Fitting in, standing out and doing both:

Supporting the development of a scholarly voice

Arif Ismail[1,*], Gwen Ansell[1], Helena Barnard[1]

[1]University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

*Corresponding Author:
Arif Ismail, University of Pretoria: Gordon Institute of Business Science, 26 Melville Road, Illovo, Johannesburg, PO Box 427, Pretoria 0001, South Africa. Email: arif.ismail@resbank.co.za

Abstract

What scholars call "writing" actually involves writing, reading, talking, thinking, and engaging. Yet how academic writing develops through this recursive, social process, is imperfectly understood. Although participating in academic gatherings like colloquia and international conferences can help researchers find a scholarly voice, not all new scholars have the opportunity to participate in such gatherings and the learnings they offer. Especially for those scholars, their academic writing must be consciously developed. We examine the process by which a new South African management scholar, supported by his writing coach, developed an academic voice. Analyzing their 15-month long communication (emails and summaries of conversations), we find three interweaving processes. Coaching guides the new scholar first to learn to fit in by becoming aware of genre conventions through practical writing-to-learn and show-and-tell coaching tactics. Then the challenge is to stand out by forcing tough trade-offs and intensifying the focus on novelty. Ultimately the scholar must do both, negotiating the tension between them. Our article provides evidence of how the emergence of self-reliant scholarly writing can be supported. This process is especially salient in developing country contexts with few enculturating opportunities, but we suggest that it applies more broadly, opening avenues for future theorizing.

Keywords case studies, coaching, experiential learning, qualitative approaches to research, research methods, research philosophies, teaching methods and approaches, writing skills

A review of the scholarship around doctoral education (Pifer & Baker, 2016) situates thesis writing within the knowledge enactment stage of doctoral education. However, the process of actually writing up the thesis has received little scholarly attention, although writers such as Carlinho (2012, p.217) have asserted that students encounter difficulty in completing a dissertation not only because they need new knowledge, but also need to learn "a new kind of writing".

Recent research on how new scholars' develop a (multi-dimensional) new identity has documented the centrality of social processes (Coffman, Putman, Adkisson, Kriner & Monaghan, 2016; Stevens-Long, Schapiro & McClintock, 2012). We extend that view by examining another element essential to scholarly identity: academic writing competence. Employing the academic literacies perspective, we examine how new scholars become competent academic writers.

The academic literacies perspective (e.g. Ivanic, 1998) positions writing as an intertwined set of recursive processes including reading, thinking, talking, reflecting, dialoguing and scribing. Thus writing itself involves mastering a set of social practices. Prior and Bilbro (2012) also emphasize social processes in their study of how doctoral students become better writers, asserting that writing development was often wrongly characterized as the unidirectional transmission of relatively stable cultural knowledge from experts to novices. Assuming supervisors could and would do all that was required, prior literature was often weighted towards the actions of teachers, rather than new scholars' own processes and experiences (e.g. Gatfield, 2005; Hockey, 1997; Lee, 2008). Much of the scholarship on writing-focused interventions foregrounded elements such as genre analysis and

knowledge transmission, underlining diagnosis and filling deficits via tools and supplements (Shaw, Moore & Gandhidasan, 2007; Thais & Zawacki, 2006).

Despite longstanding unease about transmission models of writing development (Reuter & Donahue, 2007), the dearth of studies mapping the interactions between the multiple components of the scholarly process, and between role-players, persists.

Writing is constantly (re)defined by its community (Bhatia, 2010), and scholars' language, viewpoints, conventions and conceptual systems constantly shift through engagement with the field. However, the communities establishing writing norms often remain underspecified, or over-idealized as homogenous (Prior & Bilbro 2012).

Researchers such as Castello and Iniesta (2012) focus learning-to-write interventions on how students perceive their own writing development. But because those studies tend to examine formal writing interventions, they are essentially done under "laboratory conditions". Lacunae remain around how the processes develop in action, under real strains and conditions. We complement those studies by documenting, for one new scholar in a developing country, how scholarly writing was learned and how his authorial voice emerged – in short, how a scholar "became". A longitudinal study tracking the actors *in situ* enables understanding of how writing challenges are framed: the tactics adopted and choices made; and, finally, what outcomes emerge and how they are understood (see Castello & Donahue, 2012; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2016).

