 postgraduates in the sciences, 6 participants have had articles published or accepted for publication. As the majority of the other manuscripts involve co-authorship with a range of academics

in the sciences (whose research teams have highly successful publication records), this number will likely increase in the coming months.

Our experiences with these two workshops demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach with postgraduates across a wide range of disciplines. In addition to extremely positive feedback from participants, subsequent remarks by their supervisors supports the processes employed. For example, the supervisor with four participants in the sciences workshop noted in a letter to the dean and the university's deputy vice-chancellors for academics and research that he now spent far less time on editing or structural considerations with these postgraduates. In addition to improved writing abilities, the postgraduates involved were now more confident, self-reliant, and supportive of each other's work and that of new members of their research group. As the body of research on writing publication workshops demonstrates, these are not merely anecdotal comments. Yet the success of these endeavours and initiatives needs to be weighed not only against the costs of providing such support, but longer-term goals and developments within the academy and beyond.

Consequences, risks and opportunities with postgraduate writing for publication workshops

Two central questions develop from these contexts: first, how should support for increased levels of academic publication by postgraduates be provided, and second, what are the consequences of greater emphasis on such publication.

As with many academic development initiatives, sustainability is problematic. At the New Zealand university involved in this study, local policies and the departures for other universities by two of four academics who taught these publication workshops have resulted in their discontinuation. When organized as voluntary and non-credit bearing, these workshops cannot be sustained by ordinary tuition and fees that could support their continued teaching and ongoing curricular development. Yet neither can they be readily transformed into standard offerings under existing governmental policy, since current postgraduate funding in New Zealand effectively serves to prevent any required, 'for credit' courses for doctoral candidates. So these and similar writing for publication workshops elsewhere must be supported centrally, and therefore they remain at risk from the inconstant nature of funding priorities. If the combination of time-constrained degree pathways and expectations for increased research productivity are to be met, the time and development processes necessary to support postgraduate writing for publication must be addressed by university administrations. The 'centre-led, disciplinary-focused' approach discussed here is one option for meeting such needs.

The future directions of these and related initiatives, to include workshops focused on non-academic publication, need consideration and research. Kalmer (2008) notes the success of related postgraduate interventions, and argues that they should be linked with a rethinking of doctoral programmes rather than propping up existing approaches. New PhDs increasingly leave the higher education sector, with well over half now seeking employment outside the academy (Auriol 2010; Hunt, Jagger, Metcalfe & Pollard 2010; Lee, Miozzo & Laredo 2010; Neumann & Tan 2011).

Further, as fields of study see increasing specialisation, the approach explored here – the collaboration of academic developers with disciplinary experts – may be well suited to fostering alternatives to scholarly publication that would benefit postgraduates destined for non-academic employment. While some of these PhDs will work for commercial and governmental research organizations, many have no need to publish in academic journals. Consequently, although various existing forms of structured publication workshops can function to enhance university research production metrics beyond degree completions, they may not be helping to prepare their participants for future writing or research publishing in their endeavours outside the academy. Skills in identifying target publications, meeting audience needs and expectations, developing and presenting evidence, and so forth are clearly valuable in a range of writing contexts. However, publishing outside the academy is rather different than publishing in scholarly journals.

As a pragmatic endeavour that supports postgraduates writing for academic publication, this and related approaches function well. Yet such workshops can only constitute limited aspects of postgraduates' writing skills development. Further, as Devenish (2009) has observed, the long-term benefits of effective support for peer learning at the postgraduate level are too easily missed in measurements of research productivity. Although workshops oriented towards non-academic venues may not contribute to current knowledge production metrics and parallel university ranking schemes, they should be considered in the context of effectively preparing postgraduates for their likely professional employment.

