

, vol. 17, 2024, pp. 27-46.

Taking a closer look together.

Colombo, Laura, Rodas, Elisabeth y Alvarez, Guadalupe.

Cita:

Colombo, Laura, Rodas, Elisabeth y Alvarez, Guadalupe (2024). *Taking a closer look together.* , 17, 27-46.

Dirección estable: <https://www.aacademica.org/guadalupe.alvarez/74>

ARK: <https://n2t.net/ark:/13683/p0zR/yW3>



Esta obra está bajo una licencia de Creative Commons.
Para ver una copia de esta licencia, visite
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.es>.

Acta Académica es un proyecto académico sin fines de lucro enmarcado en la iniciativa de acceso abierto. Acta Académica fue creado para facilitar a investigadores de todo el mundo el compartir su producción académica. Para crear un perfil gratuitamente o acceder a otros trabajos visite: <https://www.aacademica.org>.

Taking a closer look together

Written and oral feedback in a faculty writing group

Laura Colombo, Elisabeth Rodas and Guadalupe Alvarez

ABSTRACT

Peer response writing groups support faculty in their development as scholarly writers around the globe. Nevertheless, little is known about feedback provision inside these groups. This work analyses written and oral comments in a faculty writing group to determine how feedback progressed as meetings developed. Results indicate that participants shifted from mainly correcting or giving directions to eliciting clarification, confirmation or information. Similarly, orally retaken comments (oral comments that referred to previous written comments) changed from discussing linguistic accuracy issues to centring on the content and cohesion/coherence of the text, with most of the latter prompting exchanges among participants. With continued participation members moved from mainly offering corrections to establishing a dialogue with authors. In writing groups faculty safely engage in peer feedback practices that enrich texts and writers.

KEYWORDS

academics, faculty development, oral comments, peer revision, writing circle, writing for publication, written comments

In academia's current culture, researchers increasingly face the pressures associated with writing to publish if they expect to have access to promotions, permanent positions/tenure, and grants or other incentives within higher education (Habibie and Hyland 2019; McGrail et al. 2006). Oftentimes the number of publications is the barometer by which their research efforts become evident and tangible (Geller 2013) and through which they become recognised by others in their fields (Chakraborty et al. 2021). However, research writing is frequently done outside university hours (Murray 2013) and usually competes with other duties, such as teaching and class

This article is available open access under a CC BY NC ND 4.0 license as part of Bergahn Open Anthro, a subscribe-to-open model for APC-free open access made possible by the journal's subscribers.



preparation, committee work and other miscellaneous activities (Alexander and Shaver 2020; Badenhorst et al. 2013; Houfek et al. 2010).

Not only do they face these pressures, but many academics also contend with lack of preparation as scholarly writers who are able to produce the genres associated with academic research (e.g., Bosanquet et al. 2012). Academic literacy develops with practice and experience within a disciplinary field and it demands a 'considerable investment of time and effort' (Hyland 2019: 20). However, not many spaces are created within higher level institutions that continually and sustainably give their scholars opportunities to develop the literacy practices connected with academic writing, where they can feel part of a community of writing peers (Grant 2006). Among these few spaces are writing centres offering tutoring, sporadic workshops, writing retreats and writing groups (Geller 2013).

The latter, writing groups, present themselves as a flexible and easy-to-implement initiative to support faculty in their development as scholarly writers. They can become learning communities where participants collaborate and interact with each other while becoming involved in literacy practices related to writing for publication (Aitchison and Guerin 2014; Chakraborty et al. 2021). Additionally, they present opportunities to build less competitive environments (DeFeo et al. 2016; Guerin 2013; Tysick and Babb 2006) fostering collaboration among members (Bosanquet et al. 2012; Kwan et al. 2021). Due to their flexibility, writing groups can be organised for different purposes and include a variety of in-meeting activities (Haas 2014). Peer feedback writing groups, as the name indicates, are geared towards improving writing and writers through collective revision activities. In these groups, participants have their own writing projects and share the reviewing activity, taking turns commenting on each other's texts. Therefore, activities surrounding the revision of a text are their backbone.

Although several studies have analysed peer revision writing groups, most of them focus on evaluating or reporting on these experiences and their efficacy as well as how to improve institutional actions to help faculty in their publication endeavours (e.g., Allen 2019; Brook et al. 2021; Cassese and Holman 2018; Fallon and Whitney 2016; Nixon et al. 2017). In general, studies on faculty writing groups do not analyse in depth the types of written or/and oral feedback participants provide on a text. However, studies that focus on the importance of dialogic feedback, understood as the conversations held among participants to help 'clarify written comments and encourage the negotiation of meaning' (Chakraborty et al. 2021: 2)



within groups have been usually carried out in classroom environments to determine its benefits in the development of students' learning skills (e.g., Cao et al. 2019; van Popta et al. 2017; Yang and Carless 2013).