The value of consciously developing scholarly writing in doctoral programs is especially salient for non-traditional centers of scholarship. The presence or absence of "Southern voices" (Alcadipani, Khan, Gantman & Nkomo, 2012; Tsui, 2004; Villanueva,

2011) in scholarship attracts limited attention, although students from those contexts are known to face substantial barriers in their scholarly becoming (Nkomo, 2015). One such, we suggest, is the geographical and financial challenge of attending enculturating events such as conferences. Scholars including Lee (2008) and Wisker (2005) have pinpointed enculturation as important for scholarly becoming, with the latter foregrounding attendance and participation at conferences as a key tool in this process.

This emphasis on dialogic practices invokes the work of Russian scholar and semiotician Mikhail Bakhtin, whose work provides a key theoretical foundation for the academic literacies perspective (Lillis, 2003). Bakhtin positioned writing in a genre as a social process unfolding over time within writing communities, and resulting in sets of "relatively stable types of…utterances" (Bakhtin, 1986: p.60). He argued that writing grows through engagement, dialogue and multivocality, rather than discrete acts of utterance and style. Dialogue creates a "chain of speech communion" (Bakhtin, 1986: p.75-6): deep-level sharing in an active, responsive partnership. Where students cannot attend academic conferences, what strategies might help create analogous forms of dialogic engagement to help the new scholar become?

This was the challenge faced by Arif, a part-time doctoral student with an onerous full-time job, in a country with almost no academic conferences on business and management, and lacking the time and resources to attend international conferences. Additionally, Arif's supervisor, John, had moved to a coastal town because of declining health. Distance communication – sequential, with time-lags eroding its dialogic potential – predominated in the supervisory relationship. In writing up his data, Arif struggled to

transcend a mass of local detail to produce a dissertation. He failed to conform to genre conventions (for example, one draft chapter exceeded 200 pages), and to assert a novel scholarly contribution. Arif was advised by John to work with a writing coach. After 15 months of interaction with his coach, Gwen, and his supervisor, Arif successfully submitted his dissertation.

Recognizing that this represented an extreme case (Yin, 2003) that could facilitate theory development (Barnard, Cuervo-Cazurra and Manning, 2017), the program director Helena encouraged Arif and Gwen to analyze the data that had serendipitously been collected over 15 months. The three authors analyzed the meeting notes and e-mail correspondence between Arif and Gwen. The evidence from these dialogic engagements suggests three things were happening. First, Arif was mastering genre conventions. Second, he increasingly asserted his unique contribution to extant knowledge. Finally, he developed more confidence, negotiating the tension between existing conventions and his novel contribution.

We term these three stages 'fitting in', 'standing out' and 'doing both', suggesting they provide a framework for scholarly becoming. We thus shift the focus away from supervisor actions to develop a better understanding of how a doctoral student (co-)shaped his own improved writing. Our explanations offer practical, replicable strategies to help develop the writing of new scholars.

Methodology

Arif and Gwen held regular, short coaching meetings, minuted and shared to ensure a common understanding of next steps. They also used email extensively both for simple

contact-maintenance messages (“Did you get round to trying out X?”) and conversational reflections on the guided steps Arif was taking. Drafts and re-drafts of sections and chapters, plus emails, went from Arif to his supervisor, writing coach and the doctoral director.

When the examiners heaped praise on Arif's thesis, the doctoral director sought to understand whether the co-writing strategies employed were replicable. The dataset provided rich evidence of Gwen's interventions and Arif's responses. It had been produced "innocently” with no initial intent to analyze or publish any of the communications. However although the paper was built on an unexpected and limited dataset – one coach and one student in South Africa – it provides useful longitudinal insights.

Research based on data analyzed by scholars who are themselves participants offers strong contextual understanding, as was the case here. However, it carries potential pitfalls around data trustworthiness and analytical credibility (Gibbert & Ruigrok, 2010). Miles and Huberman (1994) warn of the danger of confirmation bias in such qualitative, reflexive work. Participants may also harbor blind spots (Pronin & Krugler, 2007). To help counter these biases, the doctoral director, Helena, was asked to participate as third author.

The three authors coded the data independently. Three very different coding schemes emerged. Arif echoed the approach of his dissertation: process coding. As writing coach, Gwen’s role informed her coding, grouping and foregrounding similar forms of supportive interaction. The director emphasized theory and focus.