Cuthburt & Spark (2008) note Guillory's (1996) warning concerning the possibility that emphasizing publications can 'deform' the postgraduate experience in service of pre-professionalism within some disciplines. Yet reductions in time to completion at both masters and PhD levels, alternatives for professional doctorates, options for PhD by publication, and research quality metrics based partly on the numbers of academic publication outputs have already substantially changed postgraduate pathways and experiences in many universities. A more significant current risk does not concern the issue of whether postgraduate publication workshops overly emphasize pre-professionalism. Instead, the question to explore is whether their typical intended outcome of academic journal publication is appropriate, given the increasing likelihood of employment outside the academy for postgraduates. As has Micciche (2011), we recommend that universities pursue postgraduate courses that support and sustain a range of writing projects. Rethinking the outcomes of writing for publication workshops is necessary to ensure their attention to the future needs of our postgraduates.

Endnotes

1. A few of the increasing number of book-length guides on writing dissertations include Rountree and Laing's (1996) *Writing by degrees: A practical guide to writing theses and research papers*; Foss & Waters' (2007) *Destination dissertation: A traveler's guide to a done dissertation*; Rudestam and Newton's (2007) *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*; Miller's (2008) *Finish your dissertation once and for all!*; and

Roberts' (2010) *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*.

2. Similar courses or workshops are provided at a range of universities around the world. Just a few of those we reviewed included the writing for academic publication workshop and the PhD writing retreat at the University of Auckland, New Zealand; the three courses in writing for graduate students at University of British Columbia, Canada; the course in academic writing for PhD students at Chalmers University, Sweden; and the academic journal writing workshop for PhD students conducted by the European Sociological Association.
3. Besides the texts used for our courses – Belcher's *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks* and Sterken's *Scientific Writing for Young Astronomers* – there are increasing numbers of book-length works devoted to academic publication, both with respect to the general area (Johnson & Mullen, 2007; Silvia, 2007; Murray, 2009; and Thomson & Kamler, 2013), or with a focus on scientific publication (Bazerman, 1988; Peat, Elliott, Baur & Keena, 2002; Blum, Knudson & Henig, 2006; Körner, 2008; Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Gustavii, 2009; and Blackwell & Martin, 2011).
4. On 4 September, 2010, the first of these – a magnitude 7.1 earthquake 40 km west of Christchurch, New Zealand – caused significant property damage and disrupted teaching schedules at all educational institutions throughout the region. The second, a magnitude 6.3 earthquake only 10 km south of the city centre on 22 February, 2011, killed 185 people and caused widespread damage to city and university structures. The third, another 6.3 earthquake on June 13, 2011, caused one additional death and further injuries along with further damages to city and university infrastructures. On each of these occasions university teaching schedules were suspended, though for varying periods.
5. That same participant has remarked in email correspondence that the final workshop manuscript also formed the basis for a successful PhD application to a highly selective program. Our participant noted that this prestigious research university offers a full-semester and for-credit course designed to foster postgraduate success in academic publishing.
6. Supporting books and supplementary articles and texts made available to workshop participants: the following resources were posted or linked within the university's learning management system (LMS) and provided via library research databases or other Internet links.

Book-length resources for participants from the humanities and social sciences:

Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009b *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*, Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gray, Paul & David E Drew 2012 *What they didn't teach you in graduate school: 299 helpful hints for success in you academic career* (2nd ed.), Sterling, Virginia, USA: Stylus Publishing

Book-length resources for participants from the physical and natural sciences:

Sterken, Christiaan 2011 *Scientific writing for young astronomers: A collection of papers on scientific writing (part 1 and part 2)*, Cambridge, UK: European Astronomical Society/EDP Sciences

Gray, Paul & David E Drew 2012 *What they didn't teach you in graduate school: 299 helpful hints for success in you academic career* (2nd ed.), Sterling, Virginia, USA: Stylus Publishing

Articles and links made available to participants from both workshops:

Belcher, Wendy 2009c 'Parsing the decision letter', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 13 February, at <http://chronicle.com/article/Parsing-the-Decision-Letter/44856> (accessed 31 January 2013)

Belcher, Wendy 2009 'Responding to a journal's decision to reject' *IETE Technical Review* 26, 391-393