Different studies highlight the importance of participants' engagement with face-to-face peer dialogue to discuss feedback (e.g., van den Berg et al. 2006; Zhu and Carless 2018). When participants have an opportunity to discuss written comments through face-to-face dialogue, oral feedback is seen as more positive than only reviewing written comments. In this case, the dialogic interactions participants engage in, made possible through face-to-face contact, seem to help them deliver more constructive feedback and to take this process more seriously with the purpose of helping each other improve the text (Schillings et al. 2021). Additionally, being able to discuss written feedback face-to-face among writing group members helps to develop an element of trust, thus creating a cooperative environment where critical comments on each other's text are easier to accept (e.g., Liu et al. 2021) and a safe space is created (Chakraborty et al. 2021).

From the perspective of cooperative learning (Johnson and Johnson 1994, 2002), writing groups also present cooperative components (Gillies 2016) that can help to make this type of pedagogical tool successful. First, they promote positive interdependence since by working together on giving each other feedback and providing mutual support everyone involved benefits. Second, individual accountability in a writing group means that all members work individually on their text to meet the presentation dates established within the group and to provide feedback on other's texts. Third, writing groups present opportunities for face-to-face promotive interaction since members get together to review previously made written comments on each other's texts; this allows further discussion of the comments, providing possible solutions, sharing knowledge that might be useful to advance the text, among others, which encourage members to reach the completion of their texts. Fourth, through the guidelines established at the beginning of a writing group (e.g., deciding together on expectations and meeting times; how to give and receive feedback constructively), participants learn to interact with each other, thus building interpersonal skills that help them to negotiate their face-to-face interactions.

In this cooperative environment (Johnson and Johnson 1994, 2002), during the process of writing to communicate research results, academics receive feedback meant to highlight difficulties and progress as well as provide information to improve the texts. This literacy practice has shown

important benefits when it involves not only written comments on the text but also face-to-face dialogues to discuss those comments (East et al. 2012; Liu et al. 2021). Additionally, the relationship between the written comments and the conversations about them has been understood as ‘productive learning conversations’ (Wisker et al. 2003: 389). In this sense, based on central aspects of the concept of feedback by Helen Basturkmen and colleagues (2014), we understand feedback as a means to socialise and gradually introduce writers into the literacy practices of a particular discourse community. It is an activity that provides information about the expectations, values and beliefs of a community, the nature of disciplinary knowledge, and the roles within that community.

Considering features yet unexplored about faculty writing groups, the objective of our study is to analyse the written comments on one specific author’s text, reviewed on three different occasions, as well as the oral exchanges regarding the written comments during face-to-face meetings to determine how these two types of feedback developed as the meetings progressed. For this purpose, the categories established for written comments on a text in a study by Basturkmen and others (2014) are relevant to our analysis and were used as a starting point.

The faculty writing group: Background information

The writing group under study was implemented through the Reading and Writing Programme at a public Ecuadorian university to provide support to experienced as well as new research academics; it ran from March 2017 to February 2018 (two semesters). All three members were part of a different research group, came from varied disciplinary areas (a sociologist, a doctor, and a chemical engineer), and had been unknown to each other before the first group meeting. Their participation was voluntary, outside assigned university hours, and members learned about the writing group through word of mouth. The draft articles presented were from their research groups. During the writing group’s first meeting, members (two men and one woman) introduced themselves, talked about their previous writing-for-publication experiences, and gave some details about the research projects they were involved in.

After this brief introduction, the writing group facilitator (the second author of this paper) and participants agreed on the group’s main objec-



tive: to advance their writing projects through peer feedback in the form of reader's perspectives on their texts. This fitted well with the group's multidisciplinary composition, allowing a broader audience to help make texts more accessible beyond a particular disciplinary field (e.g., Beck et al. 2008; Brooke et al. 2021; Colombo and Rodas, 2021; Plummer et al. 2019). It was for the members to decide together the writing group's inner workings in accordance with their needs. Based on the facilitator's writing group experience and suggestions, this first meeting served to set up the group's functioning rules: frequency (weekly meetings), meeting date and time, text sharing for peer review, the language of communication during meetings (Spanish-L1 or English-L2, depending on the text), and meeting location (the writing centre).

The facilitator created a shared Google Drive folder to upload the meetings' audio files (recorded with the members' consent), each member's draft texts saved in individual folders where others would offer their comments / suggestions, and any additional shared resources. Members agreed to upload their texts for peer review at least four days before the face-to-face meeting. The facilitator also suggested that authors guide their readers regarding what sections of the text they should focus on (e.g., the methodology, the results) so as to receive more relevant feedback. The expectation was not that authors would present a finished text but a draft of their writing-for-publication projects, which could be of different academic genres, such as articles, abstracts and conference presentations.

Regarding the written comments, specifically, the facilitator advised that these be given in the form of suggestions or questions about a section of the text that needed clarification or more information (e.g., organisation, structure), where readers considered this relevant; thus, the focus was meant to be on the content more than on editing issues. As the facilitator mentioned in the first meeting,¹

What we want to comment on is, mainly, the content of the article, if it is understood, if it is well organised. If there are grammatical issues or things having to do with punctuation, these can be comments that can also be added.... I would recommend that you do not erase, add, or take out anything directly in the text since it is not yours. But we can give suggestions in the comments: [for example] you are missing such or such a thing.