To integrate these perspectives, authors returned to the common ground of the research question: how do scholars become? In debate, two core processes emerged. Scholarly writing is about ‘fitting in’ (writing in a genre-appropriate manner) simultaneously

with ‘standing out’ (making a novel scholarly contribution). How that “at the same time” operated and its importance, were initially unexplored. Through further reading and dialogues, the authors defined not two but three pivotal benchmarks in the process of scholarly becoming: ‘fitting in’, ‘standing out’ and ‘doing both’.

Evidence

Gwen guided Arif's writing process through multiple writing development techniques. Having established a relationship and contracted that she was going to help develop his academic writing skills, not improve a document, Gwen set out to raise Arif’s awareness on the importance of ‘fitting in’. In addition to introducing technical editing tools, she requested a single page ‘6-question thesis’ outline (see Table 1, for coaching tools used during the ‘fitting in’ phase). In response, Arif delivered over 12 pages. The ensuing discussion helped him understand audience interests – not in the minutiae of the dataset, but in “the shape of the change process and the turning points”.

Gwen underlined the distinction between expressions of theory and descriptions of supporting detail, unpicking the text to illuminate ‘foregrounding’: Theory elaboration could be foregrounded by style (declarative sentences) and placement (at the start of sections and paragraphs) before the reader was asked to follow detailed analysis. It was this lack of knowledge of how to signpost, leading to the choice to include detailed descriptions, that perplexed Arif’s supervisor, who described the text as “cryptic abstruseness”. To address this, Gwen emphasized the function of labels and headings in scholarly writing – how consistent terminology and framework help readers to follow a clear, unified narrative.

The initial focus was on making Arif's work look like a thesis: 'fitting in' (see Table 2 for evidence of his learning process). But Gwen's guidance soon shifted to helping Arif understand better his distinctiveness as a writer: first, *how* he wrote – as a discovery writer, most effective in developing ideas through repeated redrafting. Writing scholars have often categorized students' writing approaches by the extent to which their texts are pre-planned in advance. Often it was assumed that tight pre-planning – analogous to creating an architect's plan – produced better results. However, for many writers the most effective texts emerge through the act of writing itself: these may be termed discovery writers. See, for example, Galbraith (1992). Gwen eschewed readymade "writing recipes" and helped Arif design work-plans to suit his writing style. Visual tools like mind-maps, for example, are more useful for discovery writers in transitioning from longer to shorter drafts than for creating initial planning outlines.

In terms of the distinctiveness of *what* he wrote, a key strategy was "imagined interactions" (Honeycutt, 2008). Arif was challenged to imagine who his examiners, and what their requirements, would be. Identifying the hierarchy of information, and clearly differentiating between main and subsidiary themes were also suggested to help meet these requirements (see Table 3 for coaching tools during 'standing out' phase).

To anchor this continuous strategy, an actual interaction was arranged where Arif had to present his research to peers to demonstrate his techniques for communicating core ideas. Throughout this phase (see Table 4), Arif's key challenge was identifying and communicating *his* core ideas – how he was 'standing out' from others.

To develop a scholarly voice, Arif had to master asserting his distinctive contribution as a scholar while signaling mastery of scholarly writing conventions. Thus he needed to select what to include and exclude. Gwen continued to focus on the writing process. She suggested a “talk it, then write it” technique, aligned with Arif’s discovery writer style, to help untangle complex arguments. These coaching tools helped to highlight how transitions between text sections could draw out the implicit debate between extant literature and what the thesis proposed (see Table 5 for coaching tools during the ‘doing both’ phase, as the thesis is refined and finalized).

But Gwen’s role – and indeed, that of Arif's supervisor – shifted from being a guide to being primarily an appreciative (and occasionally questioning) reader (see Table 6, evidencing the learning process).

After 15 months, Gwen's application of writing coaching tools in a deliberately dialogic, Bakhtinian process had not only improved Arif's writing, but also allowed his scholarly identity to emerge.

Discussion

Learning to write in a scholarly manner is an iterative, social process, but it need not happen by chance. Just as students are taught research methodologies to master analytic techniques, scholarly writing methodologies can be formally developed, with dialogic interactions central.