- Fields, Alison 2009 'Writing your first article: what the publishers really want', presented at the ALIA 2009 National Library and Information Technicians Conference, Adelaide, Australia, 18 September, at <http://conferences.alia.org.au/libtec2009/Documents%20for%20Links/FieldsALIA09.pdf> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Grant, Barbara M 2006 'Writing in the company of other women: Exceeding the boundaries' *Studies in Higher Education* 31: 4, 483-495
- Herrmann, Rachel 2011 'On becoming cannibal girl', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20 July, at <http://chronicle.com/article/On-Becoming-Cannibal-Girl/128233/> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Hoelscher, Karen 2011 'Revising a writing group', *Inside Higher Ed*, 28 January, at http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/one_university_re_envisions_how_it_s_upports_faculty_writing (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Hoelscher, Karen & Carmen Werder 2010 'Reading the Creek', *Inside Higher Ed*, 8 December, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/werder5> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Hoelscher, Karen & Carmen Werder 2010 'Write now!' *Inside Higher Ed*, 20 October, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/hoelscher3> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Pollard Jr, Robert Q 2005 'From dissertation to journal article: A useful method for planning and writing any manuscript' *The Internet Journal of Mental Health* 2: 2, January, at <http://archive.ispub.com/journal/the-internet-journal-of-mental-health/volume-2-number-2/from-dissertation-to-journal-article-a-useful-method-for-planning-and-writing-any-manuscript.html#sthash.kd9rWqD0.5BLFgRbw.dpbs> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Are you afraid to succeed? (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 9 August, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer9> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Assess and adjust (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 16 August, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer10> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Do you really want to be a professor? (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 2 August, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer8> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Lower your standards (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 12 July, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer5> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Meet your bodyguard (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 21 June, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer3> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'No more post-summer regret (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 7 June, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer1> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Shut up and write (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 14 June, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer2> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Tame your inner critic (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 26 July, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer7> (accessed 31 January 2013)

- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Why aren't you writing? (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 28 June, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer4> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Rockquomore, Kerry Ann 2010 'Writing is thinking (Support for Summer Writers series)', *Inside Higher Ed*, 19 July, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/summer/summer6> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Werder, Carmen & Karen Hoelscher 2010 'Finding our best readers', *Inside Higher Ed*, 11 November, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/werder4> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Werder, Carmen & Karen Hoelscher 2010 'Time out to write', *Inside Higher Ed*, 1 October, at <http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/werder2> (accessed 31 January 2013)
- Werder, Carmen & Karen Hoelscher 2011 'Editing matters', *Inside Higher Ed*, 14 January, at http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/hoelscher/why_editing_and_proofreading_matter_in_academic_writing (accessed 31 January 2013)

Works cited

- Aitchison, Claire 2009 'Writing groups for doctoral education' *Studies in Higher Education* 34: 8, 905–16
- Auriol, Laudeline 2010 'Careers of doctorate holders: Employment and mobility patterns. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)', Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry, 26 March, at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/46/43/44893058.pdf> (accessed 31 March 2013)
- Bazerman, Charles 1988 *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*, Madison, Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P
- Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009a 'Reflections on ten years of teaching writing for publication to graduate students and junior faculty' *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 40: 2, 184–200
- Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009b *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage
- Blackwell, John & Jan Martin 2011 *A scientific approach to scientific writing*, London: Springer Science
- Blum, Deborah, Mary Knudson & Robin Marantz Henig 2006 *A Field Guide for Science Writers* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Oxford UP
- Burgoine, Thomas, Peter Hopkins, Matthew F Rech, & Gisela P Zaputa 2011 "'These kids can't write abstracts": Reflections on a postgraduate writing and publishing workshop' *Royal Geographical Society Area* 43: 4, 463–69
- Caffarella, Rosemary S & Bruce G Barnett 2000 'Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques' *Studies in Higher Education* 25: 1, 39–52
- Cameron, Jenny, Karen Nairn & Jane Higgins 2009 'Demystifying academic writing: Reflections on emotions, know-how and academic identity' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 33: 2, 269–84
- Cargill, Margaret & Patrick O'Connor 2009 *Writing scientific research articles: Strategies and steps*, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell
- Catterall, Janice, Pauline Ross, Claire Aitchison & Shelley Burgin 2011 'Pedagogical approaches that facilitate writing in postgraduate research candidature in science and technology' *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* 8: 2, 10 October, at from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol8/iss2/7> (accessed 31 March 2013)