A final functioning rule mentioned by the facilitator was to keep in mind that authors had no obligation to accept any or all comments given. Instead, they could evaluate and decide what to do based on their particular needs and knowledge of their disciplines and their writing conventions. Thus, other members would take this into consideration and not see it negatively if their comments were not accepted or incorporated into the texts. In the case of these faculty writing groups, ‘written peer feedback was conditional for the dialogue’ (Schillings et al. 2021: 10) which took place during face-to-face meetings, allowing the opportunity for members to provide oral explanations to written comments and/or discuss different areas of the text when necessary.

Originally, the group was meant to be semi-facilitated (Kozar and Lum 2013); in this sense, the facilitator’s role was to set up the group, suggest preliminary guidelines, and attend some meetings to model the feedback process. However, at the request of the participants, the writing group became fully facilitated; thus, the facilitator actively participated in the sessions: organised meetings, maintained email communication and provided peer feedback, but did not present a text to be reviewed.

As the writing group’s face-to-face meetings progressed, a dynamic started to develop, following a simple structure for participants’ interactions during each session. First, they would voluntarily decide who would begin taking up their written comments. It was up to each member to elaborate or not on their written feedback; at the same time, authors could intervene either by answering questions regarding the section of the text being reviewed or by asking members to clarify a written comment not understood on face value. However, taking turns to cover all comments made by one author at a time did not prevent members from interacting when feedback coincided with another person’s observations. That is, the written comments prompted oral exchanges between the text’s author and the other members to help clarify what had caused miscomprehension or required additional information. Finally, a session would generally close with the facilitator asking for members to agree or confirm on future dates and texts to be reviewed.

Materials and methods

This case study analyses the written and oral comments made by the writing group members on three different drafts of one member's text. We decided to focus on one member's text to determine how written and oral comments developed as meetings progressed. Thus, three meetings and their corresponding commented-on drafts were selected for analysis. Additionally, the first meeting was also analysed in order to describe the writing group's decision-making process which led to their functioning rules. For reference purposes, the sessions chosen are referred to as Meeting One, Two and Three, in chronological order; these correspond to sessions 8, 10 and 14, from a total of 17 meetings which took place during two academic semesters. Participants gave their informed consent and were given pseudonyms to maintain anonymity. Sessions lasted between 30 to 55 minutes, and they were transcribed verbatim.

Written comments made using the commenting or suggesting function of Google Drive were segmented based on idea units because 'reviewers sometimes discussed more than one idea within a single comment entry' (Gao et al. 2019: 6). Following Melissa Nelson and Christian Schunn (2009), 'an idea unit was defined as a contiguous comment referring to a single topic. The length could vary from a few words to several sentences' (386). Thus, each comment could include more than one idea unit. The analysis involved the following steps. First, as Table 1 shows, idea units were analysed and categorised using the taxonomy by Basturkmen and others (2014) regarding their pragmatic function (referential to specific facts, information or knowledge in the text-/directive/expressive).

Second, also following Basturkmen and others' (2014) categorisation, idea units were characterised according to their focus, as Table 2 illustrates. Based on the results from this preliminary quantitative analysis, a second phase of the study consisted of determining if the idea units in the written comments had been 'retaken' or not during the face-to-face meetings. Retaken idea units were those that participants mentioned or referred to in the oral exchanges they had during face-to-face meetings. After iterative readings of the sessions, we determined four categories to characterise idea units that were orally taken up: reformulated, justified, followed by a suggested course of action, and followed by exchanges among the members. One orally retaken idea unit could fall under one or more of these categories.

Table 1. Codes and examples for idea units according to their pragmatic function

Pragmatic function	Code	Example
Referential	Providing information	I think that this idea doesn't connect to the one before it.
	Providing correction	These ... (suggests a period)
	Including reformulation	Maybe 'however, in the Faculty of Chemistry...'
Directive	Suggesting what to do	It is very suggestive. For me, a high percentage could be more than the majority. The results could be presented directly. For example ... more than 70% of the participants from architecture or engineering reported that they chose this career as their first option to access the university... Something like that.
	Eliciting info	What is the number of people surveyed? Were there students who did not answer the survey? Was it mandatory?
	Eliciting clarification	I can't seem to understand: Where does this percentage come from? Does it belong to graphic 4? To what year does it refer to, or it is the total of the three years?
	Telling what to do	Restructure the discussion: 1. Include a first paragraph about the importance of the study and the most important results to highlight the contribution of this article. 2. The second paragraph could include the discussion one at a time. 3. Indicate the limitations of the study, tools used and describe future studies that could be done from the results, comparing it with other authors. Once this has been done, the conclusion can be written as a summary of the discussion with the main results found and future studies.
Expressive	Registering a negative response	This doesn't seem clear to me.
	Registering a positive response	No occurrences.