Our analysis of the process reveals that specific coaching tactics (see Table 1, 3 and 5) may be deployed during the ‘fitting in’, ‘standing out’ and ‘doing both’ phases to help develop students' writing. Initially, the coaching process involved “show and tell” tactics,

demonstrating in action how particular tools and techniques are applied. During the ‘fitting in’ phase, the scholar becomes increasingly fluid in applying these techniques. Because each doctoral study must demonstrate its unique contribution, the ‘standing out’ writing techniques continue to reinforce ‘fitting in’ techniques, but shift the primary focus to accentuating novelty.

The scholar’s growing self-reliance emerges most strongly during the ‘doing both’ process. Scholars themselves must decide, project by project, the appropriate balance between ‘fitting in’ and ‘standing out’, with the supervisor’s or writing coach’s role now primarily that of a sounding board. We therefore argue that ‘doing both’ represents the point of scholarly becoming: the attainment of competence. Scholars can manage the dialectical tension between deciding how (and even whether) to conform to genre conventions, and contributing to knowledge creation. This allows their identity to emerge and opens a path towards recognition within the broader academic community.

It is important to note the social dimension of this process. The person guiding the doctoral student – often the supervisor, but in cases where supervisors lack the requisite skill or availability sometimes another party like a writing coach – engages in conversation and debate about writing choices. The "editing" process is thus not about improving the text, but about developing the scholar, demonstrating that developing academic writing skills is important not simply because it helps scholars present their research. It is additionally – like other processes of doctoral becoming (e.g. Coffman et al, 2016) – a social process helping neophytes to develop a scholarly identity.

Because of this, our findings are salient and supportive for supervisors in any national context (not only the developing world) seeking to better support their students. We also provide evidence that writing coaching is a process whose execution need not be limited to the supervisor. Indeed, in circumstances where the supervisor's strength is not in writing coaching, or where supervisors must manage a very heavy workload, a subject-matter outsider can also provide this type of support. This is a particularly important finding for a country such as South Africa, where the rate of production of supervisors is slow and their time is consequently already over-stretched (Nkomo, 2015). This insight may offer fresh options for program design in terms of writing support in such contexts.

Other enculturation processes like presenting at writing groups, colloquia and conferences are also important. We suggest that the same three mechanisms ('fitting in', 'standing out', and 'doing both') may characterize them – a potentially fruitful area for future research. One frequent recourse for support by neophyte scholars – the 'How to get published' editorial letters from scholarly journals – tends to highlight how scholars should fit in, e.g. identifying a scholarly community or developing theory. Useful though these pointers are, their fundamental purpose is to foreground genre conventions. They do not reflect the range of social processes characterizing scholarship. In live presentation, experienced scholars are more likely to reveal the trade-offs they made and why – information that is sometimes shared in academic papers, but seldom foregrounded. Few emerging scholars can read an academic contribution and deduce what authors had to do to develop it and make their contribution stand out.

The processes we document are equally relevant in more and less developed countries. But it is worth remembering why the dataset on which we base this paper emerged: scholarly resources in South Africa are so limited that it was possible to isolate the key process by which a new scholar had developed his scholarly voice. South Africa is hardly the least developed academy globally, and we want to suggest the value of studying scholarly processes in less developed countries. Both what happens there and what fails to take place can provide useful insights for global scholarship.

One important insight relates to the value of the doctoral student simply talking about his work and discovering what it 'sounded' like. Students from North America or Europe can relatively easily attend academic conferences where they get to talk about their research. Given Huff's (2002, p.72) insight that "scholarship is facilitated by community and conversation", the value of a range of communities – such as other doctoral students or writing groups (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014) – should be further researched. And to the extent that formal writing coaching can support doctoral training, it is also important to understand the techniques that allow such coaching to take place. Email-based support is significant among these. It is now a widely employed element in tutorial interactions and thus merits further exploration.

Although the dataset from which we worked is rich, it is limited: it details the interactions between one coach and one doctoral student, in South Africa, in business studies. Additional research is needed to test, refine and develop our findings, both in other enculturating contexts (e.g. symposia and writers' circles) and with diverse role players (e.g. involving various nationalities, genders or races). Further grounded micro-studies would

allow us to better understand the other elements that are likely to affect the coaching relationship. For example, issues of race and gender were surprisingly non-salient in this particular coaching relationship. But given the understanding of how power relationships shape the process of scholarly becoming (Lee, 2008), additional research is needed to understand how those dynamics operate.