- Crane, Nicholas Jon & Zoe Pearson 2011 'Can we get a pub from this? Reflections on competition and the pressure to publish while in graduate school' *The Geographical Bulletin* 52, 77–80
- Cuthbert, Denise & Ceridwen Spark 2008 'Getting a GRiP: Examining the outcomes of a pilot program to support graduate research students in writing for publication' *Studies in Higher Education* 33: 1, 77–88
- Cuthbert, Denise, Ceridwen Spark & Eliza Burke 2009 'Disciplining writing: the case for multi-disciplinary writing groups to support writing for publication by higher degree by research candidates in the humanities, arts and social sciences' *Higher Education Research and Development* 28: 2, 137–149
- Dankoski, Mary E, Megan M Palmer, Julianna Banks, Randy R Brutkiewicz, Emily Walvoord, Krista Hoffmann-Longtin, Stephen P Bogdewic & George D Gopen 2012 'Academic writing: Supporting faculty in a critical competency for success' *The Journal of Faculty Development* 26: 2, 47–54
- Devenish, Rosemerry, Sylvia Dyer, Therese Jefferson, Linley Lord, Sue van Leeuwen & Victor Fazakerley 2009 'Peer to peer support: The disappearing work in the doctoral student experience' *Higher Education Research and Development* 28: 1, 59–70
- Fergie, Gillian, Suzanne Beeke, Colleen McKenna & Phyllis Crème 2011 "'It's a lonely walk'": Supporting postgraduate researchers through writing' *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 23: 2, 236–45
- Foss, Sonja & William Waters 2007 *Destination dissertation: A traveler's guide to a done dissertation*, Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefields
- Gere, Anne Rugles 1987 *Writing groups: History, theory and implications*, Carbondale, Illinois, USA: Southern Illinois UP
- Grant, Barbara M & Sally Knowles 2000 'Flights of imagination: Academic women be(com)ing writers' *International Journal for Academic Development*, 5: 1, 6–19
- Grant, Barbara M 2006 'Writing in the company of other women: Exceeding the boundaries' *Studies in Higher Education* 31: 4, 483–95
- Guillory, John 1996 'What graduate students want' *Modern Language Association (MLA) Profession* 1996, 91–9
- Gustavii, Björn 2009 *How to write and illustrate scientific papers* (2nd ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge UP
- Hunt, Will, Nick Jagger, Janet Metcalfe & Emma Pollard 2010 *What do researchers do? Doctoral graduate destinations and impact three years on*, London: Vitae/Research Councils UK (RCUK), at http://www.vitae.ac.uk/CMS/files/upload/WDRD_3_%20years_%20on_soft%20copy.pdf (accessed 29 Jan 2013)
- Jackson, Debra 2009 'Mentored residential writing retreats: A leadership strategy to develop skills and generate outcomes in writing for publication' *Nurse Education Today* 29, 9–15
- Johnson, W Brad & Carol A Mullen 2007 *Write to the top! How to become a prolific academic*, Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kamler, Barbara 2008 'Rethinking doctoral publication practices: writing from and beyond the thesis' *Studies in Higher Education* 33: 3, 282–94
- Kapp, CA, RM Albertyn & BL Frick 2011 'Writing for publication: An intervention to overcome barriers to scholarly writing' *South African Journal of Higher Education* 25: 4, 741–59
- Körner, Anne M 2008 *Guide to publishing a scientific paper* (2nd ed.), Oxon, UK: Routledge
- Lee, Alison & David Boud 2003 'Writing groups, change and academic identity: Research development as local practice' *Studies in Higher Education* 28: 2, 187–200
- Lee, Hsing-fen, Marcela Miozzo & Philippe Laredo 2010 'Career patterns and competences of PhDs in science and engineering in the knowledge economy: The case of graduates from a UK research-based university' *Research Policy* 39: 7, 869–81