Table 2. Definitions and examples for idea units according to their focus

Focus	Definition	Example
Content	Information and arguments about the study	Is it necessary here to specify that it has to do with the...?
Formal requirements	Academic conventions related to genre expectations, formatting, and referencing issues	Which is the main source for this information?
Cohesion / Coherence	Links between paragraphs, sentences, and phrases as well as order of ideas	I think that this idea doesn't connect with the one before it.
Linguistic accuracy	Surface level language features, forms and clarity of meaning	Delete: 'real'

An orally reformulated idea unit paraphrased what was previously written, maintaining the meaning. Justified orally retaken idea units provided a reason for offering the feedback. Retaken idea units that were followed by a suggested course of action provided the author with concrete actions to improve his/her text. Finally, retaken idea units that were followed by oral exchanges among the members indicated that what was previously written was not only retaken but also led to elaborate interactions between group participants.

After a preliminary analysis undertaken individually by each author of this article, codes, definitions and categories for both steps of the analysis were jointly discussed and reviewed by all authors to ensure reliability (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). When differences arose, authors jointly reviewed the idea unit in question and came to an agreement as to its final category.

Results

In this section we first present the results associated with the written feedback offered by participants before the face-to-face meetings. Later, we introduce the findings connected to the oral interactions that arose from the written feedback.

Written feedback before each face-to-face meeting and across meetings

Idea units contained in the written comments were analysed regarding their pragmatic function and the focus of the feedback provided. When looking at the pragmatic function of the written feedback participants provided on the three drafts, the referential function was the most recurrent, with more than half (55.22%) of the total idea units analysed (n=134) falling into this category. At the same time, most of the referential idea units focused on providing corrections to the author's text, followed by providing information, and including reformulation.

The second most frequent type of pragmatic function found in the written feedback corresponded to the directive function, with almost half (48.51%) of the idea units falling into this category. However, as meetings progressed, there was a change in the type of directive comments participants offered. While the idea units of the written comments given before Meeting One mostly *suggested* authors *what to do*, those offered on the second and third drafts of the text before Meeting Two and Meeting Three elicited clarification, confirmation or information. In fact, while on the first draft before Meeting One participants offered a few directive idea units telling the text's author what to do, no such idea units were identified in the written feedback offered on the drafts before Meeting Two and Three.

Writing group participants made very few written comments that fell under the last pragmatic function analysed, the expressive function. Overall, only four idea units were classified as showing a negative expressive function and there were no idea units that fell under the *positive* category.

On the other hand, when looking at the focus of the written feedback, almost half of the idea units were centred on linguistic accuracy (43.28%); however, over half of these linguistic comments were made on the first draft before Meeting One. As meetings progressed, fewer idea units associated with linguistic accuracy were identified. This could be attributed to a better understanding of the topic of the text as new drafts were presented and the meeting progressed, thus prompting participants to focus on areas that hindered comprehension and, as it will later be shown, went beyond surface level issues.

The decrease in focus of linguistic accuracy issues can be related to the change in the written comments' pragmatic function. As mentioned earlier, although the referential function providing corrections had the majority of idea units (55.22%) falling under this category, almost half of these idea



units were written before Meeting One. This could indicate that, as they continued their participation in the writing group, participants began to move from mainly offering corrections to establishing a dialogue with authors.

Orally retaken written comments during face-to-face meetings

Overall, more than half of all of the idea units (70 out of 134) contained in the written comments offered on the three drafts before the face-to-face meetings were orally retaken. There is a progressive increase in the number of idea units that were mentioned or discussed during face-to-face meetings with the percentage going from 49% in Meeting One to 52% in Meeting Two and 60% during the last one.

The 70 idea units orally retaken by participants during meetings fell under four categories: reformulated, justified, followed by a suggested course of action, and/or followed by exchanges among the members. As Table 3 shows, when looking at the percentages within each category, participants elaborated mainly idea units centred on content and cohesion/coherence during face-to-face interactions. Actually, when focusing on these two areas, participants not only reformulated what was previously written but also voiced the reasons that prompted them to make the written comment and gave suggestions to improve specific sections of the text.

Table 3. Different types of orally retaken comments in frequencies and percentages

	Reformulated	Justified	Followed by a suggested course of action	Followed by exchanges among the members
Content	34 (51.51%)	28 (56%)	22 (57.89%)	25 (55.55%)
Formal requirements	7 (10.93%)	5 (10%)	3 (7.89%)	5 (11.11%)
Coherence/cohesion	17 (25.75%)	14 (28%)	10 (26.31%)	13 (28.88%)
Linguistic accuracy	8 (12.12 %)	3 (6%)	3 (7.89%)	2 (4.44%)
Total	66 (100%)	50 (100%)	38 (100%)	45 (100%)

Of all written comments addressed by participants during meetings, those focused on linguistic accuracy were the least orally retaken. If we compare the ranking obtained regarding the focus of the written idea units with the ranking of those written idea units that were retaken in the oral exchanges, there is a shift, with linguistic accuracy moving from the first to the last position. A possible explanation for this shift is that more than half of them (58.6%) consisted of suggested corrections directly inserted in the text by the reviewers. In this case, the text's author could either take up the suggestions or ignore them without further explanation from the reviewer, as these were self-evident. In addition, as meetings progressed, there was a decrease in those idea units focused on linguistic accuracy that were orally retaken.