Conclusion

In this paper we argue that how doctoral students learn academic writing represents a key scholarly enculturation process. This enculturation process was magnified as a result of an extreme case. Not only was the traditional supervisor ailing and geographically distant, the student was battling with his academic writing competence. The dialogic interactions through coaching helped to accentuate the processes of scholarly becoming, through improved writing.

First comes the 'fitting in' stage. Scholars-in-becoming have to embed their analysis and voice within existing scholarship, intentionally positioning through their writing a sound grasp of the current discussions and debates in the field and the text conventions for presenting these. This 'fitting in', expressed through writing, signals robust and in-depth understanding of the domain of interest. When students struggle to achieve this, coaching tactics, such as raising awareness of this gap through the "six point" framework (see Table 1), or visual aids to signpost arguments, or technical copy editing to foreground current contentions, help to demonstrate 'fitting in'. However, this 'fitting in', albeit necessary, is only the starting process in developing a scholarly voice.

Second, the doctoral student must again demonstrate through writing the process of 'standing out'. They must be able to show how they extend the body of knowledge through their unique contribution. When students struggle with this, coaching tactics such as audience analysis, playing out imagined interactions, or foregrounding what 'stands out' help to hone in on the novelty of contributions. Lastly, our evidence suggests that developing a scholarly voice depends on balancing the tension between 'fitting in' and 'standing out'. We suggest that dialogic interactions are crucial to this process, and that as the scholar-in-becoming masters this tension, their reliance on a writing coach diminishes, revealing the emergence of a scholarly voice.

Our model of 'fitting in', 'standing out' and 'doing both' highlights this. We believe this perspective counteracts what we have detected as a current under-emphasis in the process of scholarly becoming on writing as a competence developed through dialogic interactions. Other skills – such as statistical manipulation – are taught as fundamental interventions to help in scholarly becoming, but writing is often taken as a given.

Examining the interactions between a student and his writing coach, we emphasize this importance of developing "a new kind of writing" through our simple model of scholarly becoming: 'fitting in', 'standing out', and 'doing both'. We believe that competent scholars will have mastered all three of these components, and hope that in this paper we have also succeeded in 'doing both'.

References

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

Alcadipani, R., Khan, F.R., Gantman, E., & Nkomo, S.M. (2012). Southern Voices in management and organization Knowledge. *Organization: The Critical Journal of Organization, Theory and Society, 19* (2), 131-144. doi:10.1177/1350508411431910

Bakhtin, M.M. (1952/1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, reprinted 1986.

Barnard, H., Cuervo-Cazurra, A., & Manning, S. (2017). Africa business research as a laboratory for theory-building: Extreme conditions, new phenomena, and alternative paradigms of social relationships. *Management and Organization Review*, *13*(3), 467-495.

Bhatia, V.K. (2010). Inter-discursivity in professional communication. *Discourse and Communication*, *4*(1): 32-50. doi:10.1177/1750481309351208

Carlinho, P. (2012). Helping Doctoral Students of Education to Face Writing and Emotional Challenges in Identity Transition. In: Castello M and Donahue C *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Writing.* United Kingdom, Emerald.

Castello, M., & Donahue, C. (2012). *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Societies*. United Kingdom, Emerald.

Castello, M., & Iniesta, A. (2012).Texts as Artifacts-In-Activity: Developing Authorial Identity and Academic Voice in Writing Academic Research Papers. In: Castello M and Donahue C (eds). *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Writing Societies.* United Kingdom, Emerald.

Coffman, K., Putman, P., Adkisson, A., Kriner, B., & Monaghan, C. (2016). Waiting for the

Expert to Arrive: Using a Community of Practice to Develop the Scholarly Identity of Doctoral Students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *28*(1), 30-37.