- Micciche, Laura R with Allison D Carr 2011 'Toward graduate-level writing instruction' *College Composition and Communication* 62: 3, 477–501
- Miller, Alison B 2008 *Finish Your dissertation once and for all!: How to overcome psychological barriers, get results, and move on with your life*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Murray, Rowena 2009 *Writing for academic journals* (2nd ed.), Berkshire, England: Open UP
- Murray, Rowena & Mary Newton 2008 'Facilitating writing for publication' *Physiotherapy* 94, 29–34
- Myers, David Gershom 2006 *The elephants teach: Creative writing since 1880*, Chicago: U of Chicago P
- Neumann, Ruth & Kim Khim Tan 2011 'From PhD to initial employment: The doctorate in a knowledge economy' *Studies in Higher Education* 36: 5, 601–14
- Nolon, Robert & Tonette Rocco 2009 'Teaching graduate students in the social sciences writing for publication' *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 20: 2, 267–73
- Ondrusek, Anita L 2012 'What the research reveals about graduate students' writing skills: A literature review' *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 53: 3, 176–88
- Palmer, Betsy & Claire Howell Major 2008 'Using reciprocal peer review to help graduate students develop scholarly writing skills' *Journal of Faculty Development* 22: 3, 163–9
- Peat, Jennifer, Elizabeth Elliott, Louise Baur & Victoria Keena 2002 *Scientific writing: Easy when you know how*, London: BMJ
- Reisman, Anna B, Helena Hansen & Asghar Rastegar 2006 'The craft of writing: A physician-writer's workshop for resident physicians' *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 21, 1109–11
- Roberts, Carol M 2010 *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (2nd ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin/Sage
- Rountree, Kathryn & Patricia Laing 1996 *Writing by degrees: A practical guide to writing theses and research papers*, Auckland: Longman
- Rudestam, Kjell Erik & Rae R Newton 2007 *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (3rd ed.), London: Sage
- Sampson, Kaylene & Keith Comer 2008 'Making progress: The postgraduate experience for doctoral students (Report on the 2007 University of Canterbury Postgraduate Experience Questionnaire for Doctoral students)', Academic Development Group, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University Centre for Teaching & Learning, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
- Sampson, Kaylene & Keith Comer 2009 'Seeking balance: The postgraduate experience for masters students (Report on the 2008 University of Canterbury Postgraduate Experience Questionnaire for Masters students)', Academic Development Group, University Centre for Teaching & Learning, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
- Sampson, Kaylene & Keith Comer 2010 'When the governmental tail wags the disciplinary dog: Some consequences of national funding policy on doctoral research in New Zealand' *Higher Education Research & Development* 29: 3, 275–289
- Sampson, Kaylene, Keith Comer & Erik Brogt 2011 'Supporting PhD research: Further evidence for action (University of Canterbury Postgraduate Experience Questionnaire 2010, Report on the UCPEQ)', Academic Development Group, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University Centre for Teaching & Learning, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
- Silvia, Paul J 2007 *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Sterken, Christiaan 2011 *Scientific writing for young astronomers, part 1 and part 2: A collection of papers on scientific writing*, Cambridge, UK: European Astronomical Society/EDP Sciences
- Storch, Neomy & Joanna Tapper 2009 'The impact of an EAP course on postgraduate writing' *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 8, 207–33

Topping, KJ, EF Smith, I Swanson & A Elliot 2000 'Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students' *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 25: 2, 149–66

Wang, T., & Linda Y Li 2008 'Understanding international postgraduate research students' challenges and pedagogical needs in thesis writing' *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning* 4: 3, 88–96

Wang, Ting & Linda Y Li 2011 "'Tell me what to do" vs. "guide me through it": Feedback experiences of international doctoral students' *Active Learning in Higher Education* 12: 2, 101–12

Woodward-Kron, Robyn 2007 'Negotiating meanings and scaffolding learning: Writing support for non-English speaking background postgraduate students' *Higher Education Research and Development* 26: 3, 253–68