The prominence of oral exchanges among members with a focus on content and coherence/cohesion could indicate that participants followed one of the guidelines established at the beginning of the writing group: to concentrate on what would help improve the content of the text. At the same time, this is consistent with what was previously mentioned regarding written comments: continued interaction among the participants and a better understanding of the topic through reading several drafts about it shifted their focus to eliciting information or clarification, thus establishing a dialogue with the author, instead of just providing surface corrections. These progressive interactions promoted rich exchanges that generally prompted members to ask further questions about a section to better understand it, and thus provide the author with further suggestions for changes/improvements.

An example of this took place during Meeting Two, approximately around minute 21. One of the members asked for clarification regarding a source cited in the text. This required the author to clarify why he had included the citation, but at the same time, it prompted him to mention that the area under review had not been developed completely at that point. After several exchanges between only these two group members (the first member and the text's author, minutes 21 to 25), a second member voiced a question regarding a key term in the text, connected to what was being discussed. She asked: 'What is a [names the term]? Because [names another writing group member] indicates [names a company], and I would not have thought that it would be a small company'. The first reviewer then stated: 'it is very important to include this information... because you have to define your methodology since there are several concepts [about the term in question] but you could say: we are going to define it like this'. The third



writing group reviewer agreed with the first member, indicating that: ‘You could propose [the definition]. If there is too much diverse information, you can also say: for this study, we consider [names the key term] as such and such’. These exchanges between all the writing group members regarding this specific situation of a key term not being clearly defined lasted seven minutes (minutes 25 to 32 of the meeting). The exchange finished as follows:

Author: In the [research] group we also said that we needed to define it, but we have overlooked it. And now that you all mention it, it is very clear that it’s necessary.

Reviewer 1: Sure, now you have a lot to do: first the definition of this term and then the methodology.

Reviewer 2: Now, get down to it [they all laugh].

Author: Yes, of course, the methodology is not clearly defined. Thank you.

This author acknowledged the areas that he, along with his research team, still needed to work on after they were highlighted and discussed within the writing group. As can be seen, this type of exchange was prompted by a written idea unit having to do with the content of the text. However, the oral exchanges that came from it led to a deeper understanding of the written comment and also of what the text itself needed to present for a wider audience to understand it. Taking up this written comment also prompted the different group members to voice new ideas as the exchanges continued, at the same time making way for new suggestions on a course of action through the participants’ oral discussion about the text.

Discussion and conclusion

In this study we have analysed the types of written and oral feedback in a faculty writing group, an aspect that has not been explored so far. We focused on the written comments made asynchronously on one specific author’s text, reviewed on three different occasions, as well as the oral exchanges during three face-to-face meetings based on the written comments. This two-step feedback process was established at the beginning of the faculty writing group as one of its functioning rules and modelled by the facilitator at the outset. In this sense, as mentioned earlier, the written comments offered first were conditional for the dialogue that took place in each face-to-face session (Schillings et al. 2021).

Overall, the shift observed in the focus and function of the written feedback as meetings progressed is similar to the shift that occurred when a written comment was orally retaken in face-to-face meetings. Analysis of the pragmatic function and focus of the written comments indicates that participants moved away from mainly correcting or giving directions to eliciting clarification, confirmation or information. Similarly, when looking at the orally retaken idea units, participants moved from discussing linguistic accuracy issues to talking about the content and cohesion/coherence of the text, with most of the comments leading to exchanges that reformulated or justified what they had stated in writing. This could indicate that, as their interaction in the writing group continued, participants began to move away from mainly offering corrections to establishing a dialogue with each other as authors.

As has been noted by Qiyun Zhu and David Carless (2018), oral comments give participants the opportunity to go beyond a text's surface features, allowing them instead to engage in more in-depth discussions. Our results are also consistent with research that has shown that being involved in different feedback stages, as was the case of this faculty writing group, can be beneficial in peer-to-peer feedback practices. As Fangtong Liu and colleagues (2021) found, a combination of e-feedback and face-to-face feedback can be ideal since, as participants gain rapport with each other, they also gradually learn how to better offer feedback. This two-step process to provide written and oral comments can be easily done in a completely online format combining synchronous and asynchronous communication as was the case of the experience of the online writing groups implemented by Elisabeth Rodas (2022) during the COVID-19 lockdown. Additionally, studies focused on face-to-face as well as online interactions can contribute with the analysis of the growing number of pedagogical experiences that have been reported as a result of the challenges presented by the pandemic (Ball and Savin-Baden 2022; Fawns 2022; Jandrić and Ford 2022; Johnson et al. 2022; Perez Zambón 2020).