Galbraith, D. (1992). Conditions for discovery through writing. *Instructional Science*, *21*(1-3), 45-72. doi:10.1007/BF00119655

Gatfield, T. (2005). An Investigation into PhD Supervisory Management Styles: Development of a dynamic conceptual model and its managerial implications. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(3), 311–325. doi:10.1080/13600800500283585

Gibbert, M., & Ruigrok, W. (2010). The" what" and" how" of case study rigor: Three strategies based on published research. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(4): 710-737. doi:10.1177/1094428109351319

Hockey, J. (1997). A complex craft: United Kingdom PhD supervision in the Social Sciences. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *2*(1): 45-70. doi:10.1080/13596749700200004

Honeycutt, J.M. (2008). *Imagined interaction theory.* In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithewaite (Eds.), Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives (pp. 77-87). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Huff, A. (2002). Learning to be a Successful Writer. In: Partington, D., (ed) *Essential Skills for Management Research*. London: Sage.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lee, A. (2008). How Are Doctoral Students Supervised? Concepts of Doctoral Supervision Studies. *Higher Education, 33*(3): 267-287. doi.org/10.1080/03075070802049202

Lillis, T. (2003). Student writing as' academic literacies': Drawing on Bakhtin to move from critique to design. *Language and education*, *17*(3), 192-207. doi:10.1080/09500780308666848

MacArthur, A.C., Graham, S. & Fitzgerald, J. (2016). *Handbook of Writing Research*. New York:The Guildford Press.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, M.A. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. California: Sage Publications.

Nkomo, S.M. (2015). Challenges for Business Education in a "Developmental State: The case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 14*(2), 242-258. doi: 10.5465/amle.2014.0323

Pifer, M. J., & Baker, V. L. (2016). Stage-based challenges and strategies for support in doctoral education: A practical guide for students, faculty members, and program administrators. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *11*(1), 15-34.

Prior, P., & Bilbro, R. (2012). Academic Enculturation: Developing Literate Practices and Disciplinary Identities. In: Castello and Donahue C (eds) *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Writing*. United Kingdom, Emerald.

Reuter, Y. & Donahue, C. (2007). Disciplines, language activities, cultures: Perspectives on teaching and learning in higher education from France and the United States. *Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8*(2), 1-11.

Shaw, J., Moore, P. & Gandhidasan, S. (2007). Educational Acculturation and Academic Integrity: outcomes of an intervention subject for international post graduate public health students. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning, 1* (1), 55-67.

Stevens-Long, J., Schapiro, S.A., & McClintock, C. (2012). Passionate scholars: Transformative learning in doctoral education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *62*(2), 180-198. doi:10.1177/0741713611402046

Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T.M. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Heinemann: Portsmouth, NH.

Tsui, A.S. (2004). Contributing to Global Management Knowledge: A Case for High Quality Indigenous Research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 21*, 491–513

Villanueva, V. (2011). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. In: McLeod, S.H., Miraglia, E., Soren, M. and Thaiss, C. (eds.). *WAC for the New Millenium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Wisker, G. (2005). *The Good Supervisor: Supervising Postgraduate and Undergraduate Research for Doctoral Theses and Dissertations*. Palgrave 1st edition.

Yin, R. K. (2004). *Case study research: design and methods*. Sage Publications: 4th edition.

Table 1: 'Fitting in' – the coaching tools

Stage	Coaching tool	What did this tool prompt and produce?
'Fitting in' **(*Incremental steps with the coach very present throughout*)** ***Arif reflects:*** *"When you e-mailed something quite harsh, I could see your face as we had been talking and that took the 'sting' out of it…feedback was fast, furious, direct and hands-on…Gwen was able to teach/demonstrate in action [with] practical examples I could follow."*	Establishing the relationship and mutually agreeing ground rules	*Arif had to sacrifice and mutilate a personal project he was proud of. It had to be positioned as the co-creator of his new texts through dialogue, not the object of an editor's 'red pen'.*
	Requesting 'six-sentence thesis' Why does the research matter? [Introduction] What does the literature say/not say? [Literature review] How did you collect and analyze data? [Methodology] What did the evidence reveal? [Findings]	*Arif had to clarify his meta-narrative to produce single sentence summaries. Helps to clarify what is key and what window-dressing*

	What are the key implications? [Discussion] What are the limitation and the contribution of this work?[Conclusion]	
	Introducing technical editing tools (cutting/re-phrasing/visual readability via rethink of sectioning and headings)	*The 'technical' aspects of copy-editing are easy, learnable tools. Once routinized as part of how he looks at a text, Arif can focus on the more important discourse issues*