It could also be argued that one of the reasons for the change in types of comments (from a focus on linguistic accuracy to a focus on content and coherence/cohesion) is that members were able to engage in deeper dialogues regarding the text beyond surface level concerns as they developed a more trusting relationship with each other. As David Carless (2012) indicates, trust plays a key role in the facilitation of dialogic feedback practices. At the same time, according to Chakraborty and colleagues (2021), trust also helps

build agency and allows participants to experience writing as a social and collegial practice. Thus, especially for faculty who have little or no support in the development of literacy practices related to writing for publication, peer response writing groups can constitute a place where they can collaborate with each other and learn how to navigate the challenges associated with research writing.

We can also affirm that writing groups can set the stage for participants to take risks and start to conceptualise themselves as authors as groups consolidate over time (Chakraborty et al. 2021). Members begin to embrace the idea of being academic authors by actually making their texts available to others whom they trust while at the same time taking the role of reviewers. This cooperative environment (Johnson and Johnson 1994, 2002) is important not only for the success of peer feedback practices (Chakraborty et al. 2021) but also for the development of academic and research writing identities (Carr et al. 2020; Guerin 2013). It is by enacting those literacy practices associated with writing for publication that academics gradually acquire them. Nevertheless, this is not a sudden change but, as Olga Dysthe and Sølvi Lillejord (2012) point out, a process that can happen only if the joint endeavour is sustained over time and there is some guidance to develop promotive interaction (Kristiansen et al. 2019).

Since opportunities to develop academic literacy in higher education are not generally offered consistently, cooperative spaces in which faculty can interact and learn from each other need to be promoted. Writing groups constitute an arena where participants can safely engage in different stages of peer feedback that can enrich texts as well as writers. In addition to becoming familiar with publication practices, writing group participants become involved in cooperative learning spaces where knowledge is produced in conjunction with others and not as a solitary endeavour. This, ultimately, can lead to more democratic and less competitive ways of communicating and producing science.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the writing group members who collaborated with us in this research through their active participation and perspectives. This work was supported by CONICET: [grant number PIP N° 11220170100122CO]; Fondo para la Investigación Científica y Tecnológica: [grant number PICT 2017 1622].

Laura Colombo is an Adjunct Researcher at the National Scientific and Technical Research Council based at the Linguistics Institute of University of Buenos Aires. She is also a Principal Researcher of Grupo PLECDi (Reading and Writing Pedagogies in the Digital Culture; <https://grupoplecdi.wixsite.com/sitio?lang=en>). She has been researching and organising writing groups for graduate students and faculty since 2012.

Email: laura.colombo@conicet.gov.ar; ORCID: 0000-0001-6026-4436

Elisabeth L. Rodas is an English as a Foreign Language professor at the Language Institute of the University of Cuenca, Ecuador. She is also a member of the University's Reading and Writing Program and the Academic Writing research group. Her research focuses on faculty writing groups; she has organised writing groups for faculty and university students since 2017. She is also a researcher of Grupo PLECDi (Reading and Writing Pedagogies in the Digital Culture; <https://grupoplecdi.wixsite.com/sitio?lang=en>).

Email: elisabeth.rodas@ucuenca.edu.ec; ORCID: 0000-0002-6518-6243

Guadalupe Alvarez is an Associate Professor at the Institute of Human Development, National University of General Sarmiento, Argentina. She is also a Researcher at the National Scientific and Technical Research Council and a Principal Researcher of Grupo PLECDi (Reading and Writing Pedagogies in the Digital Culture; <https://grupoplecdi.wixsite.com/sitio?lang=en>).

Email: galvarez@campus.ungs.edu.ar; ORCID: 0000-0001-7152-730X

Notes

1. Writing group sessions were held in Spanish. The authors translated transcription excerpts.

References

Aitchison, C. and C. Guerin (2014), *Writing Groups for Doctoral Education and Beyond: Innovations in Practice and Theory* (New York: Routledge).

Alexander, K. P. and L. Shaver (2020), 'Disrupting the numbers: The impact of a women's faculty writing program on associate professors', *College Composition and Communication* 72, no. 1: 58–86. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27114483>.



Allen, T. J. (2019), 'Facilitating graduate student and faculty member writing groups: experiences from a university in Japan', *Higher Education Research and Development* 38, no. 3: 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1574721>.

Badenhorst, C. M., S. Penney, S. Pickett, R. Joy, J. Hesson, G. Young, H. McLeod, D. Vaandering and X. Li (2013), 'Writing relationships: collaboration in a faculty writing group', *AISHE-J* 5, no. 1: 1001–10026. <https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/100>.

Ball, J. and M. Savin-Baden (2022), 'Postdigital learning for a changing higher education', *Postdigital Science and Education* 4: 753–771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00307-2>.

Basturkmen, H., M. East and J. Bitchener (2014), 'Supervisors' on-script feedback comments on drafts of dissertations: socialising students into the academic discourse community', *Teaching in Higher Education* 19, no. 4: 432–445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.752728>.

Beck, W., K. Dunne, J. Fisher, J. O'Sullivan and A. Sheridan (2008), 'Turning up the heat: Collaboration as a response to a chilly research climate', *Faculty of Law, Humanities and Arts Papers* 12, no. 2. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/lhapapers/1443>.

Bosanquet, A., M. McNeill, E. Huber, J. Cahir and C. Jacenyik-Trawogger (2012), 'Reflection, speed dating, and word clouds: Evaluating a writing group for early-career researchers', *Compendium* 2, no. 5: 9–18. https://www.academia.edu/2489799/Reflection_speed_dating_and_word_clouds_evaluating_a_writing_group_for_early-career_researchers.

Brooke, C. T., J. M. Martin and R. A. Short (2021), 'Peer writing groups as productivity, research, and support networks for extension agents', *Journal of the NACAA*, 14, no. 1. <https://www.nacaa.com/journal/index.php?jid=1193>.

Cao, Z., S. Yu and J. Huang (2019), 'A qualitative inquiry into undergraduates' learning from giving and receiving peer feedback in L2 writing: Insights from a case study', *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 63: 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.08.001>.

Carless, D. (2012), 'Trust and its role in facilitating dialogic feedback', in D. Boud and E. Molloy (eds), *Feedback in Higher and Professional Education* (New York: Routledge), 90–103.

Carr, M., J. Clarkin-Phillips, K. Earl Rinehart, F. Edwards and J. Ferrier-Kerr (2020), 'Writing group commitment and caring: teacher educators talk about identities and agency in the Third Space of a writing group', *Teacher Development* 24, no. 5: 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.13662020.11812708>.

Cassese, E. C. and M. R. Holman (2018), 'Writing groups as models for peer mentorship among female faculty in Political Science', *PS: Political Science and Politics* 51, no. 2: 401–405. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517002049>.

Chakraborty, D., A. Soyooof, M. Moharami, A. D. Utami, S. Zeng, N. Chong-Lem, D. Hradsky, J-L. Maestre, E. M. Foomani and L. Pretorius (2021), 'Feedback as a space for academic social practice in doctoral writing groups', *The Educational and Development Psychologist* 38, no. 2: 238–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20590776.2021.1972764>.

Colombo, L. and E. L. Rodas (2021), 'Interdisciplinarity as an opportunity in Argentinian and Ecuadorian writing groups', *Higher Education Research and Development* 40, no. 2: 207–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1756750>.

DeFeo, J. D., Z. Kilic and R. Maseda (2016), 'From productivity to process: Flipping the writing group', *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 5, no. 3: S1: 544–550. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2016.v5n3s1p54410.5901/ajis.2016.v5n3s1p54410.5901/ajis.2016.v5n3s1p544>.

Denzin, N. K. and Y. S. Lincoln (eds) (2005), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).

Dysthe, O. and S. Lillejord (2012), 'From Humboldt to Bologna: Using peer feedback to foster productive writing practices among online Master students', *International Journal of Web based Communities* 8, no. 4: 471–485. <https://doi.org/410.1504/IJWBC.2012.049561>.

East, M., J. Bitchener and H. Basturkmen (2012), 'What constitutes effective feedback to postgraduate research students? The students' perspective'. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice* 9, no. 2: 1–20. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol9/iss2/7/>.

Fallon, L. C. and A. E. Whitney (2016), "'It's a two-way street": Giving feedback in a teacher writing group', *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education* 5, no. 1: 60–73. <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol5/iss1/4>.

Fawns, T. (2022) 'An entangled pedagogy: Looking beyond the pedagogy—technology dichotomy'. *Postdigital Science and Education* 4: 711–728. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00302-7>.

Gao, Y., C. D. D. Schunn and Q. Yu (2019), 'The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 44, no. 2: 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1499075>.

Geller, A. E. (2013), 'Introduction', in A. E. Geller and M. Eodice (eds), *Working with Faculty Writers* (Logan: Utah State University Press), 1–18.

Gillies, R. M. (2016), 'Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41, no. 3: 39–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3>.

Grant, B. (2006), 'Writing in the company of other women: Exceeding the boundaries', *Studies in Higher Education* 31, no. 4: 483–495. <https://doi.org/410.1080/03075070600800624>.

Guerin, C. (2013), 'Rhizomatic research cultures, writing groups and academic researcher identities', *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* 8: 137–150. <https://doi.org/110.28945/21897>.

Haas, S. (2014), 'Pick-n-Mix: A typology of writer's groups in use', in C. Aitchison and C. Guerin (eds), *Writing Groups for Doctoral Education and beyond* (New York: Routledge), 30–47.



Habibie, P. and K. Hyland (2019), 'Introduction: The risks and rewards of scholarly publishing', in P. Habibie and K. Hyland (eds), *Novice Writers and Scholarly Publication: Authors, Mentors, Gatekeepers* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan), 1–10.

Houfek, J. F., K. L. Kaiser, C. Visovsky, T. L. Barry, A. Nelson, M. M. Kaiser and C. L. Miller (2010), 'Using a writing group to promote faculty scholarship', *Nurse Educator* 35, no. 1: 41–45. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.1090b1013e3181c42133>.