Table 2: 'Fitting in' – the learning process

Representative quotes from dataset	Context
Arif reflecting post-process: *"I thought [people] would simply be ecstatic about 3 years of data and the fullest narrative…I was surprised the length of Chapter 6 was such an issue – it was only 200 pages!"*	The correspondence between Arif and his supervisor establishes the need for some type of editing support
Supervisor to Arif: " *…the text does not make for easy reading (…) length, volume, cryptic abstruseness…find a competent language editor…it's technical"*	
Arif to supervisor after first meeting with Gwen*:* *"… I <u>can learn from her editing and use</u> the technique for remaining Chapters.* ***Gwen reflects:*** *"The important contrast is between coaching and editing. Editing is: do I need someone to get their language right? This is <u>not</u> that... Arif's writing had to move from what was acceptable in his professional community, to what would provide a platform for scholarly conversations."*	Arif and Gwen establish a working relationship and agree on a dialogic process. Arif accepts the focus on process and transferrable techniques rather than "technical' correction of errors without dialogue. A work process involving minuted face-to-face meetings, coaching e-mails and simple contact-maintenance messages ("*Did you get around to*

	trying x?") is agreed.
Gwen to Arif: *You'll no doubt be distressed to notice how I am chopping your metaphors & proverbs!* *Just a reminder that we agreed that we'd use ONLY [the analogies & metaphors on] the list we mutually agreed (…) But this means that (…) will need revising...The 'story' has more clarity and drama if we cut down the 'characters'.*	The initial 'fitting in' requirements are introduced and negotiated: minimizing metaphors and employing consistent terminology Gwen requests a "6-sentence thesis"
Arif to Gwen: *Morning Gwen, not distressed at all…Using the phases as pegs (…) and labelling the events in a direct manner works much better…* *I'll highlight the key pieces (…) the narrative did serve as* *cues for what was going on (…) [and] was thus important in discovering - through reflection on it and theory - how change emerges*	Gwen initiates dialogue on thinking about the reader Arif acknowledges the value of clear labels; starts to consider text features that can make his analysis "stand out

Table 3: 'Standing out'– the coaching tools

Stage	Coaching tool	What did this tool prompt and produce?
'Standing out' **(*Arif grows in confidence and Gwen starts the disengagement process; focus shifts from ways of writing to the meaning of the text)*** ***Arif reflects:*** *"A wonderful surprise was that as I experienced how writing/orienting etc. could be done, the discovery of new ways of orienting and framing grew rapidly. A huge gratification was Gwen's "Now you've got it; you're learning to take your*	Abstracting from incidents to code-able patterns and turning-points via matrices and timelines	*What was novel about Arif's research was not the 'local colour' of its SA setting. The format of charts etc forces compression and categorisation*
	Conducting audience analysis and playing out imagined interactions (ideation)	*Novel scholarship stands out <u>in a context</u>. By analysing audience prior knowledge, conditions of reception and questions, Arif can decide what he wants to show and in what order. Also partially substitutes for unavailable international conferences etc.*
	Concept of and techniques for foregrounding (sentence style/positioning in text)	*Ties together audience analysis and text-editing techniques*

reader along"…a lot of the realizations came through these conversations: the dialogues and interactions are fundamental		

Table 4: 'Standing out' – the learning process

Representative quotes from dataset	Context
Gwen to Arif: *You have too many characters. They are not needed. […]. The story is about (…and) has more clarity & drama if you cut down the characters. (…) It may now be able to take a bit more signposting...*	Arif and Gwen discuss signposting through devising sections and headings Gwen prompts Arif about better 'standing out' while continuing to highlight additional 'fitting in' techniques
Arif to Gwen: *Makes sense Gwen and it's then easier to follow ."* *"What has become clear for me is that the narrative did serve as cues for…research questions and dynamics [and] was thus important in discovering – through reflection on it and theory – how change emerges."*	Arif and Gwen discuss how an audience might react and what questions listeners might have. These "imagined interactions" anticipate reader reactions and questions and support choice-making in writing. Arif acknowledges he is writing for a reader
Gwen to Arif: *"…the aim of a literature review is to create an Arif-shaped hole for what comes next"*	Arif and Gwen continue discussing the function of sections of the dissertation. This begins a process aimed towards the

Representative quotes from dataset	**Context**
Arif to Gwen: *"I was hoping the hole was covered by…Maybe there have to be explicit statements on these?"*	'doing both' phase: understanding that there is a creative tension between 'fitting in' and 'standing out' – making the right choices when conforming to required text structures can support the assertion of a novel scholarly voice and findings.
Gwen to Arif: *Your dissertation is about the PROCESS (… the level of detail…) is not essential to study process (…). This now needs another in-depth read, because I think there are lines of development in the narrative that can be brought out more clearly [to] make a good story.*	Gwen challenges Arif to stand out more distinctly Arif is tasked with applying his learnings to other chapters; this involves his making his own decisions about cuts and foregrounding.

Representative quotes from dataset	**Context**
Arif to Gwen: *Perfect….. I think I've overcome the link to the case specifics. The more theoretical process dynamics in Ch7 have helped me shift past being "clingy".*	Gwen suggests Arif uses mind-maps to clarify concepts and relationships. Arif finds this very difficult. The ensuing dialogue on Arif's personal writing process (a "discovery writer" who needs multiple recursive drafts) affirms that how he writes is an aspect of his own voice Arif understands why he so often wrote long *("being clingy [on] specifics"*) and begins to demonstrate 'doing both' by making choices between alternatives in both content and process.

Table 5: 'Doing both' – the coaching tools

STAGE	COACHING TOOL	WHAT DID THIS TOOL PROMPT AND PRODUCE?
(*Arif is now central re-writer; Gwen is active co-reader*) **Arif reflects:** *"[One of the surprises was] that the very change model being discovered in my dissertation could be applied to change in writing. Gwen probed a reweaving of my own mental models and underlying assumptions through interactions*	Understanding and applying "What kind of writer am I?" As a discovery writer: "Talk it then write it."	*Arif's long drafts were a result of being a 'discovery writer'. By employing writing techniques to support, not fight, this character he can negotiate between contextual expectations ('fit in') and asserting his own scholarly voice ('stand out')*
	Discussion of role of dissertation chapters: how can structure and expression carry the complex purpose of addressing fellow-scholars re the research <u>in its field</u>?	*Another recursive moment – this links back to text-handling (and the 'six sentences'): keeps faithful to what chapters are 'for' ('fitting in') but how they can be used to assert novel contribution ('standing out')*

to allow for new experiences (and skills to be developed). ***Gwen reflects:*** *[This taught me] the faster I can get to grips with how someone approaches the writing task, rather than just with product, the more helpful I can be… [The same approach] is NOT going to work for everybody.*	Delegating to Arif implementing final-edit tools to strengthen expression (e.g replacing phrasal verbs with stronger one-word equivalents)	*Polishing the dissertation for hand-in must derive from Arif's own final decisions about what needs stronger expression (standing-out) within the parameters of institutional requirements ('fitting in')*

TABLE 6: 'Doing both' – the learning process

Representative quotes from dataset	Context
Arif to Gwen: *… This has been an interesting exercise. The first slides that I crafted were possibly more incidents (…) This timeline now attached represents events …Serendipitously, as I started constructing the attached timeline (…) I realized that the majority of the descriptions were gerunds (ending in "ing") which is a special form of coding (called process coding)… especially for process logic studies…Placing the timeline with these labeled events at the beginning of each phase to orientate the reader, I sense may work well…Now, a short intro … may make this even easier to follow. I'll give this a stab with no more than 2-3 lines.*	Independently refining his text, Arif works to stand out by e.g. reworking his timelines to abstract from incidents to concepts, and explaining the fit of his process coding approach. He understands the need to fit in with reader needs. Arif is increasingly taking the initiative, but he still values feedback.
Arif to Gwen: *I've made significant progress using the matrix you had me put together (…)I'm feeling quite good as it's helped me figure out …I'm cleaning it up and should provide you with a revised matrix soon*	Arif, using tools on own initiative more confidently, sees how the matrix outlining exercise assisted with 'doing both'. Gwen and Arif discuss communicating hierarchies of information through matrices, inductive versus deductive paragraph structures, sub-headings, mind-

	maps...
Gwen to Arif: *Chapter 7 is way better this time around! I actually enjoyed reading it, as I could (mostly) see exactly what you were getting at. It is sharper and far more logically organised and you have managed to reduce the amount of quoted discussion to just that required to support your analytical framework.*	Gwen continues to support Arif's 'fitting in' with dialogue on technical writing techniques (e.g. replacing descriptors with strong nouns and verbs, links, declarative sentences). However, her main role has transitioned to reviewing his independent attempts.