Hyland, K. (2019), 'Participating in publishing: The demoralizing discourse of disadvantage', in P. Habibie and K. Hyland (eds), *Novice Writers and Scholarly Publication: Authors, Mentors, Gatekeepers* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan), 13–33.

Jandrić, P. and D. R. Ford (2022), 'Postdigital ecopedagogies: Genealogies, contradictions, and possible futures', *Postdigital Science and Education* 4: 692–710. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00207-3>.

Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson (1994), *Learning Together and Alone*, 4th ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon).

Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson (2002), 'Learning together and alone: Overview and meta-analysis', *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 22, no.1: 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0218879020220110>.

Johnson, M. W., E. A. Suvorova and A. A. Karelina (2022), 'Digitalization and uncertainty in the university: Coherence and collegiality through a metacurriculum', *Postdigital Science and Education* 4: 772–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00324-1>.

Kozar, O. and J. F. Lum (2013), 'Factors likely to impact the effectiveness of research writing groups for off-campus doctoral students', *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* 7, no. 2: A132–A149. <http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/issue/view/16>.

Kristiansen, K. S., T. Burner and H. B. Johnsen (2019), 'Face-to-face promotive interaction leading to successful cooperative learning: A review study', *Cogent Education* 6, no. 1: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1674067>.

Kwan, P. P., S. Sharp, S. Mason and C. L. Saetermoe (2021), 'Faculty writing groups: The impact of protected writing time and group support', *International Journal of Educational Research Open* 2: 100100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100100>.

Liu, F. J. Du, D. Q. Zhou and B. Huang (2021), 'Exploiting the potential of peer feedback: The combined use of face-to-face feedback and e-feedback in doctoral writing groups', *Assessing Writing* 47: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100482>.

McGrail, M., C. Rickard and R. Jones (2006), 'Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates', *Higher Education Research and Development* 25, no. 1: 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053>.

Murray, R. (2013), "'It's not a hobby": Reconceptualizing the place of writing in academic work', *Higher Education* 66: 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9591-7>.

Nelson, M. M. and C. D. Schunn (2009), 'The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance', *Instructional Science* 37, no. 4: 375–401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x>.

- Nixon, S., S. Brooman and R. Murphy (2017), 'The sorrow of the struggle or joy of the journey? Seven lessons learned from an education research writing group', *Innovations in Practice*, 11, no. 1: 18–22. <https://openjournals.ljmu.ac.uk/iip/article/view/152/154>.
- Perez Zambón, S. (2020), 'Desafíos para una educación post-pandemia. Reseña del evento Virtual Educa Connect "Reset educativo. Ecosistemas digitales para el desarrollo humano"' ['Challenges for a post-pandemic education. Review of the event Virtual Educa Connect "Educational Reset. Digital ecosystems for human development"'] *Revista Desvalimiento Psicosocial* 7, no. 2.
- Plummer, L., E. Pavalko, J. Alexander and J. McLeod (2019), 'Faculty writing groups: A tool for providing support, community, and accountability at mid-career', in A. G. Welch, J. Bolin and D. Reardon (eds), *Mid-Career Faculty: Trends, Barriers, and Possibilities* (London: Brill Sense), 126–142.
- Rodas, E. (2022), 'Sustaining writing-for-publication practices during Covid-19: Online writing groups at an Ecuadorian university', in J. Fenton, J. Gimenez, K. Mansfield, M. Percy and M. Spinillo (eds.), *International Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Academic English in Turbulent Times* (New York: Routledge), 167–177.
- Schillings, M., H. Robertsen, H. Savelberg, A. van Dijk and D. Domans (2021), 'Improving the understanding of written peer feedback through face-to-face peer dialogue: students' perspectives', *Higher Education Research and Development* 40, no. 5: 1100–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1798889>.
- Tysick, C. and N. Babb (2006), 'Writing support to junior faculty librarians: A case study', *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 1: 94–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.10.005>.
- van den Berg, I. W. Admiraal and A. Pilot (2006), 'Peer assessment in university teaching: Evaluating seven course designs', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 31, no. 1: 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262346>.
- van Popta, E., M. Kral, G. Camp, R. L. Martens and P. R. J. Simons (2017), 'Exploring the value of peer feedback in online learning for the provider', *Educational Research Review* 20: 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.10.003>.
- Wisker, G., G. Robinson, V. Trafford, M. Warnes and E. Creighton (2003), 'From supervisory dialogues to successful PhDs: Strategies supporting and enabling the learning conversations of staff and students at postgraduate level', *Teaching in Higher Education* 8, no. 3: 383–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510309400>.
- Yang, M. and D. Carless (2013), 'The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes', *Teaching in Higher Education* 18, no. 3: 285–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.13562012.13719154>.
- Zhu, Q. and D. Carless (2018), 'Dialogue within peer feedback processes: clarification and negotiation of meaning', *Higher Education Research and Development* 37, no. 4: 883–897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.07292018.01446417